

Palestine Focus

NO. 18

NATIONAL NEWSPAPER OF THE NOVEMBER 29th COMMITTEE FOR PALESTINE

MAY-JUNE 1986

50¢

Editorial

U.S. Scuttles "Peace Process"

According to the Reagan administration, the PLO has "missed the boat" because PLO Chairman Yasser Arafat refuses to accept U.N. resolutions 242 and 338. President Reagan stubbornly insists on these two, ignoring all the many other U.N. decisions which assert the right to self-determination for the Palestinian people. Resolutions 242 and 338 call for Israeli withdrawal from occupied territories but only refer to the Palestinians as a refugee problem with no reference to the violation of a people's national rights. Was the boat then missed, or did it sink without a trace?

Chairman Arafat reportedly agreed to accept 242 and 338, if only the United States would state that it accepted the Palestinian right to self-determination. Instead, the United States insisted that the right to self-determination should be an item on the negotiating table and not one to be agreed upon in advance. The assertion of self-determination is the fundamental demand of the Palestinian people.

United States rejection of Palestinian rights and thus blockage, along with Israel, of any possibility for peace dates from the Kissinger policy of 1975. Since that time, U.S. policy has been no role for the PLO, or the Palestinian people, and no Palestinian state.

King Hussein agrees with the U.S. stance, and the famous "peace process" trumpeted by the Reagan administration has "collapsed." Our reservation at the terminology is that it is difficult to see how something that never existed could collapse. In February 1986, following the U.S. rejection of PLO proposals for negotiations, Hussein withdrew from his one-year-old agreement with Chairman Arafat. The agreement had proposed a joint Jordanian-PLO delegation for negotiations with Israel and the United States within the context of an international conference, along with the possibility of joint PLO-Jordanian rule over the West Bank, now occupied by Israel.

The Hussein-Arafat agreement was met with much opposition within the PLO, with critics asserting that King Hussein and the United States were seeking unacceptable concessions from the Palestinians and offering nothing in return. Now that King Hussein has followed the U.S. lead in breaking the agreement, a reassessment of strategy and tactics within the PLO will most likely take place. No matter the precise outcome of such a reassessment, recent events have shown that whatever roadblocks are put up by Israel, the United States, and King Hussein, the Palestinian people will maintain their resolve to seek equality, self-determination, independence, and peace.

Yet King Hussein has called on Palestinians to dissociate themselves from the PLO and establish an alternative leadership. He has revived the rubber-stamp Jordanian parliament, with "representation" from the occupied West Bank. King Hussein has also promoted the latest Israeli "autonomy" plan on the West Bank. This "self-rule" plan calls for replacing duly elected mayors of Palestinian cities and towns (mostly pro-PLO nationalists) with pro-Jordanian Palestinians. Such "representatives" would then be given Israeli-Jordanian legitimacy to speak for the Palestinians instead of the PLO. King Hussein's real intention is thus to make himself the representative of the Palestinian people.

Palestinians, however, think otherwise. The recent assassination of Zafir el-Masri, newly appointed mayor of Nablus by the Israeli military occupation under the self-rule plan, caused other prospective appointees to withdraw their names. And while the Israelis permitted the unusual event of Palestinians entering the West Bank from Jordan to attend al-Masri's funeral, the service turned into a demonstration in support of Palestinian self-determination and the PLO and against Israeli occupation.

At the same time, King Hussein pressured delegations of West Bank Palestinians to visit him and support his plans. But, as the *New York Times* reported, "Many members of the delegations reported to be from the West Bank were, in fact, from Jordan, and stories abounded of government officials and security forces ordering people from their jobs or Palestinian refugee camps to appear at the palace."

Linked with Israel's policy of "Iron Fist" repression of Palestinians in the West Bank and Gaza is the Israeli attempt to pursue the "self-rule" plans, which the Israeli government claims are intended to "improve the quality of life." This Israeli version of classic pacification strategy cynically offers to let Palestinian collaborators replace Israelis in maintaining the civil functions of the Israeli occupation. It is the old carrot and stick, aimed at prying loose Palestinian support for the PLO and breaking the Palestinian people's deeply felt resolve to gain self-determination. In this plan, King Hussein's ambitions to speak for the Palestinians in place of the PLO is just one more obstacle to Palestinian will.

Meanwhile, the Reagan administration says it is putting a hold on all attempts to advance its "peace process," seeking a period of "reflection." Israel, once again joined by an American administration that refuses to acknowledge the just aspirations of the Palestinians, is allowed to continue its policies of repression, expansion of Jews-only settlements, land confiscation, and virtual annexation. Recognition of Palestinian self-determination is fundamental if President Reagan and the Israeli government really seek peace in the Middle East. Without it, they will both "miss the boat" every time. □



Rome demonstration against U.S. attack.

Attack on Libya

The United States Flies to War

By Steve Goldfield and John Masterson

Ronald Reagan has taken on his most challenging theatrical role: presiding over the resurrection of war hysteria in the United States. Reagan is pulling out all the stops: melodramatic cries of "the communists are coming from Nicaragua"; solemn warnings that "the terrorists are coming, masterminded by Libya"; rousing visions of his science-fictional "Star Wars" defense system; patriotic evocations of "founding fathers fighting for freedom" in Nicaragua and Angola.

Now this hysteria has become a pathological state. The disease is war fever. The latest symptom is the unprovoked, irrational, and illegal (under international law) bombing of Libya. The United States once again joins Israel in the resort to aerial terrorism in punishing its adversaries. Muammar Qadhafi's infant daughter and other Libyan civilians are only the latest victims of Reagan's criminal foreign policy.

Greeted by massive demonstrations

This issue of *Palestine Focus* contains a special four-page section focusing on Israel's relationship with South Africa. Starting on page 3, the section includes an introduction, historical and ideological background, information on economic and military ties, a comparison between the conditions under South African and Israeli Apartheid, a look at Israeli relations with the so-called African homelands, and a summary.

around the world, the U.S. attack on Libya has almost totally isolated the United States government in the international arena, even from its closest European allies. Most governments—and most people—believe Reagan's aggression against Libya only compounds the problem of political violence in the Middle East rather than contributing to stopping it. Once again, the Reagan administration refuses to deal with the real causes of violence in the Middle East: the denial of the national and human rights of the Palestinian people and the adventurist growth of U.S. intervention.

While, for the moment, Reagan has won domestic popular support, his "victory" did not automatically translate into congressional approval for aid for the Nicaraguan contras as he had intended. Nevertheless, Reagan's shipment of Stinger missiles to UNITA contras in Angola and his continued nuclear tests in the face of a unilateral Soviet moratorium passed almost without comment in the aftermath of the raid on Libya. In this sense, he retains the initiative.

