

PALESTINE MONOGRAPHS

55

Int. /
DS
120
25
55

no. 55

THE ARABS UNDER ISRAELI
OCCUPATION



PALESTINE RESEARCH CENTER

THE ARABS UNDER ISRAELI OCCUPATION

THE ARABS UNDER ISRAELI OCCUPATION



Palestine Research Center

Beirut — Lebanon

February 1969

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Introduction	5
Chapter I: Annexation and Integration	9
Chapter II: Jerusalem	17
Chapter III: Reign of Terror	41
Chapter IV: Schools and Education	69
Chapter V: Economic Difficulties	81
Appendices	99

INTRODUCTION

More than seventeen months have passed since the outbreak of the Middle East war of June, 1967. When the war had ended Israel was in occupation of territory equivalent to three times its size: the Sinai Peninsula, the West Bank, the Gaza strip and the Syrian Golan Heights. All these territories belonged to three independent sovereign states—the UAR, Jordan, and Syria.

In addition to occupying these territories through a pre-conceived military invasion, Israel directly and indirectly caused a further flow of Palestinian refugees, amounting to about 400,000, to cross the Jordan River to the East Bank; many of these became refugees for the second time in their lifetime. The period since the end of the war also witnessed scores of Israeli large-scale attacks across the ceasefire line in the shape of artillery and aerial bombardment, as well as infantry and armoured incursions.

Suez, Ismailia, Port Said, Karamah, Irbid, Salt, are some of the Arab towns and cities that have hit the headlines as a result of heavy Israeli artillery, air or ground assaults—that have caused the deaths of hundreds of Arab civilians, including women and children. Zones bordering the cease-fire lines along the Suez Canal had to be evacuated as a result of the consistent Israeli shelling of civilian concentrations.

Within the occupied territories, the Palestinian population has been living under continuous physical and moral harassment. Homes are blown up with little notice given. The pretexts for such atrocities are often so flimsy as to be ridiculous and it is quite obvious that what Israel is doing is merely administering indiscriminate collective punishment in retaliation against Palestinian resistance (a form of punishment that contravenes the 1949 Geneva Convention).

Furthermore, arbitrary arrests and deportations are frequent and widespread, while a full-scale campaign of intimidation is concentrated upon the population of the Gaza strip in order to "encourage" people to move to the East Bank via the West Bank.

Often Israeli pressure takes the form of psychological harassment, torment frequently applied against the citizens of Arab Jerusalem. Thus the Israeli authorities in the illegally annexed city are pursuing an elaborately designed policy with the distinct aim of erasing Arab culture, history, and even the Arabic language from a city that has been Arab for 1,300 years. School text books are being changed with strict concentration on Israeli and Jewish themes. Hebrew has become a compulsory language in state schools, while even street signs and official correspondence are almost exclusively Hebrew.

Israeli authorities are also actively encouraging the growth of prostitution, strip-tease clubs and the traffic in drugs in Old Jerusalem with the resultant increase in juvenile delinquency. By blatantly condoning the above practices (practices that are not tolerated in New Jerusalem) the Israeli administration

is apparently seeking to outrage the traditional and religious-minded Arab population of Jerusalem as part of the general psychological campaign to get as many Arabs to leave as possible.

The war and its aftermath is a story that can be summarized as one of Israeli conquest of Arab territory, of heavy recurrent Israeli bombardment of Arab towns and cities, of Israeli oppression of the Arab Palestinian population presently under the yoke of occupation. It is furthermore, a story of attempts by Israel to de-Arabize, culturally and demographically, the occupied territories and of a steady Israeli settlement in usurped Arab territory.

In the following chapters, Israeli measures against the Arabs since the June war of 1967 are recorded and evaluated in the light of the Geneva Agreement, the Hague Convention, United Nations Resolutions world public opinion, and Human Rights values—more so, since the year 1968 has been declared the Human Rights Year.

CHAPTER I

ANNEXATION AND INTEGRATION?

Sometime before his conversion to Zionism, Theodore Herzl expressed his belief that the Jews of the world, when put together, would not blend. He wrote,

"And if the Jews really returned home one day, they would discover on the next day that they do not belong together. For centuries they have been rooted in diverse nationalisms, they differ from each other, group by group; the only thing in common is pressure, which holds them together."¹

If what Herzl wrote about Jews between themselves holds true—despite the fact that they have a language and religion acting as a common denominator between them, how more aptly it would apply to Arabs and Israelis, who have in common almost twenty-one years of animosity.

Despite this, Israeli leaders have been telling the whole world that, as a result of their rule and administration, integration between the two peoples in occupied territories has been a success. They even refer to those Arabs who were living in

(1) Selzer, Michel, *The Organization of the Jewish State* (New York, 1967), pp. 53-54.

Israel before the June war and claim that they lived in harmony with the Jews for 20 years.

On August 23, 1967—about one and a half months after the Six Day War of June, Israeli bulldozers set to work tearing down the wall at Maundelbaum Gate in Jerusalem—the 20 years' standing symbol of division between the East and West sides of the same city.

For the Israeli occupiers, the measure was believed to have brought an end to their unsettlement and their division with the Arabs whom they had expelled from their homes 20 years before. It was the first of a series of steps to be taken in a futile effort to unite similar poles of two magnets.

It is simply sufficient to cite two examples to prove the futility of the attempt.

1. On August 20, 1968, bombs exploded in the West side of Jerusalem. As a result, swarms of Israeli youth poured into the streets of the East side of Arab Jerusalem, beating up men, women, and children, turning cars upside down, and raiding Arab shops. If any thing, it drove the Israeli Defense Minister, Moshe Dayan, probably the most sensitive of the Israeli leaders to the question of integration, to say, "We do not want what happened in Cyprus to happen here."² He was referring to the fights between Greek-Cypriots and Turkish-Cypriots that ignited the Civil War on the island. At another occasion, Dayan was quoted as saying, "All the trouble in the occupied territory is caused by Jews and not Arabs."³

(2) *The New York Times*, August 20, 1968.

(3) *The London Times*, October 2, 1968.

2. Three months after the incident, on October 18, 1967, an Arab revolt erupted in practically all the occupied West Bank of Jordan. Scores of Israeli tanks and soldiers poured into the dissatisfied cities of Nablus, Jenin, Ramallah, Jerusalem, Bethlehem, and Beit Jala. Tens of students and Israeli soldiers were hurt in fighting before the Arab population was finally forced into their homes, after curfew was imposed on them.

If anything, the Arab uprising 15 months after the occupation provided ample proof to falsify the Israeli myth that Arabs and Israelis can live together in peace. It showed to the outside world that the euphoria of integration could not succeed. The riots came to refute Israeli propaganda that the Arabs of Jerusalem welcomed the annexation of their city.

Old and New

There are a number of orthodox Jews and Israeli extremists who cherish the idea of Israel's annexation of more lands occupied during the June war. Many Westerners believe that further integration between the Arabs and Israelis would bring about a final peaceful settlement to the whole question. These advocates of integration or annexation cite the example of the Arabs who were living in Israel before the June war and who, they claim, were satisfied with their treatment by the Israeli government and were leading a normal way of living like the Israelis. Comparing the life of the Arabs under occupation before and after the June war leads, however, to a number of conclusions to the effect that integration is even more difficult now than before.

1. The Arabs who suffered occupation during the 1948-67 period were a total minority, numbering 170,000 in 1948 and 223,000 at the end of 1966. They were engulfed by a Jewish majority and restricted to one area of Palestine. In fact, the Arabs in Israel, according to Israeli government figures,⁴ formed only 11 percent of the population. Three percent were employed in the professions and 25 percent in the government. There was only 1 judge among them. Arab university students in Israel formed 0.15 percent. The same figures showed that 50 percent of the Arab population lived in houses with no electricity and that only 2.5 percent of Israel's housing budget was actually allocated to the Arabs.

The Arabs who came under occupation in 1967, on the other hand, numbered 850,000 or 40 percent of Israel's population. Thus the Arabs, after the war, were no longer a minority and their integration into Israel was rendered very difficult—as the over 17 months of occupation has proved.

2. The rise of the Arab commandos changed the situation between the two periods of occupation. Commando activity has brought the whole occupation issue more to the attention of the world. It has also boosted the morale of the Arabs in occupied territories. To date, the commandos have caused more than anxiety to both the military and civilians in Israel. They have aroused nervousness among the Israelis. And commando groups are growing at a fast rate. Membership to Fatah, one of the main Palestinian commando groups, was reported to

(4) Based on Israeli government figures published in the *Guardian*, June 1, 1967.

have swelled from 5,000 to 15,000 between May and June, 1968.⁵

3. The access of the Arabs in occupied territories to the Arab countries in general and to Jordan in particular has maintained the links between families, political figures, and leading personalities on both sides of the River Jordan. While Israel had hoped that this open bridge policy, as it is often referred to, would make the Arabs feel less the yoke of occupation and consequently would lead them, in due time, to accept the status quo. The links between the Arabs on the two sides had also helped keep the amber aglow.

4. The Israeli occupation authorities have caused more destruction to Arab territories after the war. The desecration of holy places, the legislative and educational measures, and the general treatment by the military of civilians, have all helped to feed the resentment of the Arabs against occupation and against integration.

On December 9, 1967, the *London Times* summed up the situation as follows, "From past discussion of the future of the occupied territories, it is clear that there is no substantial support for real partnership between Jews and Arabs. If this were in doubt, the history of Arab minorities before the war in June reinforces this point."⁶

(5) Hudson, Michel C., *Jerusalem—A City Still Divided*, Washington, September, 1968.

(6) The *London Times*, December 9, 1967.

But perhaps the acknowledgement of the Mayor of Jerusalem, Teddy Kollek, was the most revealing. He said in an interview, "We failed completely in our efforts at psychological and social integration of the Arab population."⁷

Annexation Measures

The irony of Kollek's statement is seen in the integration and annexationist measures carried out by the occupying authorities in the West Bank of Jordan. The fact that Jerusalem was officially annexed to Israel on June 21, 1967 did not change anything as far the Arabs were concerned—or the big powers, for that matter, including the U.S., which denounced the annexation on January 16, 1968.

Similarly, Israel's change of the names of the West Bank into Judea and Samaria on February 29, 1968, mattered little for the world in general. It bred in the Arabs further resentment, however. On the same date, moreover, the Israeli occupying authorities issued a decree announcing that the West Bank of Jordan and the Sinai strip were no longer considered as enemy territory.

In early March, 1968, street names in Jerusalem were changed from Arabic to Hebrew biblical names. Customs posts were established at the River Jordan as official points of entry and exist.

Another decree issued in March regarded any land of

(7) Interview with the Associated Press, February 21, 1968.

the Arabs taken as "confiscated property" which in reality was never bought or compensated for.⁸

In all these measures taken, the Israeli formula was de facto rather than de jure integration.

(8) See the following Chapter.

CHAPTER II

JERUSALEM

Perhaps of all the occupied territories, Jerusalem has been the one place to suffer most from the Israeli determination to keep it under Israeli domination. While there is variance in opinion about the other occupied territories vis-à-vis annexationist measures, there is none about Jerusalem.

This was obvious from a poll conducted by the Israeli Dachaf Agency.¹ The poll showed that 95 percent of the Israelis are in favor of retaining Jerusalem. This compared with only 47 percent who are for continuing the occupation of the West Bank of Jordan, 61 percent for keeping Sharm El Shaikh, 88 percent for keeping the Golan Heights, and 21 percent for keeping the Sinai.

The Israeli leaders share the same opinion with the people in what concerns Jerusalem. This has been emphasized on numerous occasions. Israeli Defense Minister Moshe Dayan said, "We shall never leave this place, Jerusalem, again. It is not only the capital of Israel but of the whole Jewish people."²

(1) Results of poll were published in *Time* magazine, May 3, 1968.

(2) *Jewish Observer*, June 20, 1967.

Prime Minister Levi Eshkol described the situation as follows, "Israel without Jerusalem is Israel without a head."³

The Zionist attitude towards Jerusalem was first conceived by the founder of the Zionist organization, Theodore Herzl, who wrote in his diaries, "I want to drive the hucksters and the filth out of that Holy City."⁴ The measures now being taken against the rightful Arab inhabitants of Jerusalem appear to be more Herzlian than the founder even envisaged them, as the following description will reveal. Jerusalem, the Israelis argue, will be made whole and wholly Israeli. The Israeli Government has adamantly maintained that the future of Jerusalem is not up to the negotiator no matter what the United Nations decides. As the former Foreign Minister of Israel Golda Meyer said, "If a resolution is passed not to our liking, so what?"⁵

Annexation

On June 27, 1967—less than a month after the occupation of Jerusalem, the Israeli Knesset passed a bill calling for the annexation of the Old City of Jerusalem. The bill authorized the Israeli Government to apply Israeli law, justice, and administration in the area of Palestine, to be determined by decree.

On the same date, a second bill was passed as an amendment to the municipal corporations ordinance, authorizing the

(3) *Newsweek*, July 3, 1967.

(4) Herzl, Theodore *The Complete Diaries*, Vol. III, p. 874.

(5) Interview with *Newsweek*, July 3, 1967.

government to extend the area of jurisdiction of municipalities. The bill also authorized the appointment of additional members to existing municipal councils.

The measure came in direct abrogation of the Hague Convention and the 1949 Geneva Agreement which stipulates that sovereignty over occupied territory shall, until the termination of the state of war, remain with the state that owns the territory and that the occupying authority shall not bring about alteration in the territory or make any alteration in the administrative or judicial system of the region.

It will also be recalled that according to the provisions of Paragraph 4 of Article 20 of the United Nations Charter, occupied areas are considered as integral parts of the state (Jordan) which used to rule them. As a result, the Israeli authorities have no right to infringe the integrity and political independence of Jordanian territory, and consequently forbidden to annex any part of Jordanian lands.

Protest

The Israeli annexation measure, which was later extended to include areas about four miles outside the limits of the old boundaries of the Municipality, roused immediate protest from Arabs and world powers alike:

1. Between July 22 and August 9, 1967, 17 memoranda of protests were submitted to the Israeli occupying authorities from Arabs in occupied territories. These protests came from the Jerusalem Municipal Council, Moslem leaders of the West

Bank, engineers, women organizations, inhabitants of all West Bank cities, lawyers and others.⁶

2. The Arab governments, without exception, denounced the annexation measure. U.N. delegates of Jordan, Syria, Lebanon, Iraq, Saudi Arabia, the UAR, Sudan, Libya, Morocco, Kuwait, and the Gulf states appealed to the world body to adopt a resolution rejecting the Israeli measure and asking the occupation authorities to rescind the annexation of the Old City.

3. On July 4, 1967, a General Assembly resolution was adopted by 99 votes in favor and none against, expressing "deep concern at the situation prevailing in Jerusalem as a result of the measures taken by Israel to change the status of the city." The Assembly called upon Israel to rescind these measures and requested the Secretary General to report to the General Assembly and the Security Council on the implementation of this resolution not later than one week from its adoption. There were 20 countries which abstained from voting, including the U.S.

The week passed and Israel still persisted in strengthening its control over Jerusalem and in ignoring the Assembly's resolution. On July 11, Israeli Foreign Minister Abba Eban informed U.N. Secretary General U Thant of Israel's refusal to yield to the U.N. resolution invalidating the annexation of the old city of Jerusalem.

(6) See *The Resistance of the Western Bank of Jordan to Israeli Occupation*, 1967, The Institute for Palestine Studies, Beirut.

On July 14, the General Assembly again reaffirmed the same resolution and again called upon Israel to rescind the measures it had taken.

4. All the major powers condemned the annexation, but probably the most significant was the censure of the U.S. A White House statement issued on behalf of President Lyndon B. Johnson, said that "there must be adequate recognition of the special interests of three great religions in the holy places of Jerusalem," and that before any unilateral action is taken on the status of Jerusalem "there will be appropriate consultations with religious leaders and others who are deeply concerned." The State Department also issued a statement to the effect that the U.S. did not recognize the new status of Jerusalem.

This was the first time that the U.S. refused to recognize an Israeli measure—but it was not the last. Three months later, in September, the U.S. also rebuked Israel for sending settlers into captured territories on the West Bank of the Jordan River. On January 14, the State Department refused to recognize yet another Israeli move to incorporate a sector of the Old City into Israeli sovereignty. For a week earlier, Israel had announced that 883 acres of the Arab sector of Jerusalem had been "expropriated" by the Israeli Government.

