

# Relating PROBLEM IN PERSPECTIVE

95  
956.9405

P 175

TOPICAL PUBLICATIONS

P A L E S T I N E

Problem

in

Perspective

TOPICAL PUBLICATIONS

5, Madras House, Daryaganj,

D E L H I - 6

*All Rights Reserved by the Publishers.*

**April, 1967**

**Price : 2.00**

 **Library** IIAS, Shimla



**00022060**

---

Printed at Navin Press and published for the Topical Publications, 5 Madras House, Daryaganj, Delhi-6.

## **A NOTE FROM THE PUBLISHERS**

Topical publications have pleasure in presenting this booklet answering some of the burning questions about the most important problem in the Middle East, namely the Arab-Israeli conflict. Based on authentic data collected through a good deal of research from various important sources, the reader will find it useful both from an academic and a layman's point of view. The questions posed in the booklet are taken directly from writings and discussions on the subject and are familiar to those following this problem.

As answer to these questions is essential not only for the proper understanding of the causes which endanger peace in the Middle East and, in fact, the whole of the world, but is also important from the point of view of India's national interest. The editors shall be happy to receive suggestions and comments from readers on this attempt of theirs, and would try to take note of them in the next edition.

# Contents

Operation Enslavement	5
An Unparalleled Crime	20
Continuous Aggression	28
‘Development’ or Robbery ?	46
Choice Before India	52

# Operation Enslavement

**Q. What is the historical background of the Palestine problem, especially the movement for creating a 'national home for Jews' in Palestine ?**

**Ans.** Palestine has been an Arab country since times immemorial. Briefly speaking, the tragedy started in the late 19th century when under widespread Zionist propaganda, some settlements of Jews from Poland, Russia and Rumania were sought to be established in the Holy Land, which at that time was a part of the Ottoman Empire. It is interesting to note that this wave of Jewish immigration to Palestine took place at the same time when west European colonialism started to reach out towards the Arab world through the Nile valley. When this imperialism was at its height, the first world-wide political Jewish movement was founded by a young journalist, Theodore Herzl with the publication of his pamphlet "The State of Jews" in 1896. Herzl devoted his life to the cause of creating the first Zionist Congress at Basle, Switzerland, on August 27, 1897.

It was not a coincidence that just at the time when Zionist imperialism was trying to colonise a suitable portion of Asia or Africa, the British imperialism had started its eastward thrust. In fact, as it later became apparent, the so-called Zionist aspirations for a Jewish home were only meant as instruments for serving the British aim of dominating the whole of Asia. It was, therefore, no wonder that many influential members of the British ruling class became ardent champions of Zionist aims. In particular, Herzl was supported in his efforts by Lord Rothschild, the head of the Anglo-Jewish community who was a force in the financial world and a member of the Royal Commission, with the idea of creating a Jewish colony in British territory, either in the Sinai

Peninsula or in Cyprus. But soon it became apparent that a Jewish settlement in Cyprus would be opposed by the native population. The same consideration did not, of course, apply to Palestine. The reasons for this were obvious. Firstly, the Arabs had been very tolerant of the Jews throughout history and so, no trouble was expected on that score. Secondly, the strategic importance of the Arab lands made the proposed Jewish colony very valuable for the British from the military point of view.

So, the British Government favoured the idea of a Jewish settlement at Wadi-Al-Arish in the Sinai Peninsula. But the Egyptian Government rejected the scheme completely.

After the failure of Al-Arish project, the British Government offered Herzl territory in British East Africa for the establishment of a Jewish national home. Herzl accepted the offer. But due to strategic and imperialistic considerations this idea was finally given up.

After World War I, the British imperialistic policy was designed to facilitate the domination of the Middle East. The Zionists' aspirations to Palestine, under the friendly aegis of Britain, coincided with her foreign policy, which aimed at the preservation of her empire through a military base near Suez.

Both the objectives were assured after the peace settlement when Palestine and the other Arab states which had been part of the Ottoman Empire were placed under the mandatory rules known as Class 'A' Mandates. Britain was given the mandatory power over Palestine but acted more as if it was ruling a colony. The mandate system was indeed no more than the extension of the old colonial system, particularly after President Wilson's Fourteen Points, when colonialism was just beginning to be regarded with disfavour.

Under the British mandate, the main objective of Zionism was accomplished gradually in accordance with the Balfour Declaration of 1917 which promised the

establishment of a 'national home' for the Jewish people.

Obviously this declaration was made to placate the Zionist supporters of British imperialism. At the same time it constituted a great betrayal of the forces of Arab nationalism, which had led the Arab revolt, and were mainly responsible for the eclipse of the Ottoman Empire in the Arab world. But the British Government had no intention of fulfilling any of the promises made to the Arab leaders during the Arab liberation struggle. It, instead, systematically followed a policy designed to create a Zionist State in Palestine, even though the Jews at that time numbered less than 8 per cent of the total population and owned less than 3 per cent of the Palestinian land.

**Q. Why do the Arabs call the creation of Israel by Britain and the United Nations as unjust and contrary to the dictates of law, morality and equity ?**

**Ans.** There are many solid reasons for this assertion. But to name only one, that of the numerical position of the Arabs and Jews in Palestine, it may suffice to note that immediately after the First World War, when the "Jewish National Home" policy began to be applied under the Balfour Declaration, the population of Palestine consisted of 650,000 Arabs and 56,000 Jews approximately, being roughly 92% Arab and 8% Jew. Most of these were of Palestinian origin and could be termed as "Arabs", from the cultural and linguistic points of view. The Jews at that time were the owners of 2.5% of the total area of Palestine.