Reagan has so perverted political discussion in the United States that it has become commonplace to refer to El Salvador and Guatemala as "democracies" and Nicaragua as a "brutal communist" dictatorship. In the same vein, the first two had "model" elections while Nicaragua's was a "sham," and Libya "masterminds terrorism" while Israel "defends itself" by bombing and invading Lebanon and suppressing Palestinian rights.

Continued on page 7

NOVEMBER 29th COMMITTEE
FOR PALESTINE/PALESTINE FOCUS
P.O. Box 27462
San Francisco, CA 94127

Bulk Rate
U.S. Postage
PAID
Permit No. 181
San Francisco, CA

Forwarding and Address
Correction Requested

Hilton Obenzinger
122 Clipper Street
San Francisco, CA 94114

8512

"Our most pressing domestic problem is our foreign policy."

"Our most pressing domestic problem is our foreign policy."—Wilhelm Joseph, National Conference of Black Lawyers

The place where U.S. foreign policy is largely decided—and implemented—is in the budget process. Israel, for example, is given in excess of \$4 billion to build settlements and inflict repression on Palestinians in the West Bank and Gaza, to invade its neighbors, and to arm the Nicaraguan contras, South Africa, Chile, Guatemala, El Salvador, Honduras, and other dictatorships around the world. That massive appropriation is a far more persuasive statement of the U.S. government's rejection of any "peace process" than even the wildest rhetoric of Ronald Reagan and George Shultz combined.

Aid to Israel is dwarfed by the \$60 billion, plus or minus a few billion, the United States is spending to maintain its interventionist capacity in the Middle East through the U.S. Central Command (CENTCOM), which comprises about one-fourth of active U.S. troops. The decision to approve such massive expenditures to promote war and injustice is initiated by the president, but it is reaffirmed in the U.S. Congress.

Debate on the 1987 federal budget has begun, and early indications point to a significant controversy over whether to cut, and by how much, the military portion of the budget. The president's proposed budget allocates over \$320 billion for the military and would force over \$40 billion in cuts in domestic programs below current levels.

The mandate for budget cutting was sparked by the mushrooming deficit and came wrapped in the Gramm-Rudman budget-balancing formula. The formerly docile U.S. Congress has begun to take seriously cuts in the part of the budget allocated for military expenditures, i.e., for war preparations. Since 1986 is an election year, the

debate over the budget takes on added significance.

This atmosphere presents the opportunity to raise the important issues of how much we taxpayers are expected to pay and what we get in return. The choices are stark: a special report on "The Reagan Defense Budget" by the Democratic Study Group in the House of Representatives states, "With the defense spending levels proposed by the Reagan administration, it would be necessary to cut domestic programs \$65 billion in FY 1988; \$78 billion in FY 1989; \$91 billion in FY 1990; and \$110 billion in FY 1991" to meet Gramm-Rudman targets.

The debate over aid to the contras underscored an important political reality: debates over policy are often resolved in budget and appropriations bills. The debate over the 1987 federal budget is thus a good arena in which to challenge U.S. international policy.

Representatives Ronald V. Dellums of California and Patricia Schroeder of Colorado, for example, have developed an alternative 1987 defense budget which cuts military expenditures to \$255 billion. In their own words,

The Dellums-Schroeder defense proposal rejects three fundamental tenets of the Reagan military buildup: first, that we need nuclear first-strike and war-fighting capabilities; second, that our forces should be used to impose our views on third-world nations; and third, that we should prepare to refight World War II in Europe. Rather, our plan aims at seven goals:

1. Reducing the risk of nuclear war;
2. Increasing readiness while cutting forces committed to third-world intervention;
3. Reducing the number of troops stationed in Europe and Asia;

4. Eliminating overlapping and unnecessary weapons systems;
5. Reforming the procurement process to end waste;
6. Fully funding programs for military families; and
7. Creating a capital investment and employment conversion program.

The Dellums-Schroeder plan addresses U.S. intervention in the Middle East. Consider that about 20 percent of the war budget, which in 1986 was \$286 billion, is allocated for CENTCOM, based in Florida but originally charged with the task of preserving U.S. control over the region surrounding the northern Indian Ocean.

CENTCOM, previously known as the Rapid Deployment Force, is comprised of about four hundred thousand U.S. troops from all services along with their vessels, airplanes, weapons, and supplies. CENTCOM includes five (out of a total of eighteen) active army divisions, more than a division of marines, seven tactical fighter wings and two strategic bomber squadrons from the air force, and from the navy, three (out of thirteen) carrier battle groups and other units. Only the force in Europe is larger, and many CENTCOM forces are borrowed from the European theater.

In the last few years, CENTCOM has staged Bright Star practice military operations with Egypt, Oman, and other regional allies. And, though the attack on Libya came from a different force in the Mediterranean, the reality of hundreds of thousands of American troops poised to invade the Middle East is disquieting, to say the least.

Dellums and Schroeder comment:

The buildup of the former Rapid Deployment Force, now U.S. CENTCOM, for intervention in Southwest Asia, has no coherent rationale. We would eliminate all funds for this program. The only role

of the Rapid Deployment Force is to promote an interventionist U.S. policy against small countries and to "protect" the oil fields of the Middle East and Southwest Asia. However, times are changing, and it may well be that the premiums we are paying to insure against loss of oil is greater than the cost of the possible loss.

Another item in the military budget is often overlooked because it turns up in an entirely different and inappropriate category. U.S. aid to Israel is viewed as part of American military strategy by those who give it. It ought to be considered part of war expenditures and thus a prime target for cuts. These funds are also used to attack human rights in the West Bank and Gaza and to violate U.S. law in shipping U.S. arms and technology to South Africa. Furthermore, U.S. aid to Israel is given without any oversight as to the use of the funds: a guaranteed formula for abuse.

The maintenance of U.S. troops and bases abroad not only exacerbates the deficit and siphons funds from social spending, it also heightens the tremendous U.S. balance-of-trade deficit. The United States spends funds for its bases in other countries; other countries are not spending money to maintain bases in the United States. U.S. aid to Israel, since much of it is not spent in the United States, has the same effect.

Thus there are sound economic reasons—aside from the weight of the political arguments for peace and social justice, domestically and internationally—to press for massive reductions in the military budget. Demands for dismantlement of CENTCOM and cutting, if not total cessation, of U.S. aid to Israel are good places to start. □

FOCUS On Action

By Steve Goldfield

Successful protests against the first U.S. attack on Libya—during the United States' "freedom of passage" exercise in the Gulf of Sidra—were organized on short notice around the country. The larger demonstrations, which drew speakers and participants from a very broad spectrum of the peace, anti-intervention, and social justice movements—were held in Boston, San Francisco, Chicago, New York, and Washington. Central America and Anti-Apartheid groups were especially active.