The Israeli answer to the July 4 resolution of the United Nations basically contained three elements—all of which were irrelevant to the resolution itself. The first Israeli reply was in the form of a semantic argument which attempted to deny that "annexation" was the correct term to be used in reference

to Israel's acquisition of Arab Jerusalem. The second tried to justify the occupation of the city on the grounds of predicted ensuing beneficial consequences. Lastly, and most cynically, the Israeli reply endeavored to convince the member nations that the Israeli desire to add Arab Jerusalem to their own state was altruistically motivated, based on genuine Israeli benevolence.

Yet while Israel was citing at length its humanitarian objectives in an effort to evade replying directly to the United Nations entreaties, it was swiftly consolidating its gains in order to accomplish prompt *de facto* occupation of Jerusalem.

Land Expropriation

The din of battle had hardly faded away when Israeli bulldozers set to work in the Jewish Quarter of Jerusalem, stamping the land with their occupation. After three hours' notice to evacuate their homes, the houses of approximately 250 families were bulldozed down in the Moroccan Quarter of the Old City to make way for a paved square in front of the Wailing Wall. In like manner, the Jewish Quarter—so called after the Jews who rented the land there prior to 1948 from the Arab land trusts, was destroyed so that a road leading directly to the Wailing Wall might be built. The 2,000-3,000 persons made homeless by these combined operations, which were accomplished within 24 hours, wandered the streets with the few possessions they were able to snatch up and carry until finally, in desperation, most of them had no alternative but to board buses which took them to the banks of the Jordan River and over to the already crowded East Bank.

In fact, in all these and subsequent expropriation measures, the Israeli Government failed to provide homes for those Arabs who were evicted. The purpose of this was obviously to drive more Arabs out of Jerusalem and to replace them by Jewish settlers. This is what has come to be known as the Zionization of Jerusalem.

Since that first week after the war, a number of official expropriation measures have been taken in complete defiance of successive United Nations resolutions:

1. On January 12, 1968, the Israeli Government expropriated 838 acres of land outside the Old City of Jerusalem to ensure Jewish settlement in the annexed part of the city. The area ranged from Mount Scopus to the former armistice line adjacent to the Sanhedrin sector of West Jerusalem. An official announcement said that 1,400 housing units were to be built in the coming six months. Four hundred of these were presumably for Arabs whose houses had been levelled down inside the Old City. The Israeli Government did not point to world public opinion then that these Arab residents had already been evicted from their homes before the government housing units were built. As a result, these Arab residents had been forced to leave for the East Bank of Jordan to find shelter there in tents. So the majority of the housing units were to be occupied by Jewish settlers. The areas expropriated were given to the Israel Land Administration which was responsible for leasing them according to the needs of the government.

Commenting on the move, Israeli Prime Minister Levi Eshkol and other Israeli leaders said that the measure was

designed "at consolidating the administrative unification of the city."⁷

The Israeli measure, like that of annexation, was met with disapproval, including that of the U.S. Government. Three days after the expropriation, on January 15, the State Department explicitly announced that it refused to recognize the Israeli measure to "expropriate" more Arab territory. It criticized Israel's "unilateral actions affecting the status of Jerusalem," and continued, "We believe that the status of Jerusalem must necessarily be considered in the context of a settlement of all problems arising out of the recent conflict."

In further attempts at consolidating the expropriation measure and encouraging Jewish settlement in the Old City of Jerusalem, the occupation authorities allocated, on March 27, the sum of half a million Israeli pounds to ameliorate the life of Jews in the settlement areas. The amount was distributed between the Ministry of Housing, the Prime Minister's office and the Jerusalem Municipality. Yet by March, 1968, only 500 Jewish families had submitted applications for settlement in the projected housing units that were to be built on the 835 acres of expropriated land.

2. On April 18, 1968, a new order was published in the Official Israeli Gazette No. 143 by which more Arab lands and buildings in the Old City of Jerusalem were expropriated.

The area expropriated was situated between the southwestern wall of the Haram Al Sharif and the Armenian Quarter

(7) *New York Times*, January 13, 1968.

in the Old City. It included the site of the nocturnal journey of Prophet Mohammed, known as Al Buraq, the Magharba, (Moroccan) Quarter, which was bulldozed by the Israelis immediately after the June war, Bab Al Silsilah Quarter, the Jewish Quarter and Al Husor Market.⁸

All these quarters were 100 percent Arab property, except for the Jewish Quarter, which was mostly Arab-owned and Islamic Waqf. The area expropriated also included part of the Assyrian Quarter.

The total area expropriated on that date was about 116 dunums or about 28 acres which included 700 buildings varying from two to four stories. The Arabs owned 595 of these buildings distributed as follows: 12 were Islamic Waqfs, 99 were North African Islamic Waqfs, 354 were Muslim families Waqfs, and 130 were Arab individual ownership and family property. The expropriated area also included 437 shops and 1,048 apartments that sheltered about 5,000 Arabs. A girls' school with 300 pupils and belonging to the Muslim Waqf was closed down by the Israeli authorities and transferred to accommodate the Jewish Religious Court of Appeals.

All these Israeli measures of expropriation and annexation had resulted in an influx of about 5,000 Arabs from the Old City and the loss of their property which they had inherited generation after generation. These measures had also deprived more than 700 Arabs from their daily means of life

(8) These details were contained in a letter sent by Jordanian delegate at U.N. to the Secretary General U Thant on June 12, 1968.

and thus added to the number of unemployed and to the number of Palestinian refugees.

Legislation

In fact, the annexation measures and the expropriation of Arab lands cannot be dissociated from the series of legislative measures which were adopted in the period between the annexation of Jerusalem until the Administration Regularization Law of 1968:

1. *Municipal Council*: On the same day that the annexation bill was approved by the Israeli Knesset on June 27, 1967, another bill was ratified calling for the dissolution of the Jerusalem Arab Municipality after all eight members of the Municipality had refused to cooperate with the Israeli occupation authorities. Among these members was the elected Mayor of Jerusalem Rouhi Al Khatib, who was deported to the East Bank of Jordan on March 8, 1968.⁹

The bill dissolved the Arab Municipal Council and dismissed the Mayor and the members of the Council, after having seized their files and their movable and immovable property. The Jewish municipal authorities later dismissed some officials of the Arab Municipality and transferred others to the Office of the Mayor of the Jewish sector. The unified Jewish Municipality then continued to carry out Israel's administrative measures, which were wholly at variance with the Jor-

(9) The other seven members of the Municipality were: Nihad Abu Gharbiya, Dr. Ibrahim Talil, Fayeq Barakat, Ali Al Tazziz, Dr. Rashid Nashashibi, Musa Al Bitar, and Abdul Ghani Al Natsha.

danian administrative policies which the residents were supposed to continue to follow in accordance with a number of U.N. resolutions and under international law.¹⁰

2. *Israeli Currency*: On July 31, the Israeli cabinet decided that the Israeli currency is to be the sole legal tender in the Sinai and the Gaza Strip. In the West Bank, in which Jerusalem was located, the Israeli currency was made legal tender alongside the Jordanian dinar. The Jordanian dinar was valued at 7:40 Israeli pounds, entailing 26 percent losses on the Arab inhabitants. The Jordanian dinar was raised on December 20, 1967, to 9:80 Israeli pounds. But the harm had already been done.

3. *Arab Administration*: The Jordanian postal and telegraph, income tax, health and customs services, police system, cadastral survey and other city offices were abolished in Jerusalem like in other occupied areas. This administrative structure was placed under the authority of the administrative centers of the other sector.

4. *Laws*: All the Jordanian laws in force in the Arab sector of the city were repealed and replaced by Israeli measures and laws, in violation of international law, which stipulate that the laws in force in occupied territories must be maintained. Courts of Justice were suspended and made subordinate to the Israeli courts. The judges were asked to serve outside Jerusalem. They categorically refused.

(10) Article 54 of the Geneva Convention states, "The Occupying Power may not alter the status of public officials or judges in the occupied territories or in any way apply sanctions to or take any measures of coercion or discrimination against them, should they abstain from fulfilling their functions for reasons of conscience."

5. *Law for Absentee Property*: The Israeli authorities adopted the Law of Absentee Property and they appointed a custodian for "absentee" property. This notoriously severe law gives the Israeli government the right to confiscate the movable and immovable property of Arabs who were absent from the country and to use them as they saw fit. The property in question included enormous tracts of land, buildings, shares in companies, movable property and a variety of merchandize, the whole amounting to millions of Jordanian dinars. This law applied only to the Arab sector of East Jerusalem, which was considered by the occupation authorities as an integral part of the State of Israel. It would not have been applied if this sector of Jerusalem had been considered an "occupied area" of the West Bank of the River Jordan.

6. *Administrative Regularization Law, 1968*: But perhaps the Administrative Regularization Law passed by the Knesset on August 23, 1968, and published on the same day, is the most serious of all. The ambiguity of the law itself was probably aimed at confusing the Arab population and facing them with a *fait accompli* situation. It is actually inseparable from the June 27, 1967, law annexing Jerusalem to Israel. The law of annexation was now made complete through the new law to absorb the people demographically. Any Arab who fails to abide by this law or who cannot abide by it is forced to leave the city. The law is constituted of 22 articles. The first article ties it to a 1948 law named Administrative and Legal Rules Ordinance, 1948, and considers the whole area of Jerusalem as the "area of Jurisdiction."

Article 2 provides for the exclusion of holy places from

the provision of the Absentees' Property Law of 1950. This exclusion was actually aimed at stopping short from the Waqf property held as a Muslim Trust—which formed quite a large area of Jerusalem.

Holy Sites

There is a misconceived outlook in the Western world that the Jews had been deprived by the Arabs of free access to their holy sites in Jerusalem—mainly the Wailing Wall. The Israelis had claimed they were prevented from visiting Old Jerusalem's Jewish shrines while the area was under Jordanian authority.

In fact, however, the Israelis appeared to ignore and even suppress the fact that the Arabs offered them freedom of access to their Holy Places in 1949, but that they refused to accept that offer.

The truth of the matter is that, in response to an appeal by the Conciliation Committee for Palestine, the Arab governments of Egypt, Jordan, Lebanon, and Syria pledged themselves to the following declaration on November 5, 1949. The declaration states:

“The governments of Egypt, the Hashemite Jordan Kingdom, Lebanon, and Syria undertake to guarantee freedom of access to the Holy Places, religious buildings and sites situated in the territory placed under their authority by the final settlement of the Palestine problem or, pending that settlement, in the territory at present occupied by

them under armistice agreements; and, pursuant, to this undertaking, will guarantee rights of entry and of transit to ministers of religion, pilgrims, and visitors without distinction as to nationality or faith, subject only to considerations of national security and conformity with the status quo prior to May 14, 1948."

Israel, in response to a similar appeal made by the Conciliation Commission, replied that it "...was of the opinion that it would in the circumstances be in the interest of a constructive and final settlement if the matter of formulation were dealt with after more far-reaching consideration of these problems by the General Assembly."

It is thus obvious that Israel itself chose not to make any commitments regarding the Holy Places such as those made by the Arabs and, if access to the Holy Places has been denied in certain instances since 1949, Israel has its own attitude to blame.

For centuries before that, the Muslims had guarded one of the Jews' holiest shrines—the Wailing Wall. The Jews, before the 1948 war, enjoyed full freedom in using their rights of access to this Wall to conduct prayers and supplications. It could not be said that Israel is now treating the Muslims in the Arab states in the same way.

It should be pointed out, in this regards, that the Jewish right in the Wailing Wall has been established by *status quo* and tradition.

In 1927, during the British Mandate, the Jews tried to go beyond their rights and a bloody incident ensued between

them and the Arabs. An official paper, *The Western or Wailing Wall* was published by the Mandatory Government in Palestine in 1931, following the resolution adopted by the League of Nations on January 14, 1930, and this paper announced the formation of a Judicial Commission to consist of three non-British members. This international commission, after investigations, gave the following ruling:¹¹

a. The Western Wall is exclusive Muslim property, and Muslim right *in rem* over the wall, since it is part of the area of the Holy Mosque which is Muslim Waqf. Muslims also have right of property over the pavement facing the Wall and over the Moroccan Quarter in the vicinity of the Wall since they are charitable Muslim Waqf.

b. The Jews have right of access to the Wall where they can conduct prayers and supplications subject to the following rules.

c. The door to the northern end of the Wall should be kept closed at certain hours which have to be decided upon and become binding, seeing to it that the Muslims' right of passage on the pavement in the customary way is respected and preserved.

d. It is prohibited for any person to use the area in front of the Wall or the area adjoining for speeches or political demonstrations of any type.

e. Since the Wall is an historical site, the Administration in Palestine should undertake its reconstruction and pre-

(11) Palestine Laws, 1933, Vol. 4, page 3397.

servation after consultation with the Higher Muslim Council and the Rabbinical Council.

f. Failing any action by the Muslim authorities to reconstruct the pavement, the Administration in Palestine should then take the necessary steps to reconstruct it.

g. The wooden door leading from the pavement to the corner in the northern end of the Wall should remain closed on Saturdays and on Jewish feast days.

In addition to this, it is established by international laws and conventions that it is not allowed to infringe upon other people's rights in an attempt to expand one's own through the exercising of a claim to expand.

Yet when the Israeli authorities occupied Arab Jerusalem with other Arab territories after the June war, they contravened all local and international laws. In the Wailing Wall area alone, they destroyed two Muslim Mosques and a whole quarter, the Moroccan Quarter, rendering its population homeless, although the Quarter is a charitable Muslim Waqf, in order to expand.¹²

And, as if in direct defiance of these international laws and the official paper, *The Western or Wailing Wall*, the Israeli authorities published in the *Jerusalem Post*, on August 8, 1967, a report under the headline, "The Need to Clear 82 Meters in the Area of the Al Buraq Wall," which stated that

(12) For details on excavations at Wailing Wall, see *London Times*, August 10, 1967.

the Ministry of Religious Affairs has drawn up a plan for the clearing of this area. The paper said:

"It is possible to settle the dispute which arose over the issue of decent behaviour in the area facing the Wall, and specially as regards the separation of women from men in the area, if the plan drawn up in the Ministry of Religious Affairs to clear 82 meters is executed.

"A Committee for Education attached to the Knesset toured the Jewish Holy Places yesterday and was informed by Chief Rabbi Roin, an official at the Ministry of Religious Affairs, that the concerned area is concealed by a number of buildings adjoining the Wall, and that it is possible to destroy these buildings and thus clear 82 meters for those who wish to pray whilst the rest of the area will remain open to the general public ..."

Thus the Israeli respect for laws and conventions are revealed. Yet this was not all. The Rabbi of the Israeli Defense Army, Brigadier Schlomo Goren, prayed with his group in the Court of the Aqsa Mosque on August 15, 1967, and announced his intentions of performing other prayers in other parts of the Court and of building a synagogue in it, claiming it would be some distance away from the Aqsa Mosque and the Dome of the Rock, the third holiest place in the world for Islam, and that the area was part of the Mount Doriah.¹³

On August 12, 1967, a rabbinical conference of the Jewish communities abroad was held in Jerusalem, in the "Temple of Solomon" Hall. The conference was attended by the world

(13) *Haaretz*, August 16, 1967.

Mizrahi Party, representing Jewish communities in Britain, Canada, and America, and speakers included Samuel Yorsky, Chief Rabbi of New York and its Zionist leader, the Minister of Religious Affairs and Dr. Immanuel Jacobvits, Chief Rabbi of Britain. During the conference, the Minister of Religion delivered a speech, which included the following passage:

“The liberation of Jerusalem has placed all the Christian Holy Places and most of the Muslim ones under Jewish control, and has returned to the Jews their own Holy Places. But Israel has other Holy Places in the East Jordan and the Haram Al Sharif in Jerusalem, though Holy to other religions (referring to Islam), is a Jewish shrine also. We are not thinking of rebuilding our Temple there at present, but this will not prevent us from doing all we can towards this. We will rebuild all the synagogues in the Old City and extend the court of Buraq as soon as possible.”

These Israeli measures, like many others, did not go unprotested by the Arabs of Jerusalem, but the question is one of respecting the protests and meeting their demands rather than protesting per se. As early as July 24, 1967, Muslim leaders of the West Bank submitted a protest to the Military Governor of Jerusalem pointing out Israeli disrespect for all international laws and conventions governing occupation. The memorandum pointed out the following points:

1. The censoring of the Friday sermon delivered in the Aqsa Mosque by the Israeli Ministry of Religious Affairs. Many passages were deleted from these sermons, including verses from the Koran.

2. Israeli men and women visited the Aqsa Mosque dressed in an immodest manner which offends both the principles of religion and Arab Muslim and Christian customs.

3. Encroachment on the Waqf land known as "Al Nazir" on Al Taur road in Jerusalem, which has been disposed of without the knowledge of the Waqf authorities and against their interests.