When the resolution to partition Palestine was adopted by the United Nations in 1947, the Jewish population had risen mainly through immigration to about 650,000, while the Arab population had increased by natural growth to about 1,350,000. This means that at the time of partition the Arabs constituted 67.5% while the Jews constituted 32.5% only. Jewish land ownership had also increased by pur-

chase, to 5.6% of the total area. Strangely enough, however, the partition resolution divided the country as follows :

- (a) To the Jewish State it gave more than 56% of the total area, *i.e.* more than ten times what the Jews owned in land property ;
- (b) To the Arab State was given only 42% of the whole country, although the Arabs constituted 67.5% of the population, and owned more than 94% of the total area.
- (c) 497,000 Arabs, who represented 37% of the total Arab population, were placed under the domination of the Jewish State. (It is worth mentioning here, that it was for the purpose of compelling the Arabs to flee from the areas allotted to Israel that massacres were perpetrated by the Zionists.)
- (d) An international zone including Jerusalem was created with 65% of the area assigned to it. The net result of what has actually happened can be summarized as follows :
  - (1) One million innocent Arabs have become refugees and,
  - (2) Sixty per cent of the land, originally assigned to the Arab State, was occupied by Israel, over and above the unduly large proportion which was assigned to it by the resolution of partition. This makes the Israeli occupied territory 77.4% of the total area of Palestine. What could be more unjust, unlawful and inhuman than all these crimes of Zionists directly aided and abetted by western powers ?

**Q. How could the Zionists, with a very small Jewish minority, create a State of their own, and drive out such a large Arab population from the country ?**

**Ans :** Many have, indeed, wondered how the overwhelming majority of the Arabs in Palestine was convert-

ed into a hapless minority. This however was due to many factors. The Zionists in Palestine were aided and assisted not only by the material and financial support of Zionists in America and other countries, which amounted then to about \$200,000,000 annually, but also by the Mandatory Power and the help of many other big countries and groups well known for their incessant support for Zionism. Having, under the eyes of the authorities, armed their military and secret terrorists bands to the teeth, the Zionists were enabled to smuggle into Palestine all types of arms and ammunition and obtain unlimited military equipment and weapons from British military bases in the country. They were even enabled to establish plants for manufacturing small weapons and ammunition, and were helped by British and foreign military experts to fortify their settlements and plan their defence. The Jewish Agency was permitted by the Mandatory Authorities to force conscription and military training on Jewish population.

On the other hand, the Arabs were subjected to the pressure of unparalleled policy of bias and partiality, carried out by the Mandatory Power. Arab leaders and nationalists were either exiled from the country, or placed in concentration camps, while Arab political organisations and parties were disbanded and declared illegal. The Mandatory authorities enacted emergency laws and regulations and subjected Arabs to their severity. The Arabs were never permitted either to arm themselves or train men for defence purposes. The Mandatory Authorities resorted to the harsh methods of disarming the Arabs. No Arab could possess firearms or ammunition. Any Arab caught in possession of arms, even a cartridge or an obsolete weapon, was either sentenced to death or life imprisonment by the British military courts. These and several similar measures were taken by the authorities with the intention of checking the Arabs and keeping them unarmed and defenceless and thus making them an easy prey to the Zionists.

Such, in general, was the situation in Palestine, towards the end of 1947, when the fighting broke out. Not only

were the odds against the Arabs, but what had proved to be still worse, was the fact that the British forces in the country usually sided with the Zionists and only moved and intervened for their protection, while they remained unmoved and unconcerned whenever the Arabs were attacked and their property damaged. Under these circumstances, the Zionists were able to perpetrate a series of heinous crimes and atrocities against the Arabs and launched serious military attacks against defenceless Arab towns and villages.

After the U. N. General Assembly's resolution of November 27, 1947, Zionist terrorism made elimination of Arab population from Palestine its single objective. Thus the Zionist forces increased their attacks and became very ferocious in February, 1948, having been re-inforced and assisted by many foreign sources. Nevertheless, in spite of all the odds which were against the Arabs of Palestine, and the prejudicial interference of the British forces in favour of the Zionists, the Arabs put up a strong resistance to the armed onslaughts, showed no signs of wavering in the defence of their homeland and people and rendered precarious the position of the Zionists in March 1948.

In the meantime, the British authorities withdrew from certain Jewish towns and localities in Palestine, and handed over their administration to the Zionists. Tel Aviv and its port were among the areas handed over. The Zionists immediately made use of this port and hastily imported great quantities of arms and many trained mercenaries from Europe and America, and brought into the country thousands of new immigrants. The Zionists proceeded to reorganize their forces and resorted to new tactics and fearing that the suggestion of placing Palestine under a trusteeship might be realized, they let loose, in early April, their machinery of war and terrorism against the Arabs with a view to breaking their resistance, depriving them of their victory and forcing them to evacuate their country. Thereupon the Zionist forces

embarked on the most vicious plan of brutal atrocities and dastardly crimes.