The second attack, the bombing of Tripoli and Benghazi in April, generated even more and broader protest. The Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy (SANE) organized a demonstration in front of the White House the evening the attack was announced. Five hundred people rallied in Austin, Texas on Wednesday. The police dispersed the crowd without provocation and arrested four people, who were released without charge. Three of the four were speakers at the rally; the fourth was a bystander. Two hundred picketed the federal building in San Francisco. Two hundred and fifty picketed the Chicago Post Office on tax day. Several hundred each demonstrated in the pouring rain in New York and Washington. Hundreds marched in Boston. We also know of protests in the following cities: Detroit, Buffalo, Rochester, Denver, Atlanta, Philadelphia, Minneapolis, Portland (Oregon), Northampton (Massachusetts), Sacramento, Tucson, and San Diego. In New York, a second demonstration of five hundred confronted President Reagan the Friday after the attack. In Washington a Saturday event on Palestinian prisoners was converted into a protest of the Libya attack, and John Conyers, congressman from Michigan, and Clovis Maksoud, Arab League ambassador addressed the crowd. In New York, an Ad Hoc Committee Against U.S. Intervention planned a demonstration for April 28 and produced a petition. In San Francisco, the previously planned April 19 Spring Mobilization drew an unexpectedly large turnout of twenty thousand. Palestinian-American attorney Abdeen Jabara addressed the rally on Libya

and Palestinian rights, and the march was full of banners reading "Hands Off Libya," among other slogans.

The national office of the November 29th Committee for Palestine sent the following telegrams to President Reagan: "Stop military aggression against Libya. Halt provocative maneuvers off Libyan coast. Your policy threatens world peace." "We strongly condemn U.S. bombing attack on Libyan Cities of Tripoli and Benghazi. Such brutal actions not only destroyed Libyan lives and property but are a provocative escalation of violence in the Middle East. Stop this senseless drive toward war." We sent copies to the Libyan mission to the United Nations along with the following message: "We support your defense of national independence and sovereignty."

The African National Congress of South Africa and the November 29th Committee for Palestine launched a national tour on "Israel and South Africa: The Apartheid Connection?" with an April 16 press conference in Washington. The tour aimed to broaden the ANC's support in the United States, to focus attention on Israel's Iron Fist policy in the West Bank, Gaza, and Lebanon, and to expose the strong alliance between Israel and South Africa. Events were held in the following cities: New York, New Brunswick, Washington, Chicago, Ann Arbor, Iowa City, Kalamazoo, E. Lansing, Salt Lake City, Tucson,

San Diego, Los Angeles, San Francisco, Portland, and Seattle.

Fred Dube of the African National Congress, Wilhelm Joseph, cochair of the National Conference of Black Lawyers, and Jeanne Butterfield, national director of the November 29th Committee for Palestine spoke in a forum on "The Iron Fist: From Sharpeville to Gaza, Racism in South Africa, Israel and the U.S." at Columbia University in New York in March. The event was jointly sponsored by the university's Arab Club and the November 29th Committee for Palestine. Butterfield and Adrien K. Wing of the National Conference of Black Lawyers spoke on "South Africa/Israel: Partners in Apartheid" at Brown University in Rhode Island.

From Austin come reports of a variety of other activities: a protest against an appearance by Rabbi Meir Kahane in Houston; a forum on "Terrorism and Repression: Middle East, South Africa, and Central America" featuring Steve Ashby from the Palestine Human Rights Campaign, and a forum on "Middle East Women" featuring Lana Boudairi and Nurshat Aygen. In February, more than 300 people rallied at the University of Texas to protest Israel's Iron Fist policy. Speakers represented the Black Students Alliance, Central America Peace Initiative, Students for a Unified Left, the Union of Lebanese Students, General Union of Palestine Students, and the rally's sponsor, the November 29th Committee for Palestine.

John Masterson, Professor of Mathematics at Michigan State University and a writer for *Palestine Focus*, spoke on "Palestinians Under Occupation" at Western Michigan University in Kalamazoo. Masterson also spoke in Ann Arbor at the first meeting of the new November 29th Committee for Palestine chapter there.

In San Francisco, the National Conference of Black Lawyers, Arab-American Anti-Discrimination Committee, and November 29th Committee for Palestine held a March forum on Israel's Iron Fist focusing on recent expulsions of Palestinian leaders. Featured speakers were Mark Van Der Hout, president of the National Lawyers Guild, and Wilhelm Joseph, cochair of the National Conference of Black Lawyers, both of whom visited the Middle East to investigate expulsions in November 1985. Maha Giacaman of the Palestinian Women's Association spoke on the effects of occupation on Palestinian women, and Ginny Kraus, Western regional coordinator of the

Continued on page 7



Alameda County Supervisor John George, cochair of the Bay Area Free South Africa Movement addresses April 15 demonstration against U.S. invasion of Libya at Federal Building in San Francisco.

Steve Goldfield/Palestine Focus

Palestine Focus

NATIONAL NEWSPAPER OF THE NOVEMBER 29th COMMITTEE FOR PALESTINE

Special Feature

Israel and South Africa The Apartheid Connection?

Why the Alliance?

How is it that the Israeli government, whose leaders are Jews—some of them victimized by fascists and Nazis in Europe—can ally itself with fascists and Nazi sympathizers in South Africa? The official Israeli explanation along with the Israeli government's official condemnations of Apartheid is that Israel must maintain relations with South Africa to protect the large Jewish community there. But *Jewish Affairs*, the organ of the South African Jewish Board of Deputies explained it differently:

The argument that Israel and South Africa have a basic community of interest in the Middle East and further south has more than a grain of truth in it.... The strong ties between the two countries, closer than ever since the 1967 war, are inseparable from their geographical and strategic position, from their anticommunist outlook, and from all the realities of their national existence.... The destinies of the two countries, so different in many ways, but so alike in the fundamental conditions of their survival, are interwoven in a much more meaningful sense than any

gued that Jews were stunted in their growth as a people and actually deserved their stereotyped discrimination. Instead of fighting persecution, the Zionist movement sought to found a purely Jewish state.

Thus the Zionist movement and the state of Israel are very concerned with maintaining Jewish "purity" and separation from other religious or ethnic groupings. Israel stands for separate development of an imagined exclusively Jewish nation which does not exist. South African Apartheid stands for separate development of imaginary European and African nations within the borders of South Africa. These ideologies are, in essence, the same, and ideology is a powerful shaper of behavior.

The ties are more than ideological and are longstanding. Jan Smuts, for example, prime minister of South Africa in the twenties and again in the forties was a close personal friend of Zionist leader Chaim Weizmann. Smuts' advocacy of the Balfour Declaration in 1917 is credited as being decisive in persuading the British cabinet to issue its call for a Jewish homeland in Palestine.

The first foreign head of state to visit Israel was South African Prime Minister Daniel F. Malan, the architect of modern



South African funeral march.