4. Attempts by the Israeli Ministry of Religious Affairs to interfere in the affairs of the Sharia Courts, including the Sharia Appeal Court in Jerusalem.

About a month later, on August 14, 1968, Muslim leaders again submitted to the occupation authorities resolutions adopted by the Higher Waqf Council and the Committees for Muslim Affairs. On August 22, similar rulings were presented by the Muslim Ulema on the rights of Muslims in the Aqsa Mosque. Among other things, the rulings acknowledged that the Jews have rights to the Wailing Wall, but that this was established by status quo. One ruling explicitly stated that Muslims did not object to Jews or others visiting Islamic Holy Places on condition that they behave in a decent and seemly manner and observe the sanctity of these places. To all extents and purposes, the Jews visiting the Aqsa Mosque or the Holy Sepulchre did not show such reverence. This even prompted the Israeli authorities on August 30 to set guard on holy Christian and Muslim places—something deemed unnecessary when Jerusalem was under Jordanian Arab rule. For on August 5, 1967, five Israeli youths were arrested in connection with the theft of jewelry from the Holy Sepulchre.

The thieves made away with a gold tiara, six gold hearts each about six inches long, and a pair of earrings—all from a glass case containing a meter high effigy of the Virgin Mary in the Greek Orthodox chapel in the church. The tiara had been lying for centuries in the Holy Sepulchre—unguarded and untouched.

Such incidents, in fact, prompted the World Council of Churches to send a memorandum to the United Nations Secretary General U Thant on September 7, 1968. In this note, Christian leaders asked him to send a U.N. investigator to report on the situation and on measures to be taken "in order to protect the holy places from the immoral acts being committed there."¹⁴ The Council noted that similar protests have been made by various Arab civic groups in Jerusalem, "calling attention to the opinion of places of cheap entertainment, including strip tease shows."

A letter sent to the Israeli Prime Minister Levi Eshkol from 46 leading Arab women asked for immediate intervention to end the "deteriorating and shameless state of affairs existing in our city, due to the opening of bars, night clubs, cabarets, and similar establishments."¹⁵

The letter added, "Within the city walls gambling and prostitution are openly practiced, and narcotics are freely available all within open view of the authorities.

"The Holy City of Jerusalem, the cradle of religion and spirituality, has seldom in its long history been the scene of

(14) See *Observer*, September 8, 1968.

(15) *Ibid.*

such immorality as it is today in spite of its various conquerers and rulers." The letter further pointed out that the Israelis do not permit such activities in the western sector of the city where strict by-laws protect its character as the center of the Jewish faith.

The *Observer*, commenting on this letter, added that the changed character of East Jerusalem is underlined by the fact that about 40 girls were arrested during a police raid directed against prostitution. Juvenile delinquency of both sexes increased sharply since the Israeli occupation, with cases averaging about 38 a month compared to five to eight in former years.

The Jewish disrespect for the Holy City and the other religions were best depicted by M. Barrow, an Israeli from Tel Aviv. In a letter to the *New York Times*, Barrow said, "Since mid-June, a harsh streak of the profane has disturbed the religious atmosphere of the Old Jerusalem-Bethlehem area, deeply wounding the feelings of devout Jews, Christians, and Muslims alike. One example is the disrespectful noisy behaviour and immodest dress of many irreligious Israeli sightseers at the holy places."¹⁶

The letter went on to say, "Probably the most reprehensible thing is the conspicuous display of smut on the newsstands of recently occupied Easter Jerusalem and Bethlehem. One can hardly avoid seeing magazines, published in Israel and abroad, with photographs of unclad women and of far worse unprint-

(16) *New York Times*, October 7, 1967.

able pornographic scenes on the cover pages . . . For all their shortcomings in other matters, the previous Hashemite and British mandatory regimes strictly prohibited such obscenity in the two holy cities."

In fact, the sheer disrespect of the younger Jews for anything religious, whether Christian or Muslim, the use of churches and mosques as glorified museums, and indecent dress and demeanor forced the Israeli authorities to print large signs instructing their visitors as to how to dress, behave and talk. Many churches had to close their doors to visitors as they do not have the necessary staff, priests or nuns to police their shrines. Many churches have had also to be reconsecrated after serious offenses were performed or carried out in these holy places.

Having reviewed some of the aforementioned incidents, one can conclude a number of important facts, which throw light on Israel's intentions with regard to the religious sanctities in the occupied territory, the methods used to attain its objectives and the motives underlying her actions in this respect.

1. The violations of the religious sanctities and monumental heritage in the occupied Arab territories are not a new thing committed by Israel during and after the June aggression. They already occurred during the twenty years preceding the June aggression. But the Israelis' occupation of the old city of Jerusalem and the West Bank put in their grasp all the important Christian and Muslim sanctities in Palestine. It also provided them with the chance to continue their assaults

which they had been exercising before June 1967, but on a larger scale.

This fact is proved by the acts of demolition, sabotage and looting exercised by the Israelis in some Christian churches and cemeteries which had been under their control before the aggression of June 1967. The same took place after the aggression.

2. The Israeli violations of the religious sanctities have covered those of the Christians and the Muslims without any discrimination. They have desecrated the Aqsa Mosque and the Ibrahimi Haram inasmuch as they have done with the Churches of Nativity and Resurrection. They have violated the sanctities of mosques with their muddy shoes, exactly as they did with that of churches on the Christmas eve of 1967 with their hanging hair, the shameful dress of their women and the jaz music they played at the gates of churches during the Christmas mass.¹⁷

It is not therefore a question of hatred to one particular religion, it is rather a hatred harbored by the Israelis for Islam and Christianity, with destructive effect on the sanctities of the two religions altogether. Had the followers of Buddha or

(17) The U.S. Press agency, *Associated Press*, reported on December 24, 1967, from Bethlehem that the few Christian pilgrims who went during Christmas to that town unanimously confirmed that the Israelis spoiled their most sacred night in the year. According to the agency, during the holding of the Christmas midnight mass in the Church of Nativity, an Israeli girl in disgraceful dress was playing clamorous music on the guitar while leaning on the wall of the Church. She was accompanied by an Israeli youth who increased the noise by drum beatings.

Confucious some sanctities with the Israelis, they would have most probably met the same fate.

3. In their violations of the religious sanctities, the Israelis make no distinction between those which concern the Arabs—Muslims or Christians—and those which belong to non-Arab elements that cannot be accused of being connected with the Arab-Israeli conflict. Were it otherwise, what would be the meaning of the aggression on the churches belonging to the Armenian, Latin, and Greek sects. These violations therefore stem not from a hatred for the Arab religious sanctities, but rather from a strong aversion to all other religions of the world.

4. The Israeli violations of religious places are not confined to individual or irresponsible mass actions. A large proportion of them have occurred at the hand of official and responsible elements.

CHAPTER III

REIGN OF TERROR

The Fourth Geneva Convention was conceived for the protection of civilian populations in time of conflict. This Convention was signed in 1949 by most countries of the world. Israel signed it in 1951. According to this Convention, the civilian population in a territory occupied by a foreign power falls under the category of "protected persons" defined as follows: "Persons protected by the Convention are those who, at a given moment and in any manner whatsoever, find themselves, in case of a conflict or occupation in the hands of a party to the conflict or Occupying Power of which they are not nationals."

Yet, if anything, there could hardly be two more ironical words, for the Arabs under Israeli occupation, than "protected persons." Both during the June War of 1967 and its aftermath, Israel, which likes to pose as the pillar of civilization in the Middle East, committed grave violations of the ruling of the Geneva Convention. Both prisoners of war and civilian population, as well as members of resistance movements, are protected by these rulings, and all the military and civilian personnel of an occupying power are bound by them, whatever orders they might have received from their superiors or government. Furthermore, they are liable to prosecution for

transgressing them.

In the week of November 10, 1967, a member of the *Peace News* staff interviewed an Israeli journalist who was stationed with the occupation forces after the June war of 1967 on the West Bank near the Jordan. He recounted what he himself had seen of the shooting of refugees and the so-called "infiltrators" crossing the Jordan from the East Bank, and described, in detail, interviews with soldiers who had themselves taken part in the operations. He also spoke of destruction of Arab villages. Following are some of the accounts of the Israeli soldiers who took part in the operations:¹

"Every night Arabs crossed the Jordan from East to West. We sealed off the passages and were ordered to shoot to kill without warning. In fact we fired every night on men, women, children, even on moonlit nights when we could distinguish between men, women, and children.

"In the mornings we searched the area and, acting under explicit orders from the officers on the spot, shot the living, including those who had hidden and those who were wounded. Again, these included men, women and children. After killing them, we covered them with earth, or left them lying until a bulldozer came to bury them.

"Some of the people were intelligence agents, some were armed infiltrators, some were smugglers. *But mostly they were former inhabitants of the West Bank who had not received an Israeli permit to return* (emphasis supplied).

(1) For full details of accounts, see *Peace News*, November 10, 1967.

“There were cases I will never forget. Once we found two men wounded, and the officer ordered us to kill them. We shot them on the spot. Another time, we found two men wounded in the leg. We talked with them and took their papers, and then the officer ordered us to kill them. They understood what was happening from our gestures, and desperately pleaded for their lives. We all left the place except one man who had volunteered to kill them. He had to fire six times before they were dead. “The stories are many, but I am telling only of events that I saw with my own eyes. Accounts by other soldiers are abundant. I heard of stories setting fire to heaps of bodies. One morning I myself saw bodies in a heap, among them the body of a young girl. On another occasion an El Fatah man pleaded for his life. When he saw that it was useless, he cursed and took the bullets. Another night a group of about twenty crossed. We shot them. In the morning we found eleven bodies . . .

“I am disclosing this information in the hope that it will become known to as many Israeli citizens as possible. Perhaps some will be able to use their influence to put a stop to these events.”

The Blow-Up-and-Expel Policy

On August 31, 1967, the Israeli authorities mercilessly eradicated the three Arab villages of Emaus, Beit Nuba, and Yalu, driving the poor Arab inhabitants out, after torturing women, children and men alike. The description of the brutality of the Israeli soldiers was actually given by a soldier who

took part in the eradication operations. Amos Kenan, a free-lance Israeli writer, sent a description of the events to the Israeli newspaper, *Haolam Hazev*, but of course, the statement was never published, but it was duplicated and circulated in Israel.² The only acknowledgement of the Israeli Government to these events was a brief report in the press saying that the Cabinet had discussed "the purity of Israeli arms." This esoteric term has definite meaning in Israel. It is used whenever suspect activities of the army come to public attention.

Amos Kenan, in his statement, spoke how the decision to destroy Emaus, Beit Nuba, and Yalu was justified by the Israeli authorities who ordered the soldiers to destroy the houses and expel the villagers.

"The Unit Commander told us that three villages in our sector were to be destroyed . . . The decision was justified by strategic, tactical, and security considerations: to straighten out the border at Latrun; to 'punish the nests of murderers'; to eliminate future bases of infiltration . . .

"... the orders were to shoot over their heads and to warn them not to enter the village. We did not shoot in the air, but took cover and some soldiers who spoke Arabic went over to explain our instructions. There were old people who could hardly walk, old women murmuring, women carrying babies, and small children. The children wept and asked for water. We told them to go to Beit Sura. They said they had been walking on the roads from everywhere and forbidden to

(2) *Ibid.* See Appendix A.

enter any village. For four days they had been walking on the roads without food and water. Some of the children cried and some of our soldiers were crying too."

"Our unit was outraged. At night we were ordered to guard the bulldozers, but the soldiers were so angry that no one would carry out the duty. In the morning we were moved from the area. None of us understood how Jews could behave in such a way. No one understood why the farmers should not be allowed to take their stoves, blankets and some food."

After the eradication of the three villages, a foreign correspondent asked an official military spokesman for an explanation to the action. The answer offered was that "fewer than 67 houses had been destroyed and it had taken place during the war." The same correspondent, trying to push the question further, never received an answer and was told there was nothing to add to the earlier reply.³

But the latter example is one of hundreds of others which proved the disregard with which the Israeli occupation authorities treated the Geneva Convention or, more specifically, Article 53, which stated that "any destruction by the Occupying Power of movable or immovable property belonging individually or collectively to private persons, or the State, or to other public authorities, or to social or cooperative organizations, is prohibited except where such destruction is rendered absolutely necessary by military operations." It is difficult to

(3) For further description of destruction of three villages, see Michel Adams in *The Sunday Times*, June 16, 1967.

explain how the destruction of Beit Nuba, Emaus, and Yalu could be justified by "except where such destruction is rendered absolutely necessary by military operations."

A report presented by the United Nations to the General Assembly based on the report of Mr. Nils Göran Gussing, Personal Representative of the Secretary General, after his visit to the Gaza Strip, said on September 15, 1967, "The Israeli authorities have killed citizens and destroyed houses even after the end of military operations." The policy of blowing up houses by the Israeli occupation was even condemned by the U.S. During a press conference on March 8, 1968, an official U.S. State Department spokesman urged Israel to abide by international laws in the Arab territories seized in the June war and insisted that the destruction of the houses of "suspected" terrorists contravened international agreements.

The blow-up-and-expel policy followed by the Israelis is not new and is evidently aimed to achieve the following:

1. Blowing up a house or houses which have been allegedly used to hide or protect Arab freedom fighters was in fact aimed at setting an example to the Arab inhabitants for future actions.

2. By spreading a reign of terror, the Israelis hoped that the greatest number of Arabs would leave the occupied territories for other Arab countries thus, on the one hand, decreasing the number of Arabs, and on the other, making more

room for Jews to settle in their places.⁴

3. By acting as such, the Israeli authorities wanted to soothe the fears of the Israeli populace that there is a government which is doing something to protect them no matter if the action of blowing up houses was justified, humane, legal or not.

The destruction of houses by the occupation authorities since the June war has numbered in the hundreds and every time a house was blown up, a new wave of refugees crossed the River Jordan to the East Bank. One could only cite a few examples:

— On November 28, 1968, Israeli security forces blew up a number of Arab houses in Deir Al Balah village in the Gaza Strip in retaliation for the murder of a farmer.

— In order to intimidate the population, the military authorities dynamited houses where freedom fighters might have found shelter or help.⁵

— On January 11, 1968, the *Jerusalem Post* reported that "a number of shacks in the Shati refugee camp were demolished by the security forces on January 9."

(4) This fact has been emphasized a number of times. Two British MP's, in a letter to the *Times* on February 10, 1968, said, "There was a well-attested intimidation of Arabs in the Gaza Strip and elsewhere to encourage them to leave."

Furthermore, a Red Cross Report No. 3 on August 11, 1967, spoke of the "Israeli policy which aims at spreading fear amongst the citizens so that they leave Gaza."

(5) *Le Monde*, January 2, 1967.

— The London *Times* said on March 7, 1968, "The order to destroy houses of anyone to be connected with saboteurs or to have sheltered them is still enforced. At least 100 houses have been destroyed."

— Just before that, the *Observer*, on January 28, 1967, said, "Non-Arab residents of the (Gaza) Strip share the Arab view that punishment is meted out to tens of thousands of people who could not possibly be implicated in the incidents: the destruction of houses, whose inhabitants' only crime is to be living at or near the spot where a bomb explodes, is out of all proportion to the acts committed."

Thus the destruction of property was actually carried out on entire villages, whole quarters, and individual homes in addition to the blowing up of shops, offices, and in, some cases, hospitals.⁶

The absence of any plausible justification in most cases is made obvious by the trivial reason adduced for such drastic measures. On some occasions, the excuse has been that an electricity wire has been cut, or a grenade thrown in the neighborhood. On others, that a relative of the owner is suspected of being a member of the resistance. Sometimes no excuse whatsoever is given. In an almost insignificant number of cases the reasons alleged were the harboring of Arab commandos, the possession of arms or membership to a resistance

(6) On February 7, 1967, *Reuters* news agency reported that the Israeli forces attacked the Al Shifa hospital and imprisoned a number of doctors. Some patients were killed as well as the head nurse, Samiha Fehmi.

movement. Whatever the motive, the destruction of movable or immovable property is a direct infringement of human rights and is explicitly prohibited by Article 53 of the Fourth Geneva Convention and Article 17, paragraph 2 of the U.N. Declaration of Human Rights.

In most cases of destruction of property, it should be emphasized, the owners would not be allowed to take away their belongings or would at best be given a few minutes to save what they could. The intention was obviously not only to deprive the victims of their dwellings, but also of all means of subsistence or, in other words, to leave them altogether destitute.