One of the most outrageous and barbaric crimes committed was the massacre at the village of Deir Yasin. On April 10, 1948, the Zionist forces raided the village and indiscriminately massacred old men, women and children, bayoneted pregnant women, cut children to pieces before their mothers' eyes, then killed mothers, they threw infants into cisterns filled with water after snatching them from their mothers' breasts, they killed fathers and mothers before their children. The very few women and children who survived the slaughter were stripped off their clothes, taken in open trucks and demonstrated to the Jewish population of Jerusalem and then thrown out and driven away to the Arab section of the city. The same method of Deir Yasin was followed in the villages of Nassiruddine, Eylout, Sukreir, Hawasseh, Haladush-Sheikh, and others. These brutal massacres which were accompanied by the demolition of properties, ransacking of belongings, personal attacks and indecent assaults on women, created panic and havoc among the defenceless Arab civilian population in towns and villages.

These atrocities were a very important factor in the success of the minority to expel forcibly the Arab inhabitants of Palestine. The late Count Folke Bernadotte, United Nations Mediator for Palestine, referred to the role played by Zionist terrorization of Arab villages and towns in the displacement of the Palestinian Arabs. He said :

“The exodus of the Palestinian Arabs resulted from panic created by fighting in their communities, by rumours, concerning real or alleged acts of terrorism, or expulsion. There have been numerous reports from reliable sources of large-scale looting, pillaging, and plundering, and of instances of destruction of villages without apparent military necessity.” (*United Nations Document A/648*, General Assembly, Supplement No. 11, page 14, paragraphs 6 and 7).

It was through such naked acts of brutality that the so-called State of Israel was established and the problem of over a million Arab evictees from Palestine was created.

**Q. What were the events in the United Nations that led to the proclamation of Israel?**

**Ans.** In April 1947, the United Kingdom, as the mandatory power, referred the problem of Palestine to the United Nations and requested that the General Assembly be asked "to make recommendations under Article 10 of the Charter concerning the future government of Palestine." It was obvious that the British decision had been taken due to the simple fact that the world body at that time had been dominated by the big powers, and the Afro-Asian countries were in a hopeless minority. Even then the partition resolution was opposed by all the Afro-Asian member-States with the exception of the Philippines in Asia and Liberia in Africa.

A Special Session of the General Assembly was convened and it appointed a special committee instructing it to submit proposals for the solution of the Palestine problem. The majority of the Special Committee proposed the partition of Palestine into an Arab State, a Jewish State and an International Zone for the city of Jerusalem. The minority composed of all the three Afro-Asian members on the Committee, namely India, Iran and Ethiopia opposed the partition suggestion. When the matter was referred to the General Assembly it became apparent that the plan of partition will not obtain two-thirds majority.

How this majority was manoeuvred through Western pressure is best revealed by some of the American spokesmen who had played a leading role in getting this resolution passed. Let us, for example, consider what Lawrence H. Smith, an American expert on foreign affairs and Senator, reported to the Congress in his solemn testimony : "Let's take a look at the record, Mr. Speaker, and see

what happened in the United Nations Assembly meeting prior to the vote on partition. A two-thirds vote was required to pass the resolution. On two occasions the Assembly was to vote and twice it was postponed. It was obvious that the delay was necessary because the proponents (U. S. A. and U. S. S. R.), did not have the necessary votes. In the meantime, intense pressure was applied to the delegates of three small nations by the United States at the highest levels in Washington ! When the matter was finally considered on the 29th, what happened ? The decisive votes for partition were cast by Haiti, Liberia and the Philippines. These votes were sufficient to make the two-thirds majority. Previously, these countries opposed the move...The pressure by our delegates, by our officials, and by the private citizens of the United States constitutes reprehensible conduct against them and against us." (*U. S. Congressional Record*, December 18, 1947, p. 1176).

Another American leader, Summer Welles says in an equally frank vein : "By direct order of the White House, every form of pressure, direct or indirect, was brought to bear by American officials upon those countries outside the Moslem world that were known to be either uncertain or opposed to partition. Representatives or intermediaries were employed by the White House to make sure that the necessary majority would at least be secured." (Welles, Sumner, *We Need Not Fail*, Boston : Houghton Mifflin, 1948)

James Forrestal reveals the brutal truth when he says : "The methods that had been used to bring coercion and duress on other nations in the General Assembly bordered closely on to scandal." (Millis, Walter. *The Forrestal Diaries*, New York : Viking Press 1951, p. 63).

President Truman in his memoirs has openly admitted that since he had no "Arab constituents" he could have scarce regard for Arab interests. Truman has boasted that but for this pressure, the resolution would never have got a majority support.

Because of that pressure the plan of partition was adopted on November 29, 1947, by thirty three votes to thirteen with ten abstentions. Meanwhile, on May 14, 1948, when the General Assembly was discussing the future Government of Palestine, the representative of the Jewish Agency informed the delegates that at 10 A. M. Eastern Standard Time, the Jews had proclaimed a 'Jewish State'. This was an attempt to decide by the forcible action of the Jewish minority in Palestine, the solution of the Palestine problem. This minority usurped the authority of the General Assembly and the Security Council. All the proceedings that took place since April, 1947, were dealing with 'the future government of Palestine'. The Zionists rightly or wrongly were a party to this international dispute. For them to decide the issue unilaterally and take action is definitely illegal according to International Law.

**Q. Does Israel have a claim over Palestine because of the promise made in the Balfour Declaration ?**

**Ans.** It is true that the Balfour Declaration issued by Lord Balfour, the British Foreign Secretary on November 2, 1917, did promise, under constant Zionist pressure, 'a national home' for the Jews. But, the foremost question is to whom the promise was made and by whom ?