Allan Tannenbaum/Sygma

Apartheid South African and Israeli Style

By Joyce Chediac

The man was Black. And he was justly angry. "Apartheid in the Holy Land" is the way Aubrey McCutcheon, a member of the National Conference of Black Lawyers from Philadelphia, described conditions for Palestinians under Israeli rule. He had just returned from a fact-finding mission to the Israeli-occupied West Bank and Gaza Strip.

McCutcheon is not alone in his observations. Many have been struck by how closely the lives of Palestinians under Israeli rule mirror the daily existence of Black people under the regime in Pretoria. In truth, Palestinians in Nablus and Gaza, like their counterparts in Soweto and Durban, live under a form of Apartheid. This fact stands

South African government in July led swiftly to sweeping arrests and to troops mowing down hundreds of unarmed Black people. Palestinians in the occupied territories have lived under almost identical emergency laws for nineteen years.

"The powers the South African government granted to police under the 1953 Public Security Act have, without exception, been exercised by the Israeli military administration in the West Bank and Gaza since 1967," according to *al-Fajr*, a Palestinian weekly that comes out of Jerusalem.

"In the South African new laws," this newspaper continues, "a suspect can be arrested, detained, and interrogated without interruption for up to fourteen days without lawyers or charges." Under the 1945 Emergency Regulations in the West Bank and Gaza, any Palestinian suspect can be held up to eighteen days without charges

"As long as Israel exists, we have hope."—General Hendrik van der Bergh, former chief, South African intelligence.

enemy propaganda could conceive, or, for that matter, would be happy to see.

Both Zionism and Apartheid are products of the European nationalism which arose in the second half of the nineteenth century, the same political trend which produced Naziism in Germany and fascism in Italy. Indeed, the revisionist strain of Zionism, today represented by Menahem Begin and Yitzhak Shamir, was directly allied with and supported by Mussolini. These Zionists ar-

Apartheid. Relations continued, though they began to strengthen after Israel's 1967 victory and to accelerate after Prime Minister John Vorster's visit to Israel in 1976, when he signed a treaty agreeing to exchange Israeli arms and military training for South African uranium, steel, and coal. Vorster, who was interned during World War II for pro-Nazi sabotage, also visited the Jerusalem memorial for the 6 million Jews who died in Nazi death camps. During the visit, then Israeli Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin remarked that Israel and South Africa share the same ideals.

General Hendrik van der Bergh, former chief of South Africa's intelligence, summed up the importance of Israel to South Africa after his 1973 visit to Israel. Of van der Bergh, it was said that his "reputation for toughness was matched only by that for his anti-Semitism." Van der Bergh assured his South African compatriots, "As long as Israel exists, we have hope."

Those who continue to ask why Israel is so closely allied with South Africa must question their own view of Israel itself. Israel's massive support for South Africa is entirely in character. □

Palestine Focus focuses on Israel's relationship with South Africa in the interest of strengthening the growing movement against Apartheid in all its forms. Not only does Israel serve as a back door to get armaments and technology into South Africa and South African goods out to the rest of the world with Israeli labels, but Israel is itself an Apartheid state. Israel is inevitably a significant issue for the anti-Apartheid movement, and activists need thorough and well-documented information. This special supplement, prepared by the staff of *Palestine Focus* addresses that need.

"The powers the South African government granted to police under the 1953 Public Security Act have, without exception, been exercised by the Israeli military administration in the West Bank and Gaza since 1967."—al-Fajr

out in bold relief when one examines the kind of repression used against both people. As Fred Dube, a spokesperson for the African National Congress of South Africa, sees it, "The Palestinians are suffering in the same kind of way as we are suffering."

The emergency laws declared by the

and without access to a lawyer. This detention can be renewed every six months for an indefinite period of time.

In South Africa there are 59 separate "national security" laws that are used against

Continued on page 4

By Hilton Obenzinger

The FBI went on record to say that it suspects the Jewish Defense League (JDL), founded by archracist Meir Kahane, is responsible for the bomb blast murder of Alex Odeh, southern California American-Arab Anti-Discrimination Committee (ADC) coordinator.

But now there is a new, bizarre twist in this case. According to a November 12, 1985 *Village Voice* article by Robert I. Friedman, one of the biggest financial backers of the JDL and Meir Kahane is none other than Robert Mattus, chairman of Haagen-Dazs ice cream company! "If they needed money, I gave it," Mattus boasted to Friedman.

Now ADC has written a letter to the ice-cream czar stating that his "endorsement of the JDL, Mr. Mattus, is tantamount to supporting politically motivated violence in this country. Most American consumers would be shocked to know that a percentage of the money they spend on ice cream for their children will find its way into JDL coffers. The activities of this abhorrent and violent group you support go against traditional American values and contravene the values of American Judaism."

The letter requests, on behalf of ADC "and three million Arab-American consumers ... that you cease providing funds to the JDL and that you issue a public statement denouncing the racist policies of Meir Kahane and the violent activities of the JDL." Since his original statement appeared in the *Village Voice*, the ADC asks for Mr. Mattus' denunciation to be "clearly and prominently placed" there as well.

If Mr. Mattus is not forthcoming, a nationwide boycott of Haagen-Dazs seems to be the next logical step. After all, it's hard to stomach chocolate and vanilla knowing that one of the ingredients is ... blood.

Tin cans are an even more familiar part of our daily lives than ice cream, so consider this: "Anything Israeli that comes in a tin can is partly South African, because Iskoor [a joint Israeli-South African steel company] operates the only tin can factory in Israel." So observes Jane Hunter, editor of *Israeli Foreign Affairs*, in a new book, *Undercutting Sanctions: Israel, the U.S. and South Africa*.

Undercutting Sanctions is a cogent, well-documented volume that describes the often secretive relations between Israel and South Africa and how such relations as-

Getting It All in FOCUS

sist the Reagan administration to maintain its "constructive engagement" in complicity with Apartheid.

Jane Hunter details the growing economic relations, including the massive diamond trade, and the significant military collaboration, which has even resulted in the mutual development of nuclear weapons by the two aggressive states. The evidence raises serious questions, which Hunter directs at the anti-Apartheid movement. "The question for Americans should be simply whether we are doing all that we can to end Apartheid. If we find, therefore, that the 'special relationship' between the U.S. and Israel spills over into South Africa, then issues like the level of American aid to Israel, the role of U.S. firms in three-way trade, and U.S. diplomatic attempts to cover up this involvement cannot be ignored." Order *Undercutting Sanctions: Israel, the U.S. and South Africa* (\$5.00) from Washington Middle East Associates, 918 16th Street NW, Suite 501, Washington, DC 20006.