Such lack of restraint prompted the Chairman of the U.N. Commission of Human Rights to call upon the Israeli government on March 13, 1968, to "desist forthwith from indulging in such practices and to respect human rights and fundamental freedoms."⁷

The Israeli version of demolition actions was explained by the head of the Israel Military Government for the Occupied Territories, Brigadier Shlomo Gazit. In an interview with *Kol Israel*, he said, "The act of blowing up houses is essentially . . . a deterrent action, a punishment which is supposed to deter others. I am not sure that expropriation would achieve the same deterrent effect; first of all, because of the consideration that expropriation may be reversed. Although I repeat

(7) Telegram to the Israeli Government, U.N. Economic and Social Council Document, E/CN.W/L-1040.

that the subject needs further fundamental study, expropriation does not seem to be a practical method.⁸"

The intentional destruction of houses without justification even evoked the anger of Israelis themselves. Dr. Israel Liff, of the Hebrew University in Jerusalem, described the situation as follows:

"Now, with the bombing of houses in the heart of East Jerusalem and Beit Hanina, public opinion in Israel and abroad against such atrocities has been aroused. Demolishing houses (like the expulsion of leaders) causes only harm to our case . . . The suspects whose houses were demolished were not brought before the court martial and have not yet been convicted. Even if they were convicted in the future, there is neither justice nor advantage in avenging their wives and children and robbing them of their shelters . . ."⁹

Summary Arrests and Intimidation

According to the Fourth Geneva Convention, Article 33, "collective penalties are prohibited" while Article 32 states the following:

"The high Contracting Parties specifically agree that each of them is prohibited from taking any measure of such a character as to cause the physical suffering or extermination of protected persons in their lands. This prohibition applies not

(8) *New Outlook*, Vol. II, No. 6, July-August, 1968, p. 50.

(9) In letter sent to the Israeli newspaper, *Haaretz*, March 19, 1968.

only to murder, torture, corporal punishment, mutilation and medical or scientific experiments not necessitated by the medical treatment of a protected person, but also to any other measures of brutality

The arbitrary arrest of peaceful civilians often on whimsical charges has, perhaps, been the commonest feature of Israeli conduct. While it is not possible to give an exact figure of all those who have been so arrested, it is estimated that at least 10,000 Arab civilians have seen the inside of Israeli prisons since June 5, 1967. At any one point of time since this date, there have been at least 2,000 civilians in prison held either indefinitely or serving terms longer than one year.

On August 11, 1967, the Red Cross submitted a report to the International Red Cross office in Geneva to the effect that "the Israeli army has often arrested citizens in downtown Gaza in the daytime, for the sole reason of spreading terror."

Examples that could be cited are innumerable and one could only mention a few:

— In the period of only two days, on January 11 and 12, 40 persons suspected of sabotage were arrested in the Gaza Strip.¹⁰

— The intimidatory measures imposed by the Israeli authorities on the village of Al Arish in the Sinai Desert during the week of December 11, 1967, were so strengthened that it

(10) *Le Monde*, January 18, 1968.

was difficult to find a single boy in the town who had not been imprisoned for some days without any reason. It was also reported that during that week, and between midnight and 3 a.m. each night, every family lived in a state of anxiety and expected to be arrested by the security forces at any minute; the men have been taken off for several days or weeks and during this period of detention would be subjected to the ugliest possible forms of torture.¹¹

— The Red Cross, in Report Number 4 on August 23, 1967, reported that "adult Egyptian males, who had lived in Gaza and are presently imprisoned in Al Arish, are undergoing extreme hardships. They are held in concentration camps, which do not come up to the necessary sanitary conditions required."

A frequent practice is that of detaining individuals without any apparent reason, submitting them to interrogation accompanied by torture to obtain information, and releasing them after a certain period of time. One such case was that involving the student Youssef Attiyah Abu Youssef of Al Nusseirat Camp in Gaza, who was detained on August 21, 1967, for interrogation and freed one week later after having been beaten with iron bars on all parts of his body to the extent that—according to his own testimony, he could not stand on his own feet for some time after his release.¹²

(11) This was reported by all press agencies on December 18, 1967.

(12) The testimony of Youssef Abu Youssef was made in a survey carried out by the Institute for Palestine Studies on April 12, 1968.

Thus, to the obvious injustice of arbitrary and unwarranted detention is added the crime of physical coercion despite the fact that Article 31 of the Fourth Geneva Convention explicitly states that "no physical or moral coercion shall be exercised against protected persons, in particular to obtain information from them or from third parties."

The apparent object of this Israeli policy is to engulf the population in an atmosphere of continuous fear and insecurity in which no one feels himself beyond the reach of physical harm of degradation at the hands of the occupying authorities.

Eviction and Deportations

In its Report Number 3, issued on August 11, 1967, the Red Cross reported the following, "Public cars leave Gaza regularly every morning to the West Bank of Jordan. The number of travellers vary from 400 to 500 daily, only 10 percent of which return to Gaza in the evening." This eviction of Arabs from their own lands by the occupation authorities was bluntly admitted by an Israeli newspaper, which reported that the "Israeli authorities force the Arab citizens of Gaza to seek refuge in Jordan."¹³

In fact, following the June war, the Israeli Government had promptly followed the mass eviction of the Arabs and individual deportations of Arab leaders in each of the Gaza Strip, the West Bank of Jordan, and the Golan Heights. Between June 5, 1967, and May 30, 1968, a total of 399,248

(13) *Kol Ha'am*, January 17, 1968.

Arabs from the West Bank and the Gaza Strip were evicted to the East Bank.¹⁴

In the immediate aftermath of the war, and particularly in the Gaza Strip, large numbers of young men were rounded in most towns and villages and marched off to the Suez Canal and the River Jordan and obliged to cross over. These initial collective measures resulted in the eviction of some 5,000 men from the Gaza Strip in one batch, of whom 2,000 came from Khan Younes, over 800 from the Coastal Camp and 600 from the Jabalia Camp.

An Israeli newspaper reported on June 13, 1967, that Israeli Major General Yosef Said had said that the "Israeli forces are endeavoring 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."¹⁵

One particular measure that has been intermittently implemented by the occupation authorities in this respect is the deportation of prominent personalities from the West Bank, thus gradually depriving the Arab population of its leadership in the civic, religious and intellectual domains. This is an obvious attempt to break the morale of the Arabs and undermine their collective will to resist the step-by-step incorporation of the occupied territories into the State of Israel.

In fact, between August 23, 1967, and November 25, 1968, 34 Arab leaders, men and women, were actually de-

(14) Report of the Higher Ministerial Committee for Refugee Affairs, Amman, May 1968, p. 3.

(15) Israeli newspaper *Davar*, June 13, 1967.

ported by orders of either the Ministry of Defense or the Military Governor.¹⁶ Among these was the President of the Supreme Moslem Council Abdul Hamid Al Sayyed, Mayor of Jerusalem Rohi Al Khatib, former Jordanian Minister Kamal Dajani, and many other lawyers, teachers, school principals, doctors and school inspectors.

The blow dealt to the fabric of the community as a whole by this continuous erosion of its elite is naturally in addition to the moral and physical damage inflicted on the deported themselves, who are never given the chance to challenge the allegations made against them.

Treatment of Prisoners

Blowing up of houses, evictions, and deportations all contravene the stipulations of the Geneva Convention. Yet these measures have proved bearable when compared to the treatment of Arabs in prisons by the occupation authorities—treatment which has defied all human values, rights and principles. Nazi treatment has already been matched by the Israeli occupation authorities and long bypassed. What one could mention is only a little. The rest remains to be experienced in Israeli torture houses if it is to be comprehended.

In this regard, one cannot but quote the Declaration of Human Rights, which was primarily designed for treatment of people under occupation, for human beings imprisoned

(16) A list of these leaders, reported in Israeli and Arab newspapers, has been compiled by the Institute for Palestine Studies, Beirut.

while fighting for their rights and their country. For the Declaration, among other things, dictates the following:

— that a human person should be treated in a spirit of brotherhood (Article 1).

— that he should have the right of life and security of person (Article 3).

— that no one shall arbitrarily deprive him of his property (Article 17/2).

— that he has the right to a fair trial by an independent and impartial tribunal. That he has the right to be presumed innocent until proved guilty according to the law in a public trial at which he has had all the guarantees necessary for his defence (Articles 8-11).

But the Declaration concerns itself merely with *values*, while the question of *rights* was best stipulated by the Geneva Convention of 1949, which Israel signed in 1951. More specifically, the Fourth Convention pertains to the protection of civilian persons in time of war. Only some of these articles could be mentioned here and the description which follows will reveal to what extent the Israelis have abided by them:

— use of physical or mental coercion against protected persons to obtain information by force from them or from third parties is prohibited (Article 31).

— it is also prohibited to take any measures resulting in the physical torture (Article 32).

— internees should also be accommodated and administered separately from prisoners of war and from persons deprived of their liberty for any other reason.

— accused persons shall have the right to be assisted by a qualified advocate or council of their own choice, who must enjoy the necessary facilities for preparing the defense (Article 72).

Very few Westerners have been able to have access to Israeli prisons and to report to the outside world the exact treatment of Arab prisoners. In fact, the International Red Cross has often been refused admittance to prisons under one pretext or the other. Israel has also refused to allow a United Nations delegation to investigate into the lives and treatments of Arabs, despite a U.N. General Assembly resolution urging this, on the pretext that another delegation should also probe into the Arab treatment of Jews living in the Arab countries.

As a result, the best sources for detailed accounts of Israeli treatment of Arabs has been from prisoners themselves who had either served their sentences and were deported to the East Bank of Jordan or prisoners who had been able to appeal to the outside world through their lawyers and through international organizations.¹⁷ In many cases, the information

(17) Asaad Abdul Rahman, an M.A. graduate student of the American University of Beirut and a research assistant at the P.L.O. Research Center, Beirut, served a one-year prison sentence between December 21, 1967, and September 29, 1968. During his stay in various prisons, he was able to gather specific and well-documented facts about the treatment of prisoners. Much of the information described in this chapter is based on his first-hand account and research, part of which were depicted during a press conference held in Beirut on November 21, 1968. His memoirs were compiled in a book published by the Palestine Research Center.

proved embarrassing to the occupation authorities. In one such case, a Jewish journalist from Stockholm, Bo Kuritzen, produced evidence incriminating Israel for torturing any one suspected of being a member of the resistance organizations.¹⁸ In that particular case, Kuritzen cited the example of a student from Nablus, Moayed Osman Al Bohesh, 21, who was detained for months in Israeli prisons, tortured, deprived of the right to contact a lawyer for six months and was prevented from getting medical help which resulted in his arm becoming partially paralyzed as a result of the torture methods used with him. When he was finally allowed a lawyer, Jamil Shalhoub, the latter appealed to Israeli Defense Minister Moshe Dayan and later to U.N. Secretary General U Thant.

It appears that some of the members of the Israeli Parliament feared that such facts—and many others like them, might affect Israel's image in the eyes of the outside world. As a result, one of the Israeli members of the Knesset, Uri Ayneri, interpolated the Minister of Defense Moshe Dayan on the case of Moayed Al Bohesh, but he never received a satisfying answer. Even so, the torturing of the Nablus student by prison administrators did not stop. It was renewed and he was forced to write a confession, until he almost lost the sight of his left eye.

After writing the article about Bohesh, the Jewish journalist was summoned by Moshe Dayan, after the publication of his article had been banned by the censorship, only to be

(18) He wrote an article depicting one such case in *Aftonbladox*, August 15, 1968.

told the following, "No doubt there are some cases of mistreatment which actually happened . . . I am a military man and declare that individuals are sometimes cruel, but we are no angels. We must think of our nation . . . If some Arabs in the occupied territory spoke of the battle against the occupation, we regard this as a serious matter."

This is the official reply to mistreatment and torture to death of Arab prisoners. It needs no further comment.

According to the accounts of those who had served their sentences in Israeli prisons, Arabs are distributed in the following prisons:

Hebron Prison (700); Jerusalem Moscovite Prison (100); Ramallah Prison (80-200); Nablus Prison (450-500); Tul-karem Prison (75-100); Central Ramleh Prison (150); Atleet Prison (150-250); Shata Prison (150-200); Beit Lidd Prison (200); Ghaza Prison (550); Damoun Prison (100); Sara-fand Concentration Camp (100-200).¹⁹

It should be pointed out that in almost all these cases, the prisons were jammed with much more than they can take. For example, the prison of Nablus can take no more than 250 prisoners while in some cases it held more than 500. The administration of the prison had to detain in badly ventilated cells double what the cells could hold of prisoners. In

(19) These figures were collected by the above-mentioned Asaad Abdul Rahman, who carried out the research while in prison. The figures in parenthesis are the number of prisoners found in each prison.

some cases, 20-25 persons were crammed in a room 10 x 4 meters with no lavatory facilities, not enough ventilation or light. In other cases, the cell was 80 cms. long and 60 cms. wide. This was home for the prisoners. No blankets, no beds, mattresses or places to relieve nature except a bucket usually full to the brim.

In fact, if one were to sum up Israel's violations of the requirements for the treatment of prisoners as spelled out by the Geneva Conventions, the following could only be pointed out in brief:

— In many of the prisons, the cells are cold and damp as the sun never enters them, a matter which often resulted in the spread of many diseases among internees.

— Water taps are left open in some prisons, on purpose; the result is leakage of water that flows inside the cells in which prisoners are made to sleep on the floor.

— Israel did not provide Arab prisoners with medical care.²⁰ In some prisons, an internee who happened to be a doctor was assigned to take care of his colleagues without being assigned with sufficient tools or drugs. The prisoners of the Aroha Prison confirm the fact that at one time they were not visited by a doctor for a period of four months, despite the fact that some of their conditions were considered serious by the internees.

(20) This was verified in numerous cases, including that of Bohesh.

— Internees are assigned, in some cases, to work of a military nature for the benefit of the Israeli army such as knitting nets for camouflage used by Israeli forces during military operations, a matter strictly prohibited by the law.

— There are no recreation facilities in any of the prisons. Internees are also forbidden to read. Israel claims that Arab prisoners do not have sufficient knowledge of reading. The fact that these prisoners had requested the administration of the prison and the representatives of the Red Cross who happened to visit them, more than once, was finally met with the provision of one Koran to each dormitory.

— The responsible administration of these prisons does not permit religious ministers to visit the prisons or to minister to members of their community, contrary to the provisions of Article 93 of the Geneva Conventions.

— Several provisions of the Fourth Geneva Convention provide that trials of accused persons, who are to be examined by Courts of the occupying power should take place as soon as possible. These provisions also prohibit detention without due cause and detention on the grounds of an act which does not constitute a crime of the Penal Law.

Israel does not act according to these basic principles. Ordinances applied in the occupied areas permit detention for unlimited periods of time. Some of the prisoners are not even informed of their charges in spite of the fact that they have been imprisoned for more than one year.

— Article 84 of the convention provides that "internees

shall be accommodated and administered separately from prisoners of war and from persons deprived of liberty for any other reason." Yet in spite of this, the prison of Nablus includes a mixture of Jordanian prisoners and Israelis convicted of crimes of the public law in addition to a group of Egyptian prisoners of war, who Israel claims have been arrested in civilian clothes as they tried to reach Eastern Jordan. At the Gaza Prison, at one time, there were 292 political prisoners and 87 prisoners convicted in crimes of the penal law. The same was repeated in the Ramleh and Ramallah prisons.

— Israel does not apply any of the provisions of Article 90 of the Convention pertaining to clothing of prisoners. Many have to live without any under-wears.

— Lavatories are filthy—in all prisons—that no one can use them unless reluctantly. Asaad Abdul Rahman, who served a one-year sentence in occupied territories, described the situation at one time as follows, "The cell was divided into two by iron bars across the middle. On the other side of the bars there was a tin full of faeces. In my cell, this side of the bars, there was no one place to relieve oneself. One urinated through the bars into the tin. But for other purpose, one looked around for scraps of newspapers on which one relieved oneself and then deposited them through the bars into the tin."²¹

— Arab prisoners complained of the insufficiency of the quantities of food allowed for them. Prisoners in Gaza complained that fish was their only meal every day and that they could not eat it. Meat was not served until after the intervention

(21) Described during press conference in Beirut on November 21, 1968.

of the Red Cross, and after numerous hunger strikes staged by the prisoners.

— Article 106 to 115 of the Geneva Conventions refer to the right of internees to send letters, telegrams and receive parcels. Even Article 107 notes that "if the detaining power deems it necessary to limit the number of letters and cards sent by each internee, the said number shall not be less than two letters and four cards monthly." This is never respected by the Israeli authorities. At the Ramallah prison, for instance, parcels sent for prisoners are not delivered to them. Instead they are confiscated.