It should be noted that while making the promise, Britain did not have even colonial control over Palestine. It was later, through the notorious betrayal of the Arabs, that Britain was declared the Mandatory Power in Palestine. But when the so-called promise was made to the self-styled representatives of the world Jewry, Britain had absolutely no control over Palestine. This reminds one of the case of a thief promising the spoils from his booty to a fellow thief much before the actual theft.

Another fact to be noted is that local inhabitants, the Arabs, had no voice in the matter. Obviously, it had not only evoked great resentment among the Palestinian

Arabs who counted over 90% at that time, but had also aroused the indignation of freedom-loving people all over the world. Pandit Nehru, for instance, in a newspaper article in 1937, had rightly condemned the great betrayal of Arabs by Britain and had expressed his firm opinion that Britain could not have been able to make the so-called promise and carry it out, had the countries of Asia and Africa been as much awakened as they were after a few decades.

The fraudulent character of the so-called declaration is apparent from Lord Balfour's own diary, the extract of which could be found in Volume 2 of Documents of British Policy : "In Palestine, we do not propose ever to go through the form of consulting the wishes of the present inhabitants. Zionism is of far greater importance to us than the desires and prejudices of the 7,00,000 Arabs who now inhabit that ancient land." "As far as Palestine is concerned, the powers have made no statement of fact which is not admittedly wrong, and no declaration of policy, which at least in the letter, they have not always intended to violate." Nothing could be a more candid, and at the same time shameless, admission of the treacherous policy which the British have systematically followed in Palestine to bring about the dispossession of the vast majority of its inhabitants and drive them out of their homeland and hand it over to racist and religious fanatics.

**Q. Is there any validity in the claim that since Jews had occupied Palestine at one time in history they should be given back this land ?**

**Ans.** We have already discussed the so-called political claim, and have shown how baseless and ridiculous it is. The Israeli claim based on history is no less fictitious and illogical. Their total claim is based on Jewish Kingdom lasting less than 35 years, established in a part of Palestine over 2000 years ago.

In the first place, it should be noted that the Jews themselves were outsiders and their position was that of ordi-

nary conquerors. Many such invaders came and went in those days. Moreover, the so-called Kingdom was not established on the part on which Israel is established today. In fact, it had more of the present Jordan and Syria under it than Palestine. This means that the present State of Israel should expand to cover all these areas. It is, of course, attempting to achieve those objectives constantly and thus it is posing a threat to the security of the whole region.

Obviously, no one living in the second half of the 20th century can accept such ridiculous claims. It should be as obvious as day-light that the Jews living in America, Canada, Europe and elsewhere in the world can claim no identity with those who lived 2000 years ago in Palestine. Acceptance of their claim of inheritance of these Jews would amount to a recognition of a racial myth which is as dangerous as was the Nazi philosophy of Hitler and his colleagues which, too, was based on a mythical superiority of the so-called Aryan race over the Semitics.

**Q. Is there any basis for a religious claim of the Jews on Palestine ?**

**Ans :** Knowing the fragility of their claim on any legal, moral or political basis, Israelis had no choice but to resort to citing a religious claim of a very doubtful validity in support of their usurpation of Palestine. It is claimed that the Bible promised Abraham that Palestine would belong to his seed, namely to the Jews. They argued, therefore, that the setting up of a Jewish state in Palestine is a fulfilment of God's promise in the Bible.

As regards its validity, it has been disproved by renowned Biblical scholars, who have shown from the Bible itself that the promise is no longer valid. In any case, the Arabs also belong to the seed of Abraham. In fact the 'Divine pact' to hand over the land of "Cannan", which includes some portions of Palestine, is supposed to be made by God at the time of the circumcision of Ismail

from whose seed Arabs can claim descent and whom Jews completely disown. Isaac from whose seed Zionists claim mythical descent, was not even born at the time of the so-called 'divine promise'.

Moreover, Moslems who formed a large majority of the population of Palestine that is more than 90% do not believe in this promise, and their religious book refutes such a pact. In any case it is obvious that in the 20th century, countries cannot be conquered merely on the basis of a religious claim of a microscopic minority.

**Q. What has been the Indian stand towards Arab-Israeli conflict ?**

**Ans.** Based as it is on considerations of justice, the Indian position on Arab-Israeli dispute has always been of the warmest sympathy to the Arab cause. The most recent example of it has been the severe condemnation by the Government of India of Israeli aggression on Jordan in November, 1966. Mrs. Indira Gandhi, the Prime Minister, in an interview to Al-Ahram, Cairo, published on July 10, 1966, had admirably summed up the Indian position in these words : "We oppose Israel not only because of our friendship with the Arabs, but because we are opposed to the creation of states on religious basis. Neither can we recognize territorial gains made through aggression."

This statement of hers was exactly in line with the firm declaration by her great father Jawaharlal Nehru who in an article published in *The Hindu*, December 17, 1938, had categorically asserted that "Palestine was an Arab country and Arab interests must prevail there."

That great apostle of peace and justice, Mahatma Gandhi, was absolutely clear in his mind about the validity of the Arab cause when writing in *Harijan* (November 26, 1938), he had unequivocally declared: "I have all my sympathies with the Jews. But sympathy does not blind me to the requirements of justice. The cry

for the national home for Jews does not make much appeal to me. Palestine belongs to the Arabs in the same sense that England belongs to the English or France to the French. It is wrong to impose the Jews on the Arabs. If the Jews have no home but Palestine, will they relish the idea of being forced to leave the other parts of the world in which they are settled ? Or do they want a double home where they can remain at will ?