Interest in Israel's relationship with South Africa has been growing for some time, as reflected in the pages of *Palestine Focus*. Now "Israel and South Africa: The Apartheid Connection?" is available, a collection of the many articles on this important subject that have appeared in our pages, including interviews with ANC representatives Mfanafuthi Makatini and Fred Dube and articles by Steve Goldfield and Dr. Alfred Moleah. For a copy, send \$2.00 to November 29th Committee for Palestine, P.O. Box 27462, San Francisco, CA 94127. A new brochure on the same topic is also available; send \$.35 for a sample and write or phone us for bulk rates.

The comparison between Apartheid and Zionism has been made more and more of late. The famous UN resolution condemning Zionism as a form of racial discrimination focuses on Israeli practices and the Israel/South Af-

rica parallel. Of course, the UN resolution agitates supporters of Israel's policies who regularly lash out against both the resolution and the United Nations as a whole. Yet is the assertion valid?

Now, anthropologist Dr. Roselle Tekiner has written "Jewish Nationality Status as the Basis for Institutionalized Racism in Israel," published by the International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (EAFORD). This small pamphlet explains that Israeli law, as determined by the Zionist movement, codifies racism, not only in the famous Law of Return (which allows any Jewish person to become a citizen of Israel almost overnight while Palestinians, "non-Jews," are denied return), but in other laws which give rights to what is officially described as the "Jewish nationality" that are different from those given to "Israeli citizens."

For example, Palestinians living inside Israel's 1948 borders are Israeli citizens but are denied the rights of "Jewish nationality," such as the right to own, lease, or work on land held by the Jewish National Fund or other Zionist agencies. Dr. Tekiner charts the evolution of Israel's discriminatory laws, as well as the development of notions of "scientific racism" which seek to determine this "Jewish nationality" by genetic bloodlines (i.e. theories concerning the "purity of the race").

In addition, EAFORD, in conjunction with American Jewish Alternatives to Zionism (AJAZ) and Zed Press, has just released *Judaism or Zionism: What Difference for the Middle East?* This book presents papers delivered at a 1983 conference sponsored by EAFORD and AJAZ in Washington, D.C. Essays touch upon many critical questions, such as "Judaism, Zionism and Islam" by Dr. Isma'il R. Al-Faruqi, "The Unauthenticity of 'Jewish People' Zionism" by Rabbi Elmer Berger, "The Semantics of Zionism, Anti-Zionism and Anti-Semitism" by Don Peretz, and "The Zionist Organization/Jewish Agency in International and U.S. Law" by Dr. W. Thomas Mallison and Sally V. Mallison. After reading this book, the reader is guaranteed to be able to answer anyone's questions on whether or not Zionism is a form of racism and to defend the integrity of Judaism and Jewish cultural tradition from scurrilous attacks of any kind.

Order "Jewish Nationality Status" (\$1) by Dr. Roselle Tekiner and *Judaism or Zionism: What Difference for the Middle East?* (\$12.95) from EAFORD, Suite 1020, 2025 Eye St. NW, Washington, DC 20006. □

Apartheid..

Continued from page 4

homes of Palestinians released from prison; kidnap, beat, and sometimes kill Palestinian youths; and conduct provocative armed patrols and demonstrations in the hearts of West Bank towns. In the past five years, settler death squads have killed at least 23 civilians and injured 191 others.

Denial of National Identity

Both Tel Aviv and Pretoria even try to deny the people they oppress their very national identity. Says Fred Dube, the Palestinians "have been defined out of themselves. Palestinians are no longer even Semites; they are terrorists. In the same way, we are no longer Africans, we are 'Bantus,' and in the ANC we are also terrorists. So we share a lot."

Under Israeli rule it is actually a crime punishable by up to three years in prison and a fine of 150,000 shekels for merely saying, "I am a Palestinian." Possessing a Palestinian flag, singing a national song, saying you are for the PLO, chanting a slogan, or

attending a political rally, or even wearing clothing with the colors of the Palestinian flag carry an equal penalty. McCutcheon speaks of Fathi Gabin, an artist who was jailed for using the colors of the Palestinian flag in a painting. A patriot served time for singing a national song at his own wedding.

In August 1985, the Israeli newspaper *Ha'aretz* reported the remarkable spectacle of heavily armed Israeli reservists spending several days on the West Bank chasing, shooting down, and then burning children's kites. Why? Because they bore the Palestinian colors.

It is ironic that two of the most heavily armed regimes in the world find the mere expression of national identity by the oppressed to be a threat.

Maintaining such huge military establishments is very costly and is an ever-present and substantial drain on the civilian economy. How, then, are these two Apartheid states able to continue such extensive repression in the face of constant resistance? Black attorney McCutcheon points the finger of blame at Washington for providing the necessary assistance. He says, "The U.S. role has been to constantly support and consolidate the oppressive policies of Apartheid" in South Africa.



Israeli occupation soldiers search Palestinians.

Mark Peters/Newswatch

In regard to Israel, McCutcheon explains, "The 1986 foreign-aid budget allocated \$4.5 billion American tax dollars, while Reagan's foreign budget disposes of a meager \$225 million in famine relief funds for the entire African continent."

The U.S. government's main role in propping up Tel Aviv and Pretoria points to a key

role that concerned people in the United States can play. By working to get the United States to stop its military, political, and diplomatic support for both regimes, Americans can give an enormous boost to both the South African and Palestinian people. □

PALESTINE FOCUS (415) 861-1552 P.O. Box 27462 San Francisco, CA 94127

Palestine Focus is the national newspaper of the November 29th Committee for Palestine (formerly November 29th Coalition). The newspaper is an activist vehicle tied to an activist movement, yet aimed at a general audience with little background knowledge. We report on activities, not only of our committee, but of other groups; and we provide consistent commentary and analysis of events in the Middle East.

The November 29th Committee for Palestine takes its name from the date declared by the United Nations as the International Day of Solidarity with the Palestinian People. Our task is to spark and support consistent, far-reaching, and effective activity which brings the issue of Palestine before the American people and builds a growing and deepening base of understanding. Our committee organizes to stop U.S. intervention in the Middle East and to cut off U.S. aid to Israel. We educate Americans on the need to support the Palestine Liberation Organization, which is the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people, and to oppose Israeli policies of discrimination which deny the Palestinian people their rights.

Signed articles are not necessarily the opinion of the November 29th Committee for Palestine. Letters, opinions, and other contributions are welcome.

Editorial Board: Randa Baramki, Douglas Franks, Steve Goldfield, Riyadh Khoury, Hilton Obenzinger

Contributing Editors: Jeanne Butterfield, John Masterson

ISSN 0883-8577

Subscription Form

Enclosed is \$_____ for a one-year subscription (six issues) to *Palestine Focus*.

For a free list of *Palestine Focus* publications, send a self-addressed stamped envelope with request to the address given below.