But perhaps the psychological torture and the war of nerves are the most draconian for the prisoners. The moment they are arrested, prisoners are subjected to two influences simultaneously: inducements and threats. The latter assumes many forms, but the most common include: threatening with beating or torture, with the arrest of those dearest to them like their father, mothers, sisters, brothers; with the blowing up of their homes, rape of nearest women relatives, with imprisonment in cells containing Israeli thieves and murderers and, if the prisoner is a woman, with imprisonment in cells containing Israeli prostitutes.

Following this psychological war of nerves, the prisoners are then thrown into cells—blindfolded, handcuffed, or shackled. The cells are often powerfully lit day and night without interruption. They are sometimes fitted with loudspeakers which continuously broadcast sounds and words aimed at wrecking the prisoners' nerves. At other times, the cells are fitted with blowers which direct strong waves of cold

and hot air alternately. Not rarely, dogs are set loose into the cell. They tear the prisoners' clothes and body and expertly snatch at the cloth blindfolding the prisoners' eyes.²²

Sometimes, the prisoners are led to an open grave and told that the grave was specially dug for them. Sometimes the leg of a corpse, probably artificial, is sticking out of the grave covered with dirt and the prisoners are told that it is the body of this or that friend. At other times they are led into the torture chamber to watch some of their friends or strangers undergoing torture. According to Asaad Abdul Rahman, at least 60 percent of those arrested on charges of helping the resistance receive some variations of this type of psychological torture.

Physical torture, however, is not applied to all the prisoners. The proportion varies. On the West Bank of Jordan, about 15 percent receive this physical treatment. In the Gaza Strip the proportion is higher, reaching up to 25 percent of those arrested.

A number of those who had served prison sentences in Israeli prisons have agreed upon about 16 different methods of torture used by the Israelis. They are not all practiced on the same person nor are they all used with the same frequency.²³

(22) In describing all this, Asaad Abdul Rahman pointed out that not all these methods were used with all the prisoners.

(23) Commenting on these methods, Asaad Abdul Rayman says, "All have actually been practiced. This conclusion is based on continuous research I carried out with my prison inmates. It is based upon a close examination of evidence given by these inmates, on a long rigorous process of checking and counter checking and on objective appraisal of the informants."

These different methods of torture can be described as follows:

— The prisoner is made to strip completely of all clothes. The body is whipped or beaten with sticks. No part of the body is spared. The beating and whipping continues until blood spouts out. Salt is thrown on the lacerations and the beating resumed.

— Lit cigarette ends are applied to various parts of the body.

— The prisoner is forced to sit naked on cactus leaves fixed on platforms.

— Enormous dogs are let loose on the prisoner, who is usually handcuffed with hands behind the back. The dogs are trained to throw the prisoner on the ground. The prisoner is ordered by an interrogator, whip in hand, to get up on his feet as soon as he falls down.

— The fingers of the hand are placed on the edge of an open door and the door is slammed on the fingers.

— Finger nails are pulled out with ordinary pincers.

— The prisoner is injected with pepper solutions.

— The prisoner is suspended from the ceiling from his wrists or ankles. The interrogator throws his weight on the prisoner or pulls him in downward motions.

— Electric shocks are passed through the ear lobes, the chest, and the privy parts.

— The prisoner is injected with solutions which he is told induce instant insanity. He is shown what he is told is an antidote which he would be given if only he would confess in time.

— A large metal container is fitted over the head and neck and held firm to the body by extensions that are held in place by a waist-band. The container is then hit with sticks and rods on the outside, at first slowly and in routine fashion, and then with increasing tempo. The more battered the container is the more difficult it is to pull out.

— A certain chemical substance, possibly a nerve irritant, is put in the hand of the prisoner who is ordered to clench it. The substance gives the effect of an electric shock.

— Water hoses are applied to the mouth or anus and the water turned on.

— The motions of sodomy are enacted apparently by a negro kept for the purpose.

— One of the prisoners' arms is firmly tied to the fixed bars of a window, the other to the handle of a door. The door is slowly opened in the other direction.

— Match sticks are inserted into the urinary-genital tract. Sometimes they are lit. Or, alternatively, the fillings of dry ink pens are inserted in the tract.

These methods of physical torture, it should be pointed out, are practiced with great skill and artistry in order to avoid

permanent damage. But the interrogators sometimes lose control of the situation, and certain, perhaps unwanted results, follow, such as partial paralysis, injury of the stomach, the loss of an eye, or total nervous breakdown.

Numerous examples could be cited to prove that these tortures were actually applied and in many cases led to the death of the Arab prisoners.²⁴ Among these, one could mention the death of Mohammed Shalul, with four others, in the Nablus Prison on September 6, 1967, as a result of tortures practiced on them; the Mukhtar of Khan Younes, who was tortured and died in prison on January 5, 1968. In Jericho, a policeman, Mohammed Dhib Rashid, was tortured to death in February, 1968.

The prisoners are not all men and there were many women who were tortured in equally cruel methods. Abla Shafiq Taha is a case in question, for she was arrested on her way back from Amman to Jerusalem and put in a cell usually reserved for prostitutes.²⁵ These Israeli harlots attacked her, giving her a violent and painful beating in the presence of an Israeli policeman, although Abla was in her third month of pregnancy. She asked the prison authorities to help her and to bring a doctor to see her, but they replied, "If you confess we will do what you want; if not, we shall kill the child inside you." She was interviewed by an Israeli woman lawyer, Felicia Langer, who, having heard what the

(24) Investigations into these cases were led by survey teams of the Institute for Palestine Studies, Beirut.

(25) A report on her treatment and those of others was published by the Arab Women Lawyers' Bureau in Jordan on August 1, 1968.

prisoner had to say, complained to the police of the way in which Abla had been attacked and maltreated. The complaint was submitted first orally, and then in writing. The reply came that she had been attacked by prostitutes of bad character and that nothing could be done about them.

Another example in question is that of Lutfiya Ibrahim Al Hiwari.²⁶

It is truly regrettable to be speaking of "cases" and not of humans at a time when the Declaration of Human Rights continues to be ignored. Human rights are still being violated daily in Palestine by the ruling Israeli authorities. More than one million Palestinian Arabs have been subjected to the injustice of the authorities of Zionist occupation since June, 1967. Such authorities have discarded all moral values, and have violated elementary principles of right and justice through blowing of houses, evictions, pressure, and torture. Israeli Defense Minister Moshe Dayan said, "We are not angels." One only hopes that the Israelis would become human.

CHAPTER IV

SCHOOLS AND EDUCATION

On August 13, 1967—about two months after the June war, employees of all educational institutions on the West Bank, Jordanian men and women teachers at all levels of education, declared they were unable to cooperate with the occupation authorities. They cited the following reasons:

— Education beneath the shadow of the occupying forces could not realize the objectives of their Arab society, which stem from a philosophy based on Arab heritage, religious beliefs, and their own problems and requirements. It was clear to those teachers that the occupying authorities will not leave them to manage their own school affairs without interference.

— The statements of Israeli officials on the changing of curricula and set books are incompatible with international recognized laws and customs, which do not permit occupation authorities to make any change in the laws and regulations already in force in occupied territories, except in connection with the protection of the occupation forces. International law and custom also oblige occupation authorities to respect the inhabitants of occupied territories, to protect their rights, property, and beliefs, and to refrain from ordering them to take actions which are incompatible with their national feelings and religious tenets.

More specifically, Israeli change of curricula is a direct infringement of Article 50 of the 1947 Agreement on Civilians, which obliges the occupying state to maintain cultural and educational establishments, and to permit them to continue work according to the program they had followed before the occupation, without interference by the occupation authorities in any of their affairs.

One of the first educational measures to be carried out by the Israeli authorities was to close down the Education Office of the Governorate of Jerusalem following the refusal of the Director of Education and the Administrative Supervisor to join the Israeli educational staff. Their refusal was expressed in a letter to the occupation authorities dated August 6, 1967.

In an obvious attempt at breaking the unity of Arab teachers and educators, the Israeli authorities circulated a local information leaflet on August 6, 1967, alleging that the occupation authorities had re-employed 4,500 teachers in the occupied area. This, in fact, contained no truth whatsoever, for on August 19, 1967, education personnel of the West Bank of Jordan, in a memorandum sent to the Military Governor of the West Bank, denied Israeli claims that the teachers were cooperating with them. The memorandum stated, "We are greatly surprised by this announcement, which does not contain an element of truth, and we resolutely affirm that we are employees of the Jordanian Ministry of Education, that we are Jordanian citizens, and that our posts continue to enjoy the same status as they did before June 5, 1967. This is in accordance with the 1907 Hague Convention, which states

that the occupying authorities have no right to change the status of officials in the occupied territories and also they have no right to make any change or alteration in administrative and educational organization of the occupied region.”¹

The Arab teachers also pointed out in their note that the occupation authorities had asked certain employees of the Education Department and of the Educational Staff of the West Bank to fill in forms which include a written affirmation that their present nationality is Israeli. This measure clearly infringes Article 45 of the 1907 Hague Convention, which forbids military occupation authorities to demand the allegiance of citizens of the occupied areas.

From the start, the position of the Arab teachers was that of non-cooperation. At the outset, they resorted to memoranda and written protests, but when these were ignored by the Israeli authorities, the teachers were forced to resort to strikes. This was obvious at the beginning of the academic year, when the teachers and students refused to go to school following the illegal measures carried out in the curricula of Arab schools during the summer holiday.

Change of Curricula

The din of battle was hardly over in June, when the occupation authorities confiscated all the books they could find in schools and set to work on them. A team of 30 Arabic-speaking Israeli educators worked their way through a roomful of Arab school books, closely reading every word, hunting for

(1) *Al Dastour*, August 19, 1967.

what was then called "Arab propaganda."² The books, nearly 400 of them, were the ones seized when the Israelis occupied the West Bank of Jordan, Syria's Golan Heights, and the Gaza Strip, which had been under Egyptian rule. The team's job was to cut out every word of what the Education Ministry also called "objectionable material." 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.

It would perhaps have been acceptable to the Arabs if only certain paragraphs of textbooks were omitted. But the censors' work went much further than that. Books of literature, geography, religion and Arabic language were changed. Even mathematics books were not spared.³

At this stage, the Israelis launched all their propaganda media against UNRWA and UNESCO, the latter being responsible for the curricula of textbooks used in refugee schools. The two well-respected international organizations were attacked by Israeli and pro-Zionist newspapers in Israel and the West. The two organizations, of course, denied all the false accusations and submitted the Arab textbooks for inspection by international bodies. But there was no need to do that, for Israeli manipulations were starting to dawn on the West. The attack against UNRWA and UNESCO were obviously aimed at preparing the Arabs and world public opinion for the changes which the Israeli Ministry of Education was planning to take.

(2) *Christian Science Monitor*, September 7, 1967.

(3) *Jerusalem Post*, August 30, 1967.

The changes that were introduced in the Arab textbooks were many and one can only cite a few examples:

— the word Palestine was omitted from all the textbooks to the extent that the Israeli version of one book stated that the Arab Muslim Khalifa Omar, when he visited Jerusalem, had gone to Israel and not to Palestine. Even Muslim fighters who died before 1300 A.D. had died in "Israel."

— the same change was carried out in maps—both old and new. Thus what was known in earlier times as Bilad Al Sham (countries of Syria) was crossed out and replaced by Israel.

— all accounts in Jordanian books about the development of the UAR industries were omitted. Israeli educators wanted Arab children to remain ignorant about the development of the UAR and wanted to deprive the youngsters of the feeling of pride in their culture and heritage.

Thus from what started as merely the omission of anti-Zionist statements, the Israeli educators brought out revised textbooks that will serve the interests of the Israelis. In fact, the Ministry of Education allocated 3,500,000 Israeli pounds for the reprinting of textbooks.⁴

This was the case in the West Bank of Jordan, excluding Jerusalem. For in the Holy City, curricula of Arab schools were replaced with those used in schools for the approximately 250,000 Arabs living inside Israel's pre-June ceasefirelines, for the occupation authorities had annexed Jerusalem on June

(4) *Israel Today*, December 8, 1968.

27, 1967, and treated it like any Israeli city—in certain things only, and the curricula was among these. It was obvious that the Israelis wanted to enforce the low standard of the Israeli curriculum applied to Arab community schools in Israel and the obliteration of Arab history, culture, and background from the educational system. The Israelis were working on the basis that they were there to stay and they set to work creating a new generation of Arabs that was misinformed and misguided about Arab culture.

In Jerusalem, the change of curricula meant that the Hebrew language was made compulsory for about 7,000 pupils. By September, around 5,000 other students in private and religious schools in the East of Jerusalem were also forced to learn Hebrew and to follow the Israeli curricula. Jerusalem, it should be noted, boasts institutions of higher studies, such as the Greek Catholic Seminary of St. Anne, the Dominican Convent School of St. Stephen, and American School of Oriental Studies.

It should be also pointed out that Arab teachers who were forced to cooperate with the Israeli educational authorities when some schools were forcefully opened, especially in Jerusalem, had to sign an official statement that they would not use the old textbooks or even refer to them. Violations would lead to three months imprisonment and a fine of 1,000 Israeli pounds.

Schools

In the Gaza Strip alone, official UNRWA figures showed 169 schools of all kinds with 96,790 students in 1965-66.

Of these 64 were public schools operated by the Egyptian administration before June. Some 102 were run by UNRWA for refugee children and youth. Three were private. In all the occupied territories, there were 855 schools accommodating around 200,000 students.

When the June war broke out, 2,866 teachers were preparing 9,979 candidates for elementary-school certificates in the Gaza Strip. Of these, 7,546 were preparing to enter secondary school. According to the United Arab Republic statistics, ever since 1957, some 5,642 students from the Gaza Strip were sent to Egyptian universities at the cost of the Egyptian Government. In 1967 and after, the Gaza high-school graduates, like others in occupied territories, had no university to go to at all. For even if they wished to try for Israel's Hebrew University in Jerusalem, they would not have been accepted.

The June fighting hit Gaza schools hard. The high school in Rafah was blown up by Israeli forces long after the fighting had stopped. A preparatory school in Zaitoun, also in the Gaza Strip, was burned down. Another, Al Kahira school, suffered shelling hits and was looted by the Israeli soldiers.

The situation of public schools in occupied territories was pathetic. Great amounts of school equipment had been looted or destroyed, especially school laboratories, which had taken years to build up, with large sums of Arab and foreign aid put in them.

Protest

The beginning of the year was a challenge for both the

Israeli authorities and the Arab teachers and students. The former were anxious to start schooling, because they wanted to prove to world public opinion that life in the West Bank and the Gaza Strip was returning to normal.

This, in fact, was not the case in September, when the schools were expected to open. On September 2, 1967, the teaching staff of the West Bank issued another statement denouncing the Israeli measure of changing the curricula in occupied territories.⁵ The note emphasized that "international law does not oblige teachers, who it regards as employees of the Jordanian Government, to cooperate with the occupation authorities." The note continued, "For pupils to go to school to be taught changed curricula would mean that they would learn things which were neither in the interests of their country nor of their society. They are therefore called on to boycott schools, on the understanding that what they lose under the temporary occupation will be made up to them later. To cooperate with the occupation authorities is to allow them to strike deeper roots in the soil of our beloved country, and it gives the occupying power a justification for continuing its occupation."

September 8—the date for the opening of schools in occupied territories came and the test for the Israelis failed. For over 5,000 teachers in the West Bank and about 200,000 students refused to go to school and stayed at their homes. This started a long and bitter struggle, in which tens of teachers accused of inciting students' strike were arrested

(5) *Al Dastour*, September 2, 1967.

while many were deported to the East Bank of the Jordan. A controversy arose even in the Israeli press and many called on the occupation authorities to relax some of the educational measures.

It should be noted that there are a number of factors which helped make of the strike a success:

1. A deep resentment was felt by the Arab teachers and students that the changing of the curricula went far beyond omitting a few anti-Zionist statements in school books. It was strongly believed that the occupation authorities wanted to reach deeper in smothering the outlook and national feelings of the younger generation by depriving it of a thorough Arab education and culture.

2. Education in the West Bank and Gaza was not under the auspices of the local authorities, but was centrally administered. This made the strike more controllable.

3. The Jordanian authorities, in spite of their financial difficulties proved loyal to the teachers and kept smuggling to them their monthly salaries. The Israelis realized this and later in the year, the Military Governor issued a decree banning receipt of funds by the Arabs from Jordan or any other Arab country. This deprived the teachers from their only source of income.