“The Palestine of Biblical conception is not the geographical tract. It is in their hearts. But if they must look to Palestine of geography as their national home, it is wrong to enter it under the shadow of British guns—nothing can be said against the Arab resistance in the face of overwhelming odds.”

During the freedom struggle, Indian National Congress had several times expressed its warm sympathies with the Arabs and had condemned the British policy to create an alien state on the Arab land of Palestine. It had thus been asserted time and again that India considered the cause of the Palestinian Arabs as righteous as of her own struggle for freedom. During its sessions in 1928, 1937 and 1938, Indian National Congress had passed strongest resolutions condemning the British policy of providing encouragement to the nefarious scheme of establishing a Zionist state in Palestine.

In 1947, just when India herself had achieved her own independence, she, along with the other Asian—African members on the Palestine Commission of the United Nations had resolutely opposed the majority recommendation of the commission to partition Palestine. In the U.N. she fought hard to block the passage of the partition resolution, in spite of the tremendous Western pressure, which a member of the Indian Central Cabinet at that time had described nothing less than a major scandal.

After the establishment of Israel, India has consistently refused to have diplomatic relations with it. On specific questions, specially those concerning Arab refugees, Indian leaders have often declared their fullest support to the

victims of Zionist colonisation. This was recently reiterated when Mrs. Indira Gandhi, along with President Tito and President Nasser reaffirmed India's support to the just demand of Palestine refugees.

On the Jordan waters question too, Indian position has been clear and unequivocal. Even in 1963, the great late Jawaharlal Nehru had assured India's fullest sympathy to the ambassadors of the Arab countries over the Jordan water question. This support was reiterated by the late Mr. Lal Bahadur Shastri who, while speaking in a seminar on Indo-Arab relations in December, 1964, had declared that India fully appreciated the Arab case over Jordan waters and would support any step the Arabs might take to protect their interests.

In the United Nations and its various councils as well as in various Afro-Asian and non-aligned Conferences India has supported the Arab stand on Palestine. This support of India to the Arab cause is absolutely in line with her declared policy of supporting freedom movements of Asia and Africa and her adherence to the principles of secular nationalism.

# An unparalleled Crime

**Q. What is the background of the Arab exodus from Palestine, and how was it caused ?**

**Ans :** With the object of creating terror among the Arab population the main organisation of the Zionist settlers, the Jewish Agency, had carefully planned, and organized a wave of terrorism in Palestine. According to documentary evidence published by the British Government in its White Paper of 1946 many Zionist leaders including David Ben Gurion, Moshe Sharret, Moshe Sneh and Bernard Joseph were proved guilty of being party to a common design to commit some of the outrages perpetrated. Jewish terrorism in the Holy Land from 1943 to 1947 was responsible for the outrageous crimes which were condemned by world public opinion, including the mandatory power, which itself had been pursuing a policy of active encouragement to such terrorism.

It was under the pretext of such acts of terrorism that Britain referred the matter to the United Nations, and announced its own plans of withdrawal from Palestine. This amounted to a clear signal to the Zionists to intensify their terroristic campaign against the local inhabitants and to occupy most of the country, without any authority whatsoever.

So, as the date of withdrawal approached, and fearing the United Nations would alter its partition decision, the Zionist underground forces—which later formed the Israeli army—intensified their attacks against Arab towns and villages in an effort to confront the United Nation with a *fait accompli*. Take only one glaring example

On April 9, 1948, they attacked *the Arab village of Deir Yasin* and massacred 250 men, women and children. This had the intended effect of creating panic among the Arab inhabitants who began to flee with no fixed destination in view.

As a result, before the British left and before a single soldier from any Arab State was on Palestine soil, the Zionists had occupied the territory reserved for the Arab State and the International zone of Jerusalem as well as the area assigned to the Jewish State, while over 500,000 Palestine Arabs became refugees in adjacent Arab countries.

The Palestine Arabs appealed to the Arab States for protection against Zionist atrocities, and on May 15, 1948, the Arab League cabled the Secretary General of the United Nations and informed him that the Arab States "were compelled to intervene in Palestine because the disturbances there constituted a serious and direct threat to peace and security in their territories and in order to restore peace and establish law in Palestine." (U. N. Document A/565, p. 9).

Count Bernadotte of Sweden was appointed U. N. mediator and entrusted with the task of first terminating hostilities and then arranging for a peace settlement. On September 17, 1948, he was assassinated by the Israelis in Jerusalem because his peace plan included the surrender of the extra territory occupied by the Israelis in excess of the territory allotted to the Jewish State under the Partition Resolution, the return of the Arab refugees to their homes, and the internationalization of Jerusalem as provided in the Partition Resolution.

In December, 1948, the United Nations met and resolved that the refugees wishing to return to their homes should be permitted to do so and that compensation should be paid for the property of those not choosing to return and for losses sustained. Israel's membership of the U. N. was made conditional on acceptance of the various U. N. resolutions concerning Palestine including

the one about refugees. But no sooner was Israel accepted into the membership of the United Nations, than her leaders repudiated their own pledges.

The United Nations has not ceased to remind the Israelis of their obligations—contractual and human—under United Nations' resolutions. But they have just as consistently refused to comply.