Subscription Rates: \$6 (U.S., 3rd-class bulk) \$15 (Overseas)
 \$10 (U.S. & Canada, 1st class) \$20 (Institutions)

NAME: _____

ADDRESS: _____

CITY: _____ STATE: _____ ZIP: _____

Please make check or money order (in U.S. dollars only) payable to *Palestine Focus* and mail along with this form to:

PALESTINE FOCUS P.O. Box 27462 San Francisco, CA 94127

Focus on Action...

Continued from page 2

November 29th Committee for Palestine spoke on the Iron Fist.

Hilton Obenzinger spoke on "U.S. Foreign Policy in the Mid-East, Terrorism, and Israel's Iron Fist" in Eugene and Corvallis, Oregon in February.

Since the 1984 Jesse Jackson campaign, the Rainbow Coalition has been relatively dormant, especially at the national level. A national meeting was held to discuss revitalizing the coalition in Washington from April 17 to 19. About sixty people participated in a Middle East caucus there. Resolutions were presented supporting Palestinian national rights and condemning the U.S. raid on Libya. And aside from the groups who played a prominent role in the Rainbow during the Jackson campaign, large delegations from labor and Midwest farmers came. Delegates returned with high hopes for national and local structures for political action.

San Francisco politicians have made the Middle East a local issue. "Half of the city politicians will have visited Israel, all for the first time, all within 13 months," according to the March 25 *San Francisco Examiner*. The most controversial of the trips, however, was that of lame-duck Mayor Dianne Feinstein who signed a sister-city agreement with Haifa and negotiated a shipping contract with

Zim Lines.

The anti-Apartheid movement was outraged. Haifa is a sister city of Capetown, South Africa making San Francisco a sister-in-law (or perhaps a step sister?) to Capetown. And Zim Lines, which has a joint shipping firm, Zimcorn, with South Africa's Unicorn Lines, is one of the three lines bringing South African goods to the United States. The San Francisco City Council recently passed a hotly debated ordinance banning city dealings with firms doing business with South Africa unless there is no alternative. The *Northern California Jewish Bulletin* described Zim as "one of the world's largest shipping companies" and noted that "about 20 anti-Israel demonstrators greeted the guests" at a welcoming party for Zim in San Francisco, "holding signs that read 'Protest Israel's Actions ... in the Middle East' and 'U.S. Surrogate in South Africa.' The hastily organized picket by anti-Apartheid groups will be followed up by a campaign to get the city to obey its own ordinance and boycott Zim. At press time, the Board of Supervisors was investigating the charges against Zim amidst harsh and intense pressure from the mayor and business interests.

Although the New York and Washington affiliates of public television refused to air the public-television-produced "Flashpoint: Israel and the Palestinians" on April 9, 290 out of the 308 affiliates did broadcast the satellite feed, which included an hour-long version of "Occupied Palestine" along with an Israeli film glorifying the settler movement and another presenting a debate among fanatic and moderate Zionists. The moderates were described in

the film as "radical Zionists." The comments of a Likud Knesset member and Palestinian scholar Rashid Khalidie were interspersed with the films in the two-and-one-half-hour show. The other cities not airing the program included all nine Nebraska stations, four Maryland outlets, two in St. Paul, and one in Cincinnati.

The following resolution was passed at the convention of International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union Local 6 (Bay Area warehouse union) on February 1, 1986: "The Arab-Israeli conflict continues to be a source of tension and violence and a threat to world peace. It is in the interest of all the world's peoples that a solution be found to this conflict. Central to the conflict is the fact that the original United Nations resolution to create the state of Israel and a Palestinian Arab state has not been fully implemented. There is no Palestinian state.

"Therefore, Warehouse Union Local 6 of the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union at its convention on February 1, 1986 in Oakland, California, calls for the convening of an international conference on the basis of United Nations General Assembly resolution 35/58 C at the earliest possible date. The aims of such a conference would be to guarantee Israel's right to exist within secure and internationally recognized boundaries and the right of the Palestinian people to establish their own independent state in Palestine. We call on the governments of the United States and the Soviet Union, all trade unions, peace organizations and all those who desire a just and durable peace in the Middle East to actively support this process." □

Attack on Libya...

Continued from page 1

That the bulk of evidence supports opposite positions is irrelevant to both the Reagan administration and the media, which seems to have abandoned its critical faculties.

We cannot underestimate the power of propaganda in the hands of an unscrupulous government assisted by acquiescent media.

ive writers in Washington, their "research" supplied by the CIA.

Lyndon Johnson manufactured the Tonkin Gulf incident and the White Paper "evidence" purporting to show large-scale North Vietnamese troops and weapons in South Vietnam in the mid-sixties. It is now known that the Tonkin Gulf incident was invented by the administration. It took a careful analysis of the White Paper by journalist I. F. Stone to show that the statistics proving

fell apart at the Bay of Pigs to Reagan's callous decision to use American Marines in Lebanon to "keep the peace in Lebanon" by bombing Lebanese villages, pretexts have been concocted over the last 25 years to gather popular support for invasions of Korea, Iran, Guatemala, the Dominican Republic, and Lebanon, to name only a few of the victims. Eventually, the truth leaked, but in the meantime the United States had marched to war.

It is not surprising then that the Reagan administration has presented no credible evidence linking Muammar Qadhafi to the incidents it is using as the pretexts for reprisal. And so it fits the pattern of past smokescreens: the "proof" that Nicaragua is supplying Salvadoran rebels with weapons, the "serious danger" to American medical students on Grenada, the supposed intrusion of the Soviet Union everywhere.

How long it will be before the truth about the Libyan attack emerges we cannot say. But make no mistake about it. The Libya affair is no more—and no less—than an excuse to go to war. What will a war do for Reagan? It is supposed to rally the jingoistic support of a confused populace, which is needed to bend a reluctant Congress toward giving Reagan a free hand to prosecute a many-faceted interventionist policy.

What will a war with Libya do to us? It will destroy the lives of Americans and Libyans. It will substantially increase the rate

at which valuable social programs are being destroyed to feed the military. It will significantly increase the probability of confrontation between the United States and the Soviet Union with its inevitable nuclear consequences.

The attack on Libya thus threatens all of us. To fail to oppose the attack on Libya is to betray the people of Nicaragua, to betray the people of South Africa, and to betray our own interests. We must act to stop Reagan's punishment of Libya for its refusal to submit to U.S. domination. The alternative is to passively accept the revival of U.S. interventionism. And the new version of U.S. intervention is more dangerous than the old. After "losing" Vietnam, Cambodia, Laos, Mozambique, Angola, Guinea-Bissau, Zimbabwe, and Nicaragua in a single decade, administration strategists are almost fanatic in their determination to reverse the process of national liberation.