At any rate, the struggle between the teachers and the occupation authorities was long and bitter until finally the Israelis relaxed their demands and allowed the use of the same

textbooks with the deletion of certain phrases that referred to Israel as the enemy of the usurped Arab homeland. It was only in mid-November that some of the schools started to open. By that time, it was also becoming difficult for the Jordan Government to continue smuggling the salaries for the teachers who found themselves without any sources of income.

This, however, did not end the story. It was far from a fruitful academic year for the Arabs. Classes were often interrupted by Israeli soldiers coming into the classrooms looking for alleged freedom fighters. A large number of teachers were imprisoned during the year while some others were deported. Any small incident in any quarter of Arab cities prompted the Israelis to impose curfew and schools were closed down for days.

One such incident took place in Gaza on May 26, 1968. Five Arab girls were mercilessly shot at and injured by Israeli police during peaceful demonstrations by high school students protesting the tough measures imposed on the Arab population of Gaza. Firing shots in the air, Israeli policemen managed to force the girls into the school courtyard. This only drove the demonstrators into a pandemonium and they started stoning the policemen. The latter, instead of using clubs and bayonets, fired at the girls and five of them were injured. On that day, all secondary schools were closed down.⁶

On November 25, students in Nablus again staged protest strikes. In this case, they were protesting the death of an

(6) The London *Times*, May 27, 1968.

Arab woman school teacher, Shadia Abu Ghazaleh, whose name has gone into the annals of Arab freedom fighters. The students claimed that the teacher had been tortured to death at the hand of the Israeli occupiers and they staged the peaceful protest march carrying placards expressing support to the commando activity and calling for the withdrawal of Israeli forces from Arab occupied territories. As usual, the demonstration, though peaceful, was dispersed by force by Israeli policemen. This sparked off two days of student trouble during which schools were closed down and over 25 students were arrested.

As a result, the Israeli authorities resorted to their usual practice of draining Arab schools from their best teachers. For on November 25, 1968, the very same day the clashes took place with the students, 8 Arab teachers, two of them women, were deported to the East Bank of Jordan. The two women teachers were actually the principals of the two leading girls' schools in Nablus.⁷

The Student Revolt

The eruption of the student volcano actually took place in the week starting October 17. This climaxed a year and a half's suppressed turmoil of the students and teachers. Arab students, boys and girls, demonstrated in the West Bank city of Jenin against the repressive measures taken by the Israeli authorities. Similar protests broke out in Tulkarm and Al

(7) The eight deported were: Huda Abdul Hadi, Nawal Al Titi, Saadi Diab, Shahid and Radwan Masoud Al Kharraz, Mohammed Halawa, Jirjis Hanna and Nabil Kablani.

Birah. As many as 15 students were either killed or wounded and many were arrested. The demonstrations followed mass arrests in the city of Hebron after an explosion had rocked the entrance of Hebron's main Ibrahimī mosque.

The demonstrations sparked off a long-awaited student revolt in Nablus, Jerusalem, Bethlehem, and other major West Bank cities.

An agency report from Israel stated then that the Israeli authorities had seized leaflets said to have been issued by certain Arab teachers, urging the Arab population to continue the demonstrations to divert Israeli authorities away from Palestinian freedom fighters undertaking activities against the Israeli authority.

In fact, the student demonstrations could not be dissociated from the activities of the freedom fighters or from the whole occupation issue. One merely complemented the other, but the outcome was always the same—more arrests, deportations, misery, and stronger hatred for the occupation authorities. It also meant lack of concentration of students on their studies.

If anything, the student revolt proved that integration between Arabs and Israelis under the occupation authorities was impossible. It revealed to the world that even one year after the occupation, calm and understanding were far from prevalent. It proved that force cannot pressure the relentless Arabs into accepting the status quo and that a *de facto* rule would never succeed.

CHAPTER V

ECONOMIC DIFFICULTIES

General

It should be pointed out at the outset that before the June war of 1967 broke out, the West Bank of Jordan was undergoing economic, industrial, and agricultural development as never in its history since 1948. This compared with the economic crises that plagued Israel before the war as a result of continued high allocations for military objectives. Israel's financial difficulties were outrightly reflected in the relatively high rate of unemployment, as will be shown later.

The area of Jordan is 97,000 square kilometers of which 5,900 square kilometers lie in the West Bank. Of this area, about 12,500 square kilometers are cultivable and 3,200 kilometers are in the West Bank. About 90 percent of the remaining area, which lies in the East Bank, can be considered a desert.¹

It is also significant to point out that 80 percent of land that is cultivated with fruits lies in the West Bank. This is in addition to 45 percent of the land cultivated with vegetables

(1) These figures were expounded by Jordan's Minister of Economy Hatem Al Zubi in an interview with a Beirut newspaper, Al Anwar, on August 28, 1968.

and 25 percent with crops. As far as production is concerned, the West Bank used to supply Jordan with 90 percent of its fruits, 65 percent of its vegetables, and 30 percent of its crops.

On the industrial side, 48 percent of industrial organizations are situated in the West Bank. These numbered 3,200 and employed around 14,000 workers — or 37 percent of the workers of Jordan. The majority of the industries on the West Bank are small and used to produce the bulk of consumer goods while those in the East Bank are heavy industries, producing the major exports like phosphates and cement. There were, in the West Bank, some 6,000 commercial organizations which formed 53 percent of Jordan's commercial firms. These used to employ about 44 percent of the labor force before the June, 1967 war.

In order to fully comprehend the economic measures carried out by the occupation authorities and the impact of the occupation on the Arab and Israeli economies, a picture should be given of Israel's economy before the June war.

In the field of agriculture, expansion had been so fast that today there is exhaustion of land and water resources. In fact, comparison of the area cultivated in the late fifties with that cultivated now, a decade later, shows the negligible expansion of 2.7 percent over nine years. However, yield per acre has been rising at the same time, and this explains the increase in production. The kibbutzim and meshavim, the socialist and cooperative settlements, still operate by and large in the red—a fact borne out by studies of Israeli economists.²

(2) See, for example, Eliyahu Kanovsky, *The Economy of the Israeli Kibbutz*, (Harvard University Press, 1966).

And this unprofitability is despite the fact that the Jewish settlements get the land on very favorable terms and get capital loans on very low rates of interests as well. In fact, after the June war, the settlements were obtained free of charge from the Arabs who had worked on them and who were forced to run away during or after the war.

Another indication that all was not bright in the Israeli economy, and which was one of the factors that prompted Israeli expansionism during the war, was the heavy subsidies to agriculture and industry. There were production subsidies and export subsidies, and until 1962 there was another type of subsidy in the form of a multiple foreign exchange rate.

Money in circulation in 1967 was over 15 times what it had been in 1949. The price level in 1967 was five and a quarter times what it had been in 1949.³

It should also be pointed out that the value of the Israeli pound had dropped considerably over the years. In 1948, the Israeli pound had been officially equal to one pound sterling or four U.S. dollars. By February 1962, the value of the Israeli pound had been officially reduced by a series of devaluations to 33 cents.

The most significant indicator of all the internal weakness of the Israeli economy before the war or the strains under which it operated was the necessity for foreign aid which had prevailed all through the years. Israel required foreign aid in order to cover its large deficit in the current account of the

(3) These figures were contained in the text of a lecture delivered by Dr. Youssef Sayegh at the American University of Beirut on May 16, 1968.

balance of payments. During the late forties and fifties the deficit in the current account of Israel's balance of payments averaged 298 million dollars a year. In the sixties the average deficit had risen to 483 million dollars annually.

It should be pointed out, however, that Israel was not merely receiving funds adequate to cover this deficit; it was given more money than necessitated. Indeed, between 1949 and 1967 Israel received 950 million dollars more than the total of the yearly current account deficits. Israel received aid from abroad, an average of 426 million dollars per year. In the month of June, 1967, alone it received 500 million dollars from abroad.⁴

By 1967, it was becoming obvious to the Israeli Government that neither private nor public consumption was being compressed; the expenditure on the armed forces was increasing tremendously. It was becoming clear that the only possible way of decreasing the deficit was through the compression of investment. But when investment is compressed, the rate of growth is reduced and employment decreases. Consequent on reduced investment, mild unemployment began to be noticeable in Israel in the year 1965. It jumped to 10 percent in 1966 and by May, 1967, just before the June war, unemployment in Israel had risen to twelve percent of the total labor force.⁵ The war came and all the unemployed were absorbed

(4) Article by Professor Ben Shazar in *The Financial Times*, April 30, 1968.

(5) The *Jewish Observer* March 3, 1967, reported unemployment in last quarter of 1966 to be 96,000. This was an increase of 59,000 over the year before. It was as a result of the reporting of this story that the editor of the *Jewish Observer*, John Kimche, was dismissed.

In March-April 1968, unemployment was back up to eight per cent.

If anything, these facts and figures bring to the open a number of points:

— The slump in the Israeli economy forced the government to find some means of diversifying its public opinion. War was one way of doing it.

— Israel had to resort to crisis-creating since the volume of its intake of foreign aid began to decline in the last two years and tranquility is not the appropriate climate for obtaining generous financial assistance from abroad.

— Israel was in need of the resources of the West Bank of Jordan with its agricultural riches. The River Jordan was also needed for its water to irrigate the lands. The rich highland of the Golan Heights is ideal for Israel's agricultural development.

Currency, Banks, Taxes

One of the biggest economic problems for the Arabs under occupation was financial. The Six Day War was too much of a surprise for the Arabs to allow them to draw their money from the banks before the fighting took place. In fact, the war broke out on Monday, June 5 before the banks could open after the weekend. As a result, the majority of the Arabs who stayed had hardly enough cash to survive through the difficulties of the first month. After that, the banks remained closed. The 9 banks in Western Jordan had held their reserves in Amman. These were frozen when the war broke out and

negotiations for their unfreezing and for a payments agreement in general failed as a result of Israel's stand. Jordan could not allow the opening of the banks without having them continue to operate under Jordanian banking and civil law. Israel wanted the banks to be completely independent of Amman after receiving all the frozen part that remained in Amman banks. On October 3, 1968, following a year of indirect negotiations, Jordan finally decided not to reopen its banks in occupied territories.

In addition to that, the Arab inhabitants also lost when no Jordanian currency was accepted in the West Bank. The Arabs were forced to change Jordanian dinars at the rate of 7.40 Israeli liras, thus losing 26 percent of the value of their money.

Left in this difficult situation, the Arabs had to look for some source of income. Those who could afford it, made trips to Amman or Beirut and drew of their capital in the banks. Since many of the Palestinians and Jordanians before the war had some members of their families working in other Arab countries, these became the major source of revenue for many families. Moreover, the Jordanian Government was able, for the first few months of occupation at least, to smuggle money and salaries to its employees in government posts, and teachers. But this was soon to be cut, for the occupation authorities, wanting to make the Arabs less dependent on Amman, issued a decree prohibiting the Arabs from receiving money from the Arab states and those who did not abide by this were fined and sent to prison. Thus the last threads with Jordan were to be cut.

But things did not stop at that. For on August 1, 1967, the Israeli Government, carrying out its annexation of Jerusalem, forced the Arab inhabitants to pay taxes the same as the Israelis, despite United Nations resolutions demanding the opposite. Compared to Jordanian standards, these taxes were exorbitant and the Arabs were bound to refuse payment. As one Arab of Jerusalem told the writer, "Payment of the same taxes like those of the Israelis meant that we were forced to pay for the building up of the Israeli defense efforts against the Arabs, for providing homes, facilities, and services, for the new Jewish emigrants, and for the Israeli war effort that is used against the Arabs."

A sample of these new taxes can be cited here :

— the income tax was collected in accordance with the new Israeli rates starting July 28, 1967. Reduction of these taxes from wages of Arab employees was started on August 1, 1967.

— whole sale traders were forced, in accordance with a decree issued on July 28, 1967, to pay the difference in customs duties that were in stock but which had been imported during Jordanian rule.

— taxes on cars are much higher in Israel than in occupied areas, and the new higher rates were imposed in July, 1967.

— an obligatory tax was imposed on goods stored in their places of business. This tax was based on a law which was issued in 1958 to deal with a problem that faced Israel at that time and had no connection to the present situation.

The occupation authorities were determined to collect the much needed taxes even if force had to be used. According to one report, a patrol of 20 Israeli policemen accompanied the tax collectors on their rounds in Al Tirah village near Ramallah.⁶ On these rounds, the policemen broke into houses by force and confiscated all the furniture of the Arabs.

It should be pointed out that the imposition of such high taxes on the Arabs, who had limited sources of income, had two-fold objectives: first, to force many of them to leave the occupied territories for the East Bank of Jordan so that Jews could be housed in their places and, second, to force the Arabs to legally recognize the Israeli occupation.

Agency reports said at the end of 1967 that the Israeli occupation authorities collected about 3 million Israeli pounds in the first six months of the occupation although many of the Arabs were still refusing to pay.⁷

Thus with all economic projects at a standstill in the first six months after the war for lack of raw material, with no financial help coming in, with no access to their own money deposited in the Arab countries, and with unemployment, the inhabitants of the occupied territories were facing grave financial hardships, especially since the cost of living had gone up by approximately 40 percent.

Some of the situations of the Arab businessmen were transmitted to the writer in person about one year after the June war. Only a few can be quoted here:

(6) *Al Hayat*, May 4, 1968.

(7) *Associated Press*, November 13, 1967.

— the owner of one of the biggest printing presses in Arab Jerusalem said that "though work had been practically at the zero level, I did not dismiss one of my forty one employees at the printing press." He said that for the whole year he had been paying them, most of which had large families and responsibilities, from his own capital. Every month or two, he used to take the trip to Amman or Beirut to draw out of his account. Of course, the Israeli Government facilitated travel for the businessmen by granting them open exit permits for six months.

— the owner of a tourist agency said that he has not been allowed to bring tourists directly from abroad as he used to do before the war. This facility was granted only to Israeli tourist agencies. Furthermore, transport for the tourists was not allowed in Jordanian cars to the pre-June Israeli-held areas "in order to open business for Israeli transport companies."

— the owner of a series of hotels further emphasized that Arab hotels in Jerusalem were made use only after all the Israeli hotels were filled. With the instability of conditions and the continuous turmoil in occupied areas and Israel, this meant that the major part of the year saw the Arab hotels empty at a time when they were always booked months ahead during the Jordanian rule.

— the owner of a transport company for renting cars to tourists explained how during the first week of the war, the Israelis stole all his 15 cars, which had costed him a fortune and destroyed the major part of them. The Israeli Government had refused to compensate him for his losses,

claiming that these were destroyed as a result of the war although he had emphasized that not one of them was hit during the fighting itself.

Agriculture

To add to the lot of the Arabs under occupation, the Israeli authorities established barriers for West Bank agricultural produce. From the first month of occupation, Israel set customs posts at all entrances to the West Bank. Arab farmers, badly in need of cash, were forbidden to sell their products inside the pre-June Israeli-held areas. The Israelis were already afraid of competition, for Arab farm products were sold at a much lower rate.

Under Arab pressure, protests and strikes, the Israelis were forced to raise these restrictions gradually. For on August 7, 1967, Arab traders went on strike, paralyzing trade in occupied areas. The protest was also made to coincide with the visit to Israel of United Nations envoy Nils-Goran Gussing, who was there to study the refugee needs. A day before, leaflets were distributed to traders bearing the name of the "Defense of Arab Jerusalem." The leaflets, which urged merchants not to pay any taxes, called on the Arabs to "keep Jerusalem an Arab city—belonging to the Kingdom of Jordan on both sides of the Jordan River" and called on the Arabs "not to bow to colonialism."

Of course, as usual, the Israeli authorities hit back strongly, arrested a large number of merchants and closed down five shops and one tourist agency.⁸ But the message sank home.

(8) *The New York Times*, August 9, 1967.

Gradually, the occupation authorities started to remove customs posts leading to the West Bank. Israelis were allowed to buy West Bank agricultural products, which were still at much lower prices.

It was at this stage that the "open bridges" policy began to materialize. The Israelis found out that in order to avoid competition with Israeli farm products, the best thing would be to allow the farmers in the West Bank to ship their goods to the East Bank across the River Jordan. It was not for humanitarian purposes that Israel wanted to aid the East Bank and supply the refugees with much needed farm products. The Israelis found out that the taxes they were collecting and the income that was coming from the over 200 trucks that passed daily across the River were very rewarding. For one thing, it saved Israel the problem of finding new markets abroad for West Bank products and, for the other, it did not compete with their products.

According to estimates issued by the Israeli Ministry of Agriculture, around 60,000 tons of products from the West Bank were sold in the Arab states between June and December, 1967.⁹ The major part of these went to Kuwait, Jordan, and Iraq. Israel took this as an excuse to reduce the allocations it had made to help Arab farmers. For on the same date, it announced that because of what it called this "export" to the Arab states, there was no need for Israel to allocate about two million Israeli pounds to the farmers. In fact, Israel was doing its best to show that what was going on was ordinary trade

(9) Figures published by Beirut's *Al Nahar*, December 29, 1967.

between one country and the other and for that reason it established customs posts on the River Jordan.