**Q. Why should not the Arab States, absorb Arab refugees especially since the area of Arab countries is about seventy times larger than that of Israel ?**

**Ans.** Since the Palestinian refugees forcibly evicted from their country have a distinct political personality of their own, and are determined to get back the land from which they have been dispossessed, the question of exploiting them for political reasons by any of the Arab States does not arise at all.

In this connection, we would like to quote the words of as eminent an authority as Dr. Davies, the former Director of the United Nations Works and Relief Agency for the Palestinian Refugees, who, while contradicting charges of political exploitation by Arab governments, said in a speech delivered before the Conference of voluntary agencies in Geneva on January 18, 1961 : "The Palestine refugees problem has defied political solution, not because of alleged whims of Arab politicians or the reputed shiftless nature of the refugees, but because of depth and universality of the conflict between Arabs and Israelis." He also said that Arab governments had been most generous in making every possible contribution to the welfare of the Arab refugees.

Thus, it should be clearly borne in mind that the position of Arab governments vis-a-vis the Palestinian refugees is like that of a brother offering help and hospitality to another brother who has been illegally dispossessed of his home and hearth by some outside intruders. Obviously,

the dispossessed brother would not like to become a permanent liability on the brother who has given him shelter, and would remain eager to explore all possible means for regaining his property. Similarly, the Arab refugees abhor the possibility of renouncing their just claims to their own land by being absorbed somewhere else, as that would put a seal of approval on the heinous crimes the Zionists have committed against them.

The Arab states have, on every occasion, declared at the United Nations their willingness to resettle in their countries those refugees who wish to be so settled after they have signified their choice between repatriation and resettlement in accordance with the United Nations resolution. As far back as 1955, Ambassador Kamil Abdel Rahim, speaking in the General Assembly on behalf of all the Arab States, said : "The Arab countries would be quite prepared to welcome all those who preferred to stay out of Israel, but they had no power over the overwhelming majority of refugees who want to go back." The Arab States' position remains unaltered.

The question of Arab states' ability to 'absorb them or the vast land resources of Arabs compared to the Israelis is not only irrelevant, but also completely illogical. The suggestion that since Arabs have larger land as compared to the Israelis, they should rehabilitate the Arab refugees amongst them, is like asking a man who has been forcibly thrown out of his house, that since his brother has a much bigger house than the one the robber has occupied, he has no right to claim his own house back.

**Q. Is it a fact that Arabs left their homes in Palestine on instigation from broadcasts by Arab radio stations, that since Arab armies were going to march into Palestine, they should leave the land temporarily ?**

**Ans.** Like other Israel allegations, this too is absolutely baseless and false. From the factual point of view it may suffice to note, that the B. B. C. keeps full monitored records of all the broadcasts made anywhere in the world.

In its archives there is a full record of the broadcasts made by the Arab radio stations in 1947-48. Many a research scholar and historian have searched these archives in vain to find out a single broadcast from Arabs which could have even remotely insinuated that local inhabitants of Palestine should leave their homes and hearths.

Similarly, nobody can point out a single speech from any Arab statesman asking the Arabs to leave Palestine. It should be obvious to any one with an element of common sense that even if the Arab armies wanted to invade Palestine, it would have been in their interest to have the local population helping them from inside Palestine. So even from the military point of view Arabs could have never wished that the Arab population should leave the area entirely free to the Zionist aggressors.

**Q. What is the extent, and position of the Arab property left in Israel ?**

**Ans.** The Zionist aggressors have illegally usurped these properties, which include houses, orchards and some of the best agricultural lands in the Middle East. An index of the value of these properties is the fact that according to a very conservative U. N. estimate, they annually yield an income of over 140,000,000 dollars. This is also being glutted by the Israeli usurpers.

It is important to note that this income from the properties of the refugees is about four times the amount requested for the annual budget of the U. N. R. W. A. as charity, and which is being pledged not with great difficulty and grudge. It would be a welcome move to the Arabs of Palestine, if the United Nations would appoint an Administrator who will take legal possession and be charged with the administration of Arab properties and lands in the occupied area and pay the income thereof to the rightful owners pending their repatriation to their homeland.

**Q. What is the position of Arabs still living in Israel?**

**Ans.** The treatment Israel offers to over a quarter of a million of Christian and Muslim Arabs marooned in Israel is a shocking example of the worst type of religious and racial discrimination practised anywhere in the world. Compared to this even the policy of apartheid in South Africa would seem lenient and humane. There have been numerous State laws written in the Statute Book of Israel which have virtually reduced the position of the Arab citizens as third-class subjects, the first-class being the European Jews, followed by the non-European Jews. Arabs are not allowed to move about freely in any part of Israel and cannot go out of the country.

Reminiscent of the notorious apartheid practice in certain towns of South Africa, Arabs have to carry identity cards with the letter 'B' written on them indicating their lower status. For travel to any area outside their municipal limits, Arabs are obliged to obtain a special permission from military authorities. Quite often this permission has been refused point blank even in the case of a dying patient who had to be carried to a hospital outside the prescribed limits. Numerous such instances have been cited by even Jewish writers travelling in Israel and have also been reported and taken note of by various organisations of the United Nations.

There are thousands of Arabs considered as absentees because they moved from their area of residence to another in Israel. Their property was confiscated and put at the disposal of the guardian of the enemy property. Whenever new immigrants arrive in Israel, the Arabs are evacuated from their homes under any pretence in order to accommodate the new immigrants. Israel also forces the Arab people to emigrate from Israel. Article 101 of the Emergency Regulations empowers the Chief-of-Staff of the Israeli Army to arrest for one year any Arab without giving reasons for such an act.