Americans fighting for survival today face formidable challenges. We must prevent the dismantlement of the social programs which, insufficient as they are, took decades to build. Funds for these programs are increasingly fed into the military. We must reverse the strategic nuclear weapons buildup which threatens the world with annihilation. And we must stop the increasingly reckless U.S. military intervention strategy in Africa, the Middle East, Central America, and anywhere else it threatens war. We cannot afford to neglect even one of these issues if we are to prevent war and the destruction it brings. □

Once again, the Reagan administration refuses to deal with the real causes of violence in the Middle East: the denial of the national and human rights of the Palestinian people and the adventurist growth of U.S. intervention.

The big lie has been successfully spread throughout this country before, usually trumpeted by a self-righteous television presentation similar to Reagan's of Monday evening, April 14. The evidence behind many such events has been invented by crea-

a North Vietnamese invasion actually consisted of evidence of captured American weapons in the hands of South Vietnamese people.

From the supposedly popular uprising of Cubans created by the CIA in 1961 which

said when they signed the Geneva Conventions is "Never Again." That is outlawed under international law.

And yet the same Jews who fled Nazi Germany and in whose name the 1949 Geneva Convention came to be are now the very same people ignoring it, choosing to go into another land, seize that land, occupy it, kidnap residents of that land, and deport them to another country. There is absolutely no justification for this, morally or legally.

We have an obligation to point that out, to speak about the policies of the Israeli government, to talk about the deportations, to talk about the bombings of the houses, to talk about the torture. It was shocking to me—I've done a lot of work in the United States, I do refugee defense work a lot in my practice, and I'm very involved in political work around various countries—I was much more familiar with the tortures and the killings in Guatemala and El Salvador, in Chile, in South Africa, countries where you hear about that happening in the U.S. press—not to the degree it is happening, by any means. But at least it gets into the press now and then when they want it to get in.

Now that the United States has "changed" its policy on Chile, we hear a lot of that. But you don't hear about the tortures going on in

Israel in the United States press. You don't hear about the lawyer we met with who for twenty-three days, day in and day out, was forced to stand. They fed him, because their idea was not to kill him, but they would not let him go to the bathroom except in his clothes. They would not let him sleep; any time he fell over, there would be beatings. You don't hear about that in the U.S. press.

You don't hear about the people we met with who were given electric shock, who had their heads submerged in toilets to the point of almost drowning. You don't hear

they did not believe that that was going on, that there was that degree of torture, or even any torture at all. They considered themselves a civilized country; they didn't do that. The terrorists are the Palestinians. But we shocked a few people once we got the chance to really talk to them about what was going on in their name in the state of Israel.

There's an awakening to be had there. And we have an obligation to put out that word. We have an obligation to speak out against the Israeli government's policies, what it is doing, because it is truly shock-

Lawyers Testify...

Continued from page 8

fore they pulled out, Israel's signing of the 1949 conventions would take precedence over it.

This is all legal argument, and I don't fundamentally believe that that is the most important part of it, but I think it is important to show that not only is it immoral what the Israelis are doing, but it happens to be in violation of international law. And since the Israeli government from time to time tries to invoke international law, for instance, when they're hunting the Nazis, they like to pick and choose when they can use it.

What is ironic, and sadly ironic, is that the 1949 Geneva Convention was written and then signed precisely because of what happened to the Jews in Nazi Germany. Hitler went into foreign countries, occupied those countries, kidnapped the citizens, and deported them to another country. In that case, it was to extermination camps. But the principle is the same. What the international community

"International law is of no weight in this court."—Israeli Supreme Court Justice Levin

about the constant beatings. They even had the gall in one of the most publicized cases there—these deportation hearings which created a lot of controversy—to brutalize two of the potential deportees on their way back from court one day. That does not get into the U.S. press.

When we had conversations with Israelis,

And though I do believe that as a Jew—and as Jewish-Americans, we perhaps have a special obligation to speak out against what has sometimes been done in our name—all of us have an obligation to bring the word to the American public, because this is what's supporting Israel right now." □

Israeli Expulsion of Palestinians

There is no guarantee to prevent a citizen from being imprisoned for life without trial. There is no protection of the freedom of the individual: there is no appeal against the decision of the military commander, no means of resorting to the Supreme Court... while the administration has unrestricted freedom to banish any citizen at any moment. What is more, a man does not actually have to commit an offense; it is enough for a decision to be made in some office for his fate to be sealed.... The principle of collective responsibility has become a mockery.... A citizen should not have to rely on the good will of an official, our lives and our property should not be placed in the hands of such an official. There is no choice between freedom and anarchy. In a country where the administration itself inspires anger, resentment, and contempt for the laws, one cannot expect respect for the law. It is too much to ask of a citizen to respect a law that outlaws him.

The established order in Palestine since the defense regulations is unparalleled in any civilized country. Even in Nazi Germany there were no such laws.... Only in an occupied country do you find a system resembling ours. They try to reassure us by saying that these laws apply only to offenders and not to the whole of the population, but the Nazi governor of occupied Oslo also said that no harm would come to those who minded their own business.... It is our duty to tell the whole world that the defense regulations passed by the government in Palestine destroy the very foundations of justice in this land. It is mere euphemism to call the military courts "courts." To use the Nazi title, they are no better than "Military Judicial Committees Advising the Generals." No government has the right to draw up such laws.

These impassioned appeals for justice were not made by Palestinians or their advocates. The first was by Dr. Bernard (Dov) Joseph of the Jewish Agency, the second by Yaacov Shimshon Shapira, Israel's first attorney-general. The laws they protested in the late forties are the same laws used to expel Palestinians from their homeland in 1986.

Since August of 1985, when Israel resumed expulsions of Palestinians from the occupied West Bank and Gaza, dozens of Palestinian community leaders have been taken from their homes or prison cells, dumped in remote border areas, and told to walk to Jordan. The November 29th Committee for Palestine printed thousands of postcards which are being sent to the Israeli minister of justice in protest. Copies have been sent to Amnesty International and the United Nations.

Many of those who signed the postcards received a nine-page letter from the Israeli attorney general purporting to provide legal justification for the expulsions. Attorney General Zamir's letter cites the British Emergency regulations of 1945—the same regulations described above—as the principal justification for expulsions. Palestine Focus asked three attorneys—who visited Israel, the West Bank, and Gaza in November of 1985 to investigate the policy of expulsions—to comment on the Israeli legal position.

The three attorneys, National President Mark Van der Hout and Michael Smith of the National Lawyers Guild and Wilhelm Joseph of the National Conference of Black Lawyers, unanimously noted the poverty of the Israeli arguments. The American

lawyers' complete case is presented in a thirteen-page brief submitted to the Supreme Court of Israel.

Michael Smith wrote *Palestine Focus* that "the 1949 Geneva Accords, which Israel signed, and which Professor Zamir believes Israel follows, were drafted to oppose deportation of civilians for any purpose, not just for slave labor as the professor now argues.