The same Israeli report said that total agricultural exports amounted to about four million sterling pounds. Around 40,000 tons were sold inside occupied areas and Israel.

It should be emphasized that the Israeli allegation that agricultural products in occupied areas would compete with those produced in the pre-June occupied areas was only half true. The only products that can compete are tomatoes, water melons, eggplants and grapes.

The hardest hit areas was the Gaza Strip. For before the war, the bulk of this area's exports went to East European countries, but it was not in Israel's line of policy to keep the situation the same. Moreover, these countries, the majority of which were pro-Arab, did not encourage the idea of importing their goods from Israel. As a result, farmers and merchants in the Gaza area were left without any outlet for their products. To make things worse, even products of the West Bank were dumped in the Strip, making the prices of products very cheap and entailing big losses for the Gaza Arab farmers. And, the Israeli Government did nothing to find new markets for these goods.

What made things even more difficult for the Arabs in occupied areas was the fact that all the goods that were lacking in their market were sent from the Israeli side at very high prices, for the cost of living between the two sides differed to a great extent. But the Arabs were not given much choice

and the "open bridge policy" between Israel and Jordan applied, in fact, only one way—from occupied areas to Jordan.

To get a clear picture of how things were running in the occupied territories, it is best to resort to the description of a foreign correspondent who roamed the area.¹⁰

He wrote, "Arab merchants complained bitterly that truckloads of Israeli goods, including food and even bread, are being brought in under army protection. They are being pressured, they say, into selling the Israeli goods which tend to drive out their own." The writer adds that "this increases unemployment in the West Bank's own food-producing activities: olive growing and olive oil; growing, marketing, and sometimes processing of fruits and vegetables."

Commenting on the taxes collected from products transported to the East Bank of Jordan, one Israeli officer said, "Customs duties collected are put in a special fund for the welfare of the West Bank's inhabitants."¹¹ Arab leaders could not but scoff at that, labelling it as a public relations device meant only to impress the outside world.

The Tourism Sector

Among the major Arab complaints was that from the tourist sector. Before the war, there were 34 hotels in Jerusalem that were capable of accommodating 3,726 beds. This compared with 23 hotels in the West side of the city that

(10) See *Christian Science Monitor*, September 7, 1967.

(11) *Ibid.*

accommodated 2,244 beds. While the Israeli hotels were hardly affected by the destruction of the war, the major part of Arab hotels were looted, including cutlery, mattresses, curtains, beds, food, drink, and all the rest. The Israeli Government gave much publicity to the claim that the occupation authorities were going to compensate, but in fact a little over one third of the Israeli estimates of the destruction was compensated to the Arabs.

Realizing that the cheaper rates of Arab hotels might compete with their Israeli counterparts, the Israeli Government asked Arab hotel owners to raise the prices. The Israeli Government made it appear as if it was a favor. In fact, the raise in rates was soon to be nullified by the fact that Arab hotel owners were forced to pay the exorbitant Israeli taxes, which were five times higher than those of Jordan. Food and drink, for example, was taxed very heavily.

During Jordanian rule, there were 55 tourist agencies in Jerusalem, but only 38 of these were given temporary permits. Moreover, there were 192 tourist guides who worked during Jordanian rule, but only 59 of these were granted licenses for work.

In this sector dealing with tourism, the following facts should be borne in mind:

— priority was always given to Israeli hotels, tourist agencies, and guides and only the leftovers were given to the Arabs. With the continuous turmoil and incidents, this did not leave much for the Arabs working in this sector to profit from.

— Arab tourist offices had been rendering good, efficient and courteous services for the past twenty years. Under occupation, with the exception of one Arab tourist office, bookings for tourist groups had shifted completely to Israeli agents. Even in the case of confirmed tourist reservations and bookings made prior to June 1967, correspondence in their connection had been intercepted by Israeli authorities and reservations diverted. In some instances, groups, booked through Arab offices coming via Lydd, the main Israeli airport, had been met by Jewish agents and were told that their Arab agents had failed to meet them and arrange for their accommodation and that the Israeli agents were there to offer services and oblige! On the other hand, Arab agents are restricted by permits to reach Lydd airport and these permits are not easy to obtain.

— Arab taxi companies in Jerusalem are not allowed to operate freely in the Israeli side while Israeli buses and taxis have no restrictions and operate anywhere within the West Bank. This had put nearly 300 taxi drivers out of work.

— Israeli guides are giving an Israeli-Jewish version of the story of the birth, life, teaching, crucifixion and resurrection of Christ. As an example, at the 13th Station, Israeli guides were heard pointing out that this was the spot where Jesus was crucified by the *Romans*.

— again, concerning the cars, the Israelis claimed that the East side of Jerusalem had 300 taxis for a population of 72,000 while the West side of the city had 150 taxis for a population of 200,000. On the basis of this analysis, the

Israeli authorities gave the Arabs only 50 licenses to operate the taxis. This left 250 taxis without licenses. The Israeli authorities overlooked the fact that the 300 taxis did not work on the Arab population of the city, but that they were providing facilities for the thousands of tourists that used to visit the Holy City. Obviously, the occupation authorities wanted to provide more work for the Israeli taxi drivers while depriving the Arab drivers from their only source of living.

Unemployment

As pointed out earlier, mild unemployment began to be noticeable in 1965. From the three or four percent of the labor force unemployed in that year, the proportion jumped to ten percent in 1966. By May, 1967, just before the war, unemployment had risen to twelve percent of the total labor force. The war came and all the unemployed were absorbed. In March-April, 1968, unemployment was back up to eight percent.

The latter fact explains a number of points concerning the Israeli treatment of the Arabs. For Israel, facing an economic slump after the war, was bound to suffer from unemployment, but the occupation of new Arab territories was also going to increase this figure. Naturally, priority was not going to be given to the Arabs!

One of the first measures taken by the Israelis to choke the Arabs and to prevent them from competing with the Israelis was the opening of a branch of the Histadruth (confederation of labor unions) in East Jerusalem. If Arabs were

to be accepted in any job, they had first to register their names in this organization. Of course, the purpose was to control the Arab labor force through register books. For one thing, Arab labor was much cheaper than that of the Israelis and the government was worried about the strong competition. One fact emerges from this treatment: the Histadruth promised the Arabs that if they worked in Israeli development projects, they will be given an equal pay like that of the Israelis while if they worked in Arab projects in occupied areas, they will receive salaries in accordance with the financial capabilities of the Arab owner of the project. This revealed one important aspect of the occupation: the Israelis were determined to restrict development projects to the Israeli side while neglecting the occupied territories. This was one of the reasons that prompted the Histadruth to make such tempting offers to the Arabs.

It should be mentioned, as an example, that the number of Arab workers in Jerusalem alone numbered between 12,000 and 14,000. Until September, 1967, only around 2,000 of these were actually working in such areas as construction of roads and buildings, factories, and the rest.¹²

From the looks of the situation, it appears that unemployment is going to increase in both Israel and the occupied territories. For one thing, the increased allocations for the Armed Forces will prevent investment in development projects in both Israel and post-June occupied areas. For another,

(12) These figures were contained in the report submitted to U.N. Secretary General U Thant by his special envoy to the occupied areas Ernesto Thalmann in August, 1967.

tourism, which used to constitute one of the major revenues for the Arabs, will continue to be relatively low due to the continued unstable situation. Finally, the variety of views concerning the future of the occupied territories will prevent any long-range investments in these areas. For among Israeli officials, views vary from those who favoured complete separation of the economies between Israel and the occupied areas and those who favored completely dove-tailing them. Arguments in favor of separation came primarily from the economic ministries, the Bank of Israel and the Histadruth. They have been stressing the uncertainties regarding the territories' future, the incompatibility of the Israeli and Arab economies, etc...

But meanwhile, the Arabs continue to suffer from second-class treatment in their own country while the world looks by. They continue to suffer under the yoke of occupation while the world speaks but does not act on human rights. The mere thought that 1968 was a Human Rights Year proved to be a myth.

APPENDIX A

This is an eye witness report of an Israeli soldier who wishes to remain anonymous about the massacres of refugees carried out after the war. His story has been corroborated by other soldiers. The report concerns the sector on the Jordan river between the Yarmouk and the Allenby bridge. The time is the end of July and the beginning of August, 1967. The report was given in Tel-Aviv, 10th September 1967, and published by "*Private Eye*," November 10, 1967.

"Every night Arabs cross the Jordan from East to West. We blocked the passages (i.e. the places where the river is shallow and can be crossed by foot) and were ordered to shoot to kill without warning. Indeed, we fired shots every night on men, women, and children. Even during moonlit nights when we could identify the people, that is—distinguish between men, women, and children. In the mornings we searched the area and, by explicit order from the officer on the spot, shot the living, including those who were wounded. After killing them we covered them with earth or sometimes left them lying there until a bulldozer came to bury them. Some of these people are intelligence agents; some are armed infiltrators; some are smugglers. Mostly though they are former inhabitants of the West Bank who have not received an Israeli permit to return. There were some cases I'll never forget. One morning we found two men, unwounded. The officer ordered

us to kill them and we shot them on the spot. Once we found two men wounded in their legs. We talked to them, took their papers, and then the officer ordered us to kill them. They understood from our gestures what went on and desperately pleaded for their lives. We all left the place except one who volunteered to kill them. He had to fire six times before they were dead. The stories are many. I'm only telling of events I saw with my own eyes, but stories by other soldiers are abundant. I heard of soldiers setting fire to heaps of bodies.

One morning I saw bodies in heap, among them was a young girl. On another occasion an El-Fatah man pleaded for his life; when he saw it was useless he cursed us and took the bullets. One night a group of about twenty crossed. We shot them. In the morning we found 11 bodies. Some were found hiding, unharmed. We caught them and sent them back to the East bank, unharmed.

During the time of my service, long after the war, we fired shots in our sector every night. Every night people were shot; every morning the wounded were killed. So too were those who were caught unwounded.

I am disclosing this information in the hope that it will become known to as many Israeli citizens as possible. Perhaps some could influence these events and stop them."

Some of the facts revealed in these two accounts are known to many people in Israel, yet, owing to consideration of 'national interest' they are kept secret from snooping foreigners and are never published in the press.

The press did however mention briefly that the cabinet, in its weekly, meeting discussed the issue of "purity of the Israel arms"—an expression that has a very definite meaning in Israel. It is used whenever atrocities are committed by the army and come to the knowledge of the public.

APPENDIX B

This is an eye witness account by the writer and journalist Amos Keinan who sent it as a private letter to politicians, members of the Knesset and newspapers.

The unit commander told us that it had been decided to blow up three villages in our sector; they were Beit-Nuba, Amaos, and Yalu. This was explained by strategic, tactical, and security considerations. First—to straighten the border at Latrun. Second—to punish the bases of murderers. Third—to prevent the setting up of bases for future infiltration. One can argue about this idiotic concept of collective punishment, which believes that if an infiltrator loses one house he will not find another. One can argue about the expediency of increasing the number of our future enemies. But what is the use of arguing?

We were told to search the houses of the village, to take prisoners any armed men. Unarmed people were to be allowed to pack up their belongings and to be told to go to the nearby village of Beit-Sura. We were ordered to block the entrances of the village and prevent inhabitants returning to the village from their hideouts, after they had heard Israeli broadcasts urging them to go back to their homes. The order was to shoot over their heads and tell them not to enter the village.

Beit Nuba is built of fine quarry stones; some of the

houses are magnificent. Every house is surrounded by an orchard, olives trees, apricots, vines, and presses. They are well kept. Among the trees there are carefully tended vegetable beds.

In the houses we found one wounded Egyptian commando officer, and some very old people. At noon the first bulldozer arrived and pulled down the first house at the edge of the village. Within 10 minutes the house was turned into rubble, including its entire contents; the olive trees, cypresses were all uprooted . . . After the destruction of three houses the first refugee column arrived from the direction of Ramallah.

We did not fire into the air but took cover, some Arabic speaking soldiers went over to notify them of the warning. There were old people who could hardly walk, murmuring old women, mothers carrying babies, small children. The children wept and asked for water. They all carried white flags.

We told them to go to Beit-Sura. They told us that they were driven out everywhere, forbidden to enter any village, that they were wandering like this for four days, without food, without water, some dying on the road. They asked to return to the village, and said we had better kill them.

Some had a goat, a lamb, a donkey or camel. A father ground wheat by hand to feed his four children. On the horizon we would see the next group arriving. A man carrying 100 lbs of flour in a sack—he had walked like that, mile after mile. More old people, more women, more babies. They dropped down exhausted where we told them to sit. Some had a

cow or two, a calf; all their property on earth. We did not allow them to enter the village and take anything.

The children cried. Some of our soldiers started crying too. We went to fetch the Arabs some water. We stopped a car with a major, two captains and a woman. We took a jerrican of water and distributed it to the refugees. We also handed out cigarettes and candy. More soldiers burst into tears. We asked the officers why these refugees were sent one place to another and driven out of everywhere. They told us that this was good for them, they should go, "moreover," said the officers, "why do we care about the Arabs anyway?" We were glad to hear that half an hour later these officers were all detained by the military police because their car was full of booty.

More and more columns of refugees arrived, until there were hundreds of them. They failed to understand why they have been asked to return yet not permitted to enter. We could not stand their pleading. One asked us why we destroyed their houses instead of taking them over ourselves.

The platoon commander decided to go to headquarters and find out if there were any orders about what to do with them, where to send them, and whether it was possible to arrange transport for the women and food for the children. He returned saying that there were no orders in writing, simply that they were to be driven out.

We drove them out. They go on wandering in the south like lost cattle. The weak die. In the evening we found out

that we had been taken in, for in Beit-Sura too bulldozers had begun to destroy the place and they were not allowed to enter. We found out that not only in our sector was the border straightened out for security reasons but in all the other sectors too. The promise in the radio was not kept; the declared policy was never carried out.

Our unit was outraged. The refugees gnashed their teeth when they saw the bulldozers pull down the trees. At night we were ordered to guard the bulldozers, but the unit was so outraged that no soldier was willing to carry on such duties. In the morning we were moved from the area. None of us understood how Jews could behave like this. Even those who justified the action said that at least it should have been possible to keep the Arabs in some camp until a final decision concerning their fate was taken, and they could be transported, with their belonging, somewhere else. No one understood why shouldn't these felaheens be allowed to take their stove, blankets and some food.

The chickens and doves were buried in the rubble. The fields were turned into waste land in front of our eyes. The children who went crying on the road will be Fedayeen in 19 years, in the next round.

Thus we have lost the victory.

APPENDIX C

*Arab Properties Expropriated by the Israel Government
Within the Old City Walls of Jerusalem.*

(Order of Expropriation published in the Israel Official Gazette on April 18, 1968).

<i>Parcel</i>	<i>Houses</i>	<i>Shops and others</i>
29	47	113
30	44	26
31	152	39
32	78	19
33	85	52
34	197	19
35	26	13
36	40	39
37	89	55
38	126	26
39	154	36
	<hr/>	<hr/>
	1038	437

APPENDIX D

*Testimony of Muayyad Othman Bahsh, Student, Nablus,
Currently Prisoner in Ramleh Prison Under the Occupation.
(May 26, 1968)*

I, Muayyad Othman Bahsh, of Nablus, a pupil in the 12th intermediate class in the Salehiya School in Nablus, and now confined in the central prison in Ramleh, hereby make the following statement in the presence of Jamil Shalhub, lawyer, of Haifa, on May 26, 1968.

1. On September 12, 1967, I went of my own free will to the Nablus Police to inquire why they were looking for me, and was detained on a charge of attempted murder. I made a statement to the investigating sergeant, denying the charge. From the Police Station I was taken to Nablus Prison, where I was kept in a cell for 45 days, during which time I was submitted to long interrogations by a number of investigators, some from the intelligence, some from the police. In the course of the interrogation I was charged with being a member of the Fath Organization and with possessing arms. When I denied the charges they threatened to transfer me to a prison inside Israel for torture.
2. On January 24, 1968 my goalers carried out their threat, and removed me to a new prison in Sarafand Camp, where

the investigators and policemen concerned put me in a cell measuring 50 cms. by 50 cms. When they did not succeed in extracting from me the confession they wanted, the camp authorities tortured me. The following is a brief description of the tortures inflicted on me:

- a) I was hung up by the hands from the ceiling of a room, and they bore down on my body. In the intervals between inflicting this kind of torture, they flogged me with a rubber whip all over the body, especially on the genitals, so that I lost consciousness.
- b) They blindfolded me and fettered my hands and feet, and in the intervals of beating me, made me run in a square which was full of excavations, so that I kept tripping, falling down and hurting myself; they would then make me get up and start running again, and so on. This went on until I was bleeding all over.
- c) They attached electric wires to my body and head, and gave me electric shocks.
- d) They poured urine over my head and body.
- e) Lighted cigarettes were placed on different parts of my body; the marks are still visible.
- f) They opened my legs and beat me on the penis until it ejaculated.