There is no other country in the world where a section of its population is legally singled out for a discriminatory treatment merely because its religion happens to be different from the one professed by its rulers. In Israel, Arabs belonging both to Christian and Muslim faiths, have been officially subjected to various regulations of Martial Law since 1948 which have rendered their status even less than that of third-class citizens. This is perhaps the Israeli concept of socialism in action.

Arabs cannot get jobs in important Government departments such as the Police and the Foreign Service. Arabs are prevented from forming their own political parties and are prohibited from making any contacts with the outside world, which the authorities may consider of "an important political nature". They can neither go to meet their friends and relatives across the borders nor are they permitted to come back to their country once they leave the land. The most shameful aspect of all such restrictions is the fact that they form a part of the official laws and regulations.

**Q. Are there any Indian Jews in Israel? If so, what is their position in their new homeland?**

**Ans.** Jews in India have been living since centuries as part of the composite fabric of Indian society. They had never had any cause for complaint. They have been occupying high places in business, administration and other walks of life. Yet such has been the misleading appeal by Zionism which treats every Jew outside Israel as irreligious, that a large number of them had voluntarily left India and had gone to Israel. This, in itself, refutes the Israeli argument that Jews had to leave their countries because of discrimination against them. If Indian Jews living in perfect conditions of peace and harmony could become victims of the Zionist propaganda, the Jews of other countries, too, could go to Israel merely because a constant fear is being put in their hearts that any Jew living outside Israel is Godless.

It was due to this type of Fascist propaganda urging local Jews to have an unbreakable extra-territorial loyalty to a foreign state which persuaded Indian Jews to make Israel as their home. But most of them seem to have become thoroughly repentant of their decision. This is due to the fact that Israel is totally dominated by Zionist intruders from Europe and America. They treat Jews from Asia and Africa as second-class citizens. Glaring instances of this injustice have often been appearing in the Indian press.

Only recently, in the *Blitz* weekly Dec, 24, 1966 had appeared heart-rending stories of two Indian Jews, Solomon Moses Umerdekar with a family of eight and Aaron Abraham. About 12 years ago they were lured into Israel because of the fond promises about their bright future made by Zionist propagandists. But they are in a pitiable condition now. In disgust, they have been trying to return to India, but are forcibly prevented by Israeli authorities from getting out of the country. There have also been hundreds of such instances to show that having once become the victims of Zionist propaganda, Indian Jews are not allowed to return to their homes after being thoroughly disillusioned with the so-called promised Land. Their disillusionment stems from a policy of the worst type of discrimination being practised in Israel against Jews of Afro-Asian origin.

Another instance of the discriminatory treatment against the Indian Jews came to light through a report in the Israeli Journal *Jerusalem Post Weekly* which carried in its issue of August 2, 1963, a news item about a protest and sit-down strike by Indian Jews against the "Chief Rabbinate's directive concerning the Jewish legal purity of the community". They had demanded that either this order be withdrawn which had in fact debarred Indian Jews from marrying other Jews, since their "racial purity" was in doubt, or they be repatriated to India. Could there be a more glaring example of Fascistic attitude towards race and religion than these instances of discrimination against the coloured Jews ?

# Continuous Aggression

**Q. Why do the Arabs regard territorial expansion as a danger inherent in the very existence of the State of Israel ?**

**Ans.** Israeli leaders have never made any secret of the fact that expansion of the Israeli boundary remains the primary motto of their State's policy. Even the Parliament Building of Israel bears the motto proclaiming "Your boundaries, ye Israel stretch from the Nile to the Eupherates." There have been numerous statements of Israeli leaders which confirm the active belief in the above motto.

Just a few examples. Writing in the Israeli Year Book of 1952, Mr. Ben-Gurion stated : "Every state consists of a land and a people, Israel is no exception. But it is a state neither with its land nor with its people. It has already been said that when the State was established, it held only 6% of the Jewish people...It must now be said that it has been established in only a portion of the land of Israel." (Israeli Government Year Book, 1952, p. 63).

Then, in 1955, Mr Ben-Gurion declared that "the creation of the new state by no means derogates from the scope of the historic Eretz Israel."

Israel's aggression against Egypt in October, 1956 was a determined attempt to translate words into action. In his announcement of the attack to the Israeli Parliament, Mr Ben-Gurion said : "The army did not make an effort to occupy enemy territory in Egypt proper, but limited its operation to free the area from northern Sinai to the tip

of the Red Sea, (all this area belonged to Egypt since times immemorial)." The significance and implications of this statement are self-explanatory.

**Q. Why do the Arabs consider the Jewish immigration into Israel as a danger to their own freedom and security ?**

**Ans :** The Arab governments and people view the Jewish immigration to Israel as a great danger to their inherent rights, national freedom and world peace. Mass immigration into Israel in view of its extremely limited area must ultimately lead to expansion, and expansion means war with the surrounding Arab States. This could lead to a universal conflict.

Further by confronting the United Nations with a fait accompli in the matter of Jewish immigrants, Israel hopes to keep the territory she holds in excess of that given to her by the Partition Plan and to avoid repatriating the Arab Palestinian refugees to their lawful homes. The United Nations has never recognised the territory gained through terrorism by Israel as legally belonging to the Jewish State.