"The deportees were not charged with a crime, were not charged with using or advocating violence, and were convicted without a trial on the basis of secret informer evidence that they were not apprised of in its entirety. Lawyer Felicia Langer told me that defending them was 'like wrestling with ghosts.' Such was the extent of due process afforded by the Israeli occupiers."

Felicia Langer confronted Israeli Supreme Court Judge Levin, presiding over the expulsions: "Let me repeat the words of former Supreme Court Justice (Haim) Cohen, who said that 'deportation and the demolition of homes are illegal under international laws.' Has the Supreme Court of Israel changed its position on international law?" Judge Levin responded, "It is of no weight in this Court."

Wilhelm Joseph's Comments

I find this reply to be a very weak response to the issues raised. For instance, the Israelis claim that deportations are sanctioned by Emergency Regulations of 1945 which were introduced by the British; we know that when the British left Palestine in 1948, those Emergency Regulations were rescinded by the British; in any case, if they weren't, article 49 of the Fourth Geneva Convention specifically states, "Individual or mass forceable transfers as well as deportations of protected persons from occupied territories to the territory of the occupying power or to that of any other country occupied or not are prohibited regardless of the motive." So the Israelis must apply the Geneva Convention of 1949 to the Occupied Territories; a protected person means any inhabitant. They also claim that Jordanian law incorporates these Emergency Regulations. But the Israelis choose to recognize and enforce only sections of Jordanian law that meet their own ends.

The Israelis also claim in this letter that they seek to balance concerns of security with humanitarian concerns of the population. I tell you from our observations and our discussions with the Israeli authorities: that balance is totally out of balance. We said, if you charge these men with acts of violence, or ordering acts of violence, or supporting or in any way taking actions that produce acts of violence, they should be properly charged and prosecuted in the courts, which would give their accusers an opportunity to present evidence against them in open court and would give the defendants an opportunity to present a defense, call witnesses, cross examine witnesses, and let the public witness.

These deportations are carried out pursuant to military law; they are secret proceedings. No evidence is presented against the defendants. The evidence is said to be secret and confidential. Therefore, the accused are not allowed to present a defense. They can make a presentation opposing the deportations, but they have no way of contradicting or otherwise challenging any evidence against them because they do not know what evidence is being brought against them.

We had the opportunity to cross examine the prosecutor. He pulled out his secret files and the most damaging thing he could say to us was that "I have evidence that suggests these people are leaders of banned organizations. But we can't reveal our sources because these sources may include their

closest friends and relatives." We thought it was all hogwash, quite frankly. And we say that if there is evidence to present against the men, allow them to have a defense.

The minister of justice in the West Bank told us that deportations were not used very often but that they were coming as a response to an increase in violence in the Occupied Territories. So we asked them specifically, are you alleging that any of these men is tied to these acts of violence or this increase in acts of violence? They specifically said, "No." They have no evidence whatsoever. So we asked, then why are they being deported?

These men are not just ordinary people; they are, in fact, leaders in their respective communities. Dr. Shu'aibi was an elected member of the city council of his town before the Israelis disbanded it. Mr. Jawad was a prominent journalist. All these facts were left out of the Attorney-General's letter.



Mark Van Der Hout (left) and Wilhelm Joseph (center) at forum on Israeli "Iron Fist" in San Francisco. Palestine Focus editorial board member Hilton Obenzinger is at the podium.

Zaki Abu-Steiteh was a prisoner released as part of the May 21, 1985 exchange organized by the International Red Cross. One specific term of the release was that residents of the Gaza or West Bank who were freed, if they chose, could remain there. Mr. Abu-Steiteh chose to remain in the Gaza, where he was born and raised. But the Israelis, we believe, are now violating that agreement by deporting Mr. Abu-Steiteh. Several others have now been deported. Among the evidence presented against him was an allegation that he was singing Palestinian national songs at his wedding.

We have to recognize that expulsion of a person from his or her native land or country is one of the most extreme forms of punishment that can be imposed. You are separated from your livelihood, family, and friends. They can uproot you within a very short space of time and send you away with no guarantees of any kind of rights."

Mark Van Der Hout's Remarks

When we asked the head prosecutor and the minister of Justice why these four individuals were being deported, the answer was "they're high-up members in the PLO, either the PFLP or the DFLP. They're terrorists, and they have not learned their lessons," he said.

We asked, isn't it a crime to be a member? "Yes, it is." Why don't you go to court and prove your case. "We can't," he said. "Because if we went into the criminal court process, we wouldn't have the ability to do what we can in a military court," which is basically a secret hearing where neither the defense nor the defense lawyers know what the accusations are. The only accusation is that you are a member of a "terrorist" organization. But the proof of that and the acts that the person allegedly committed or the activities that the person allegedly did are not disclosed.

He did concede that it was a little difficult

for the defense lawyers to do anything in those courts. And we said, we're lawyers, we're here to investigate what's happening here in this legal process. It's a little difficult for us to imagine what a lawyer's supposed to do when the only "evidence" is the accusation that the person is a member of the PLO. What is he or she supposed to do?

"Well," the head prosecutor said, "that's true, it is a little difficult. But you've got to understand the situation we're in here now. This is a war going on. People are being killed in Israel. There's been a rash of murders inside the Green Line, inside pre-1967 Israel; we need to take a response." We asked: were these individuals allegedly involved in any of those murders? "Well, no, they're not involved in the murders, but they're members of an organization whose existence spurs these acts on by encouraging people to do such things, and therefore these people are guilty."

Under the 1949 4th Geneva Convention, article 49 prohibits this type of deportations. The Israeli response to that was a little curious. The law seemed pretty clear to us. And as a matter of fact, when we met with the U.S. Ambassador, Thomas Pickering, whom people remember as the former ambassador in El Salvador, he agreed that the United States formal position was that the deportations were a violation of international law.

When we posed that to the Israeli government, their response was, "well if you read what it actually states"—they had a couple of different responses—"if you read the language of the Geneva Convention, it says there can be no deportations to another country. Well," they said, "we're not deporting them to another country. We're sending them to Jordan. That's where they're from. So we're not deporting them to another country; therefore, we are not in violation of the Geneva Convention." A pretty amazing argument to me, but it's the official position of the Israeli government.

They also try to say—but they don't really try to push this because it has no legal basis whatsoever—that there was a 1945 British emergency law that was still in effect that allowed them to deport. They ignore the fact that it happened to be repealed as the British were pulling out of Israel.

Now there's some dispute on that, it was to be repealed and then the act never happened, per se. But the British pulled out, and under international law, when the 1949 Geneva Convention was signed by Israel, even if the British regulation were still in effect, international law takes precedence, under legal standards in international law, over any other act. In other words, a subsequent act takes precedence over any previous act under international law and under domestic law in the United States, too. So even if that 1945 emergency regulation was not officially withdrawn by the British be-

Continued on page 7