These are some examples of the tortures inflicted on me by the investigators and the camp authorities at Sarafand dur-

ing my detention there. On one occasion, while I was hanging from the ceiling, as a result of their bearing down on my body, and the blows which were falling on it, my left shoulder was broken. I screamed with pain and told the interrogators that my left shoulder was broken, but all they said was that they would break the right one too.

When the torture proved unsuccessful and I refused to confess to actions I had not committed, I was returned to Nablus prison, where, when I complained of a broken shoulder, they had me X-rayed, and the picture revealed the fracture.

In Nablus, too, I was put into a cell, where I was beaten, and the interrogators tried to force me to confess that I was a member of Fath, and that I had killed an Arab spy working for Israel. But I always answered that I was a student, and that I knew nothing about the charges brought against me, which were trumped up and absolutely untrue.

On another occasion the interrogators threatened to send me back to Sarafand for torture, and when I refused to confess, carried out their threat, returning me to Sarafand Camp on March 5, 1968. At Sarafand the interrogators repeated their questioning and their attempts to make me confess, and, when they failed, again tortured me in the manners described above, but even more brutally. They hung me from the ceiling by the hands—all my entreaties to them not to do so, because my shoulder was broken, were unavailing, and the investigator ordered me to be hung up and tortured to death. They did, in fact, torture me mercilessly until my left arm was completely paralyzed—I can no longer feel with it. When they

found that my arm was paralyzed from the fingers to the middle of the shoulder, they sent me back to Nablus Prison.

Before they did this, however, they gave me a choice of signing a confession or agreeing that my father's house in Nablus should be blown up; I chose the latter alternative.

On March 9, 1968, I was ordered to appear before an advisory committee on the release of detainees, but I was not allowed to appear before it, in spite of my entreaties to Aluf Verdi, the investigator, that he should inform the committee that my arm had been paralyzed by torture. But, as I have said, he did not grant my request, and informed me that the committee had confirmed the order of administrative detention made against me on the ground that I was accused of being a member of Fath.

Here I should like to say that one of the intelligence men in Nablus, Mr. Baruch, threatened me, and told me frankly that I should never get out of prison until I confessed the truth. When I asked him; what truth? he replied, the fact that I was member of Fath, that I had possessed arms, etc. I replied that this was not true, and that if he did not believe me, all I could do was to stay in prison until the truth came out.

One day during my detention in Nablus Prison I was being taken for a medical examination, and from the prison entrance I saw my mother sitting in the square opposite the prison, so I raised my hand to greet her. But when I got back to the prison, they put me in a cell, and one of the warders

submitted a report to the effect that I had insulted the Israeli Government.

The Deputy Governor of Nablus Prison, Mr. Victor, then sent for me, and asked me why I refused to accept a packet of cigarettes. I replied that they had given me a more valuable present than cigarettes—a paralyzed arm. Thereupon the Deputy Governor lit a match, and applied it, lit, to my hand. Naturally, I felt no pain, but it left a mark on the palm of my hand which is visible to this day as evidence of the incident.

In Nablus Prison, as in Sarafand, they used my body as an ashtray to put out their cigarettes. The marks of these cigarette burns are still visible on my body, especially on my paralyzed arm.

One day, at the end of March or the beginning of April 1968, the Governor of Nablus Prison sent for me and told me to write a letter to my father (with my right hand), emphasizing that my left hand, which was, in fact, paralyzed, was perfectly all right. This was a lie, of course; the reason, apparently, was to keep my father quiet and prevent him exerting pressure from outside and complaining about the tortures inflicted on me.

I complained twice to the Red Cross officials who visited Nablus Prison, but this did me no good; on the contrary, it only made the warders' treatment of me more vicious; they used to kick me in the stomach and abuse me, and threaten that I should lose the use of my other arm as well.

When I succeeded in seeing the dresser in Nablus Prison, I explained my case to him, and, without permission from the Governor of the Prison, he took me to the prison doctor. When the doctor examined me, he saw that my whole arm was paralyzed, and ordered me to be sent to hospital in Ramleh Central Prison, where I was taken on May 15, 1968.

On May 23, 1968 I was sent to the Sarafand Military Hospital for a medical examination, but, because the doctor was not there, I was returned to Ramleh Central Prison, where I have remained until now without treatment. In my state of health I cannot dress or undress myself, and only just manage to eat with one hand. I urgently need treatment, and I ought to be in hospital.

Throughout my detention (nearly 6 months) no one was allowed to see me except the investigators and the police. Even the lawyer, Jamil Shalhub, engaged by my father to conduct my case, was not allowed to see me until June 26, 1968, when I saw him, and signed a Power of Attorney for him to represent me in all matters, and told him my story in detail, as set out above.

I hope that what I have said will be made known to the public in Israel and on the West Bank, and to educated public opinion throughout the world—including both men of authority and the man in the street. And I hope that people of education and democratic principle will come to hear of my illegal imprisonment and the sufferings I have endured.

PALESTINE RESEARCH CENTER

606 Sadat St.

(Apt. 22)

Ras Beirut, Beirut - Lebanon

Telephone 296803

Director General : Anis Sayegh

PUBLICATIONS

I. "PALESTINE MONOGRAPHS" :

1. Sayegh, Fayez: Zionist Colonialism in Palestine (A,E, F,G,D) (1 L.L.)
2. Jabara, Abdeen: The Armistice in International Law (E) (2 L.L.)
3. Kayyali, Abdul-Wahab: The Expansionist Aims of Israel (A) (2 L.L.)
4. Kayyali, Abdul-Wahab: The Kibbutz (A) (2 L.L.)
5. Abu-Gazaleh, Bassam: Terrorist Roots of the Herut Party of Israel (A) (2 L.L.)
6. Iskandar, Marwan: The Arab Boycott of Israel (A,E,G) (2 L.L.)
7. El-'Abed, Ibrahim: The Mapai Party (A) (2 L.L.)
8. Razzouk, Ass'ad: A Look at the Parties of Israel (A,G) (2 L.L.)

9. Kadi, Leila S.: The Histadrut (A) (2 L.L.)
10. El-'Abed, Ibrahim: Violence and Peace: A Study in Zionist Strategy (A) (2 L.L.)
11. Abdul-Rahman, Ass'ad: The Israeli Infiltration in Asia (A) (2 L.L.)
12. Sayegh, Anis: Military Balance (A) (2 L.L.)
13. Sayegh, Fayez: Zionist Diplomacy (A,E) (2 L.L.)
14. Jiryis, Sabri: The Arabs in Israel Vol. I (A,E) (2 L.L.)
15. Abdul-Rahman, Ass'ad: The World Zionist Organization (A) (2 L.L.)
16. El-Helou, Angelina: Interaction of Political, Military, and Economic Factors in Israel (A,E) (2 L.L.)
17. Mrowa, Yusuf: Dangers of Israel's Scientific Progress (A) (2 L.L.)
18. Abu-Gazaleh, Bassam: High-Pressure Planning in Israel (A) (2 L.L.)
19. Moutlak, Rafik: Israel on the Eve of Aggression (A) (2 L.L.)
20. Tariki, Abdullah: Arab Oil and the Battle for Palestine (A) (2 L.L.)
21. Jiryis, Sabri: The Arabs in Israel Vol. II (A,E) (2 L.L.)
22. Kanafani, Ghassan: Zionist Literature (A) (2 L.L.)
23. Hashem, 'Akil and 'Azm, Sa'id: Israel in Western Europe (A) (2 L.L.)
24. Shukairy, Ahmad: Territorial and Historical Waters in International Law (E) (2 L.L.)

25. Abdul-Aziz, Mustafa: Voting and Political Blocks in the U.N. General Assembly (A) (2 L.L.)
26. El-'Abed, Ibrahim: The Moshav (A) (2 L.L.)
27. Hajjaj, Ahmad: The Israeli Population: Analysis and Predictions (A) (2 L.L.)
28. Moghayzel, Joseph: The Arab Boycott in International Law (A) (2 L.L.)
29. Kawar, Adib: The Jewish Woman in Occupied Palestine (A) (3 L.L.)
30. Dabbagh, Salah: The Soviet Union and the Palestine Question (A) (2 L.L.)
31. Anabtawi, Munzer: Israeli Propaganda (A) (2 L.L.)
32. Sa'd, Ilias: Tourism in Israel (A) (2 L.L.)
33. Al-'Abed Ibrahim: The Foreign Policy of Israel (A) (2 L.L.)
34. Deeb, George: The United Nations and the Israeli Aggression (A) (2 L.L.)
35. Abdul-Aziz, Mustafa: The Jewish Minority in the U.S.A. (A) (2 L.L.)
36. Shibl, Yusuf: Fiscal Policy in Israel (A) (2 L.L.)
37. Razzouk, Ass'ad: State and Religion in Israel (A) (2 L.L.)
38. Suleiman, Atif: Israel and Oil (A) (2 L.L.)
39. Sa'd, Elias: Unemployment in Israel (A) (2 L.L.)
40. El-Helou, Angelina: Israel and the Common Market (A) (2 L.L.)

41. Mouja'is, Lamia: Mapam (A) (2 L.L.)
42. Al-Haythami, M.F.: The Strategy of Israel (A) (2 L.L.)
43. Al-Kantar, Riad: The Israeli Infiltration in Africa (A)
(2 L.L.)
44. Halasa, Tahani: David Ben Gurion (A) (2 L.L.)
45. Hashem, Akil: Planning for Arab Information (A)
(2 L.L.)
46. Mrowa, Yusuf: Dangers of Israel's Industrial Planning
(A) (3 L.L.)
47. Razzouk, Ass'ad: Zionism and Arab Human Rights, Vol.
I (A,E,F) (2 L.L.)
48. Razzouk, Ass'ad: Zionism and Arab Human Rights, Vol.
II (A,E,F) (2 L.L.)
49. Hanna, Elias W.: The Legal Status of the Arab Re-
sistance in Occupied Territory (A,E,F) (2 L.L.)
50. Azmeh, Aziz: Left-Wing Zionism, From its Inception to
the Declaration of the State of Israel (A) (2 L.L.)
51. Abdul-Rahman, Ass'ad: Memoirs of a Prisoner (A,E,F)
(2 L.L.)
52. Foda, Ezzeddin: The Question of Jerusalem in Interna-
tional Relations (A) (2 L.L.)
53. Kadi, Leila S. (ed): Essays on the American Public
Opinion and the Palestine Problem (E) (2 L.L.)
54. Foda, E., Razzouk, A., and Hanna, E.: Zionism and Arab
Resistance (E) (2 L.L.)
55. The Arabs Under Israeli Occupation (E) (2 L.L.)

56. Kadi, Leila S.: A Survey of American-Israeli Relations
(E) (2 L.L.)

II. "PALESTINE BOOKS":

1. Sayegh, Yusuf: The Israeli Economy (A) (5 L.L.)
2. Al-Kassim, Anis: Arabs, the Vatican and Israel (A)
(4 L.L.)
3. Shukairy, Ahmad: Liberation — Not Negotiation (E)
(5 L.L.)
4. Kadi, Leila S.: Arab Summit Conferences and the Palestine Problem (E) (6 L.L.)
5. Al-Kassim, Anis: Revolutionary Preparation (A) (6 L.L.)
6. 'Aloush, Naji: Arab Resistance in Palestine (A) (4 L.L.)
7. Al-Sha'ir, Lt. Col. Mohammad: Guerilla Warfare in Palestine (A) (6 L.L.)
8. Darstellungen Zum Palästina-problem (G) (6 L.L.)
9. Sayegh, Anis: Urban and Rural Settlements of Palestine (A) (6 L.L.)
10. Sayegh, Anis (ed): Herzl's Diaries (A) (8 L.L.)
11. Contemporary Zionist Thought (A) (8 L.L.)
12. Sayegh, Anis (ed.): Essays on the Palestine Problem, Vol. I (A) (6 L.L.)
13. Razzouk, Ass'ad: Greater Israel (A) (10 L.L.)
14. Arnita, Yusra Jawharieh: The Folklore of Palestine (A)
(8 L.L.)

15. Shibl, Yusuf: Essays on the Israeli Economy (E) (8 L.L.)
16. Khammar, Constantine: Geographical Sites of Palestine (A) (8 L.L.)
17. El-Abed, Ibrahim: The Palestine Question — A Handbook (A) (8 L.L.)

III. "PALESTINE ESSAYS":

1. Sayegh, Fayez: The Concepts and Slogans of Bourguibism (A) (0.50 L.L.)
2. Sa'b, Hassan: Zionism and Racism (A,E,G) (0.50 L.L.)
3. Sayegh, Anis: Palestine and Arab Nationalism (A,G) (1 L.L.)
4. Sayegh, Fayez: Do Jews Have a Divine Right to Palestine (E) (0.50 L.L.)
5. Shukairy, Ahmad: Proposal for a Unified Arab State (A) (0.50 L.L.)
6. Anabtawi, Munzer: Inherent Elements in the Zionist Movement (A) (0.50 L.L.)
7. Hadawi, Sami: Palestine in Focus (A,E,F) (1 L.L.)

IV. "PALESTINE CHRONOLOGY":

Editor: Anis Sayegh

1. Volume I: January 1 to June 30, 1965 (A) (10 L.L.)
2. Volume II: July 1 to December 31, 1965 (A) (10 L.L.)
3. Volume III: January 1 to June 30, 1966 (A) (10 L.L.)

4. Volume IV: July 1 to December 31, 1966 (A) (10 L.L.)
 5. Volume V: January 1 to June 30, 1967 (A) (10 L.L.)
 6. Volume VI: July 1 to December 31, 1967 (A) (10 L.L.)
 7. Volume VII: January 1 to June 30, 1968 (A) (10 L.L.)
- V. "FACTS AND FIGURES":
1. Sayegh, Fayez: Twenty Basic Facts About the Palestine Problem (A,E,F,S,G,R,D, Esp) (0.50 L.L.)
 2. Sayegh, Fayez: The United Nations and the Palestine Problem (A,E,F,G,S) (0.50 L.L.)
 3. Sayegh, Fayez: Discrimination in Education Against the Arabs in Israel (E,G) (0.50 L.L.)
 4. Kadi, Leila S.: Israel in the International Arena (A) (0.50 L.L.)
 5. Kadi, Leila S.: The Palestine Problem in Thirty-Three International Conferences (A) (0.50 L.L.)
 6. Abdul-Rahman, Ass'ad: United States and West German Aid to Israel (A,E,G) (1 L.L.)
 7. Darwazah, Hakam: A Short Survey of the Palestine Problem (A,E,F) (1 L.L.)
 8. Habibi, Salwa: The Israeli Press (A) (1 L.L.)
 9. Moutlak, Rafik: Political Life in Israel (A) (1 L.L.)
 10. Sayegh, Fayez: The Afro-Asian Institute, Tel-Aviv (A) (1 L.L.)
 11. Faris, Hani Ahmad: Arab Diplomatic Representation (A) (1 L.L.)

12. Mrowa, Yusuf and Dandan, Norma: Scientific and Cultural Institutes in Israel (A) (1 L.L.)
13. Mrowa, Yusuf: Israeli Scientists (A) (1 L.L.)
14. Husayni, Sharif: Israeli Student Activities (A) (1 L.L.)
15. Khouri, Yaqoub: Human Rights in Occupied Palestine (A) (1 L.L.)

VI. "PALESTINE MAPS":

1. A Six-Color Wall Map of Palestine, 140 x 100 cms (A) (6 L.L.)

N.B. — Letters in parentheses indicate language of publication
A: Arabic, E: English, F: French, S: Spanish, G: German, R: Russian, D: Danish, Esp.: Esperanto.
Prices are listed in Lebanese Currency.

14/0

PALESTINE RESEARCH CENTER

606 Sadat Street (Apt. 22)

BEIRUT - LEBANON

Established in February 1965

Publications

- I. Palestine Chronology Series
- II. Facts and Figures Series
- III. Palestine Essays Series
- IV. Palestine Monographs Series
- V. Palestine Books Series
- VI. Palestine Maps Series
- VII. Special Publications