But it is evident that Israel has every intention of retaining territory gained by war. And she is using the newly arrived immigrants as the modus operandi. Great efforts are being made to settle the new immigrants in well fortified settlements along the boundary lines preparing for new attempts to expand territorially in the neighbouring areas of Arab countries.

As early as 1948, such a situation was foreseen by the then Mediator of the United Nations, Count Bernadotte, who in his report to the Security Council dated July 12, 1948, (S/888) had said : "It cannot be ignored that unrestricted immigration into the Jewish area of Palestine might, over a period of years, give rise to a population pressure and economic and political disturbances which would justify present Arab fears of ultimate Jewish exp-

ansion in the Near East.” Count Bernadotte then added : “It can scarcely be ignored that Jewish immigration into the Jewish area of Palestine concerns not only the Jewish people and territory but also the neighbouring Arab world, who treat it as a threat to their own security.” No wonder that the noble Count was brutally murdered in Jerusalem by Zionist terrorists, after the release of the report.

**Q. Why should not there be a Tashkent-like settlement between Arabs and Israel ? What is the real nature of and the motives behind Israeli offers of a peaceful settlement of their dispute ?**

**Ans :** The Arabs, like all peace-loving people all over the world, have hailed the Tashkent Declaration as a worthy example of bringing peace between the two neighbours. But, it should be realised that this peace became possible only because both the countries accepted each other's bona-fide and were universally accepted as sovereign, independent nations. The dispute between them centred round only matters of varying understandings and interpretations of some specific problems. Neither has ever labelled the other as a standing threat to her freedom and security.

Moreover, the creation of Pakistan was legitimized by its recognition by the Indian national movement, whereas Israel was forcibly created with material help from external powers in the teeth of opposition from the Arab national movement. Israel's existence continues to be looked upon as a direct threat to Arab countries and its performance over the last 19 years fully justifies the Arab attitude.

Moreover in the case of Israel, one must not overlook the fact that Israel is not a State in the normal sense of the term. Her very existence as we have shown earlier, symbolises a constant aggression against the Arab people specially to the Palestinian Arabs. It is at best a foreign enclave whose justification rests upon the massive arms aid given to her by Western powers and their equally vast economic aid.

Stillworse, as we have shown, Israel refuses to comply even nominally with the minimum of demands of peaceful international behaviour, as embodied in the several resolutions of the United Nations. Particularly noteworthy is the Israeli arrogant defiance of United Nations resolutions regarding Palestinian refugees, internationalisation of the city of Jerusalem and the demarcation of boundaries between Israel and the Arab State of Palestine.

As is well known, Israel is in possession of 77% of the Palestinian territory, even though she was given only 56% of the territory. About Jerusalem it was decided to make it an international city. Israel has not only forcibly occupied the larger portion of it but in blatant defiance of world public opinion it has even moved the seat of its Parliament to the city. Israeli leaders have openly been declaring that the question of compliance with all these resolutions does not arise at all.

A simple test of Israel's sincerity would be to ask whether she is willing to pay even a nominal lip service to the U. N. resolutions. To complete her criminal record, Israel is never tired of embarking upon ever-fresh ventures of aggression against her neighbours defying openly the august authority of the United Nations. Only recently, for example, the U.N. Security Council had severely censured Israel for her blatant aggression against Jordan. But, the Prime Minister of Israel, Levi Eshkol had the temerity to brag that "such issues cannot be settled by bodies like the United Nations. We have the capacity to settle them right here, and we intend to do so."

It is also to be noted that throughout the years whenever Israel starts talking about peace, it soon becomes obvious that she is preparing for an aggressive war. The recent Israeli aggression on Jordan and Syria was preceded by the so-called peace offensive from Israel just as aggression against Egypt in 1956 had followed an appar-

ently massive offer of peace from Israel to settle disputes with the Arabs.

Those who have been responding to Israel's repeated proclamations of willingness to talk of peace with the Arabs fail to realize that peace, in order to be real, has to be based on justice and equity. The Israeli behaviour constitutes a gross defiance not only of dictates of justice, but also of requirements as a bona-fide member of international community.

**Q. What is the nature of recent Israeli attacks on Jordanian and Syrian territories? What is the truth behind the Israeli assertion that they be treated as mere reprisals against Arabs' acts of infiltration and sabotage?**

**Ans.** The recent Israeli aggression against the Jordanian village of Samuh is one of the most flagrant examples of the Zionist policy aimed at creating tension and ultimately at expansionism at the expense of her neighbours. This aggression has been condemned in most unequivocal terms by the Security Council in a clear resolution of condemnation. Even Britain, U. S. A. and France, the traditional supporters of Israel had to condemn her for her wanton disregard for civilised international conduct. India, of course, condemned it in the clearest terms.

The Indian condemnation reads :

“.....we deplore such outrageous acts of violence for which Israeli Government cannot evade its responsibility. This use of force is an obvious defiance of the existing Armistice Agreement, of the U. N. Charter, and in particular, of the authority of the Security Council. The Israeli Government should realise that the international community will not condone such premeditated acts the of aggression.....”

As has been pointed out in the Indian condemnation, the sole responsibility for this aggression lies with Israel. This is obvious from the fact that the Israeli excuse

that there had been an infiltration from the Jordanian side is not the first strategem it has ever adopted to confuse and mislead world opinion. It may be recalled that even in 1956, Israelis had made a fuss over raids from the Egyptian side. In the Councils of the world these raids were alleged to have forced Israel to launch an aggression. The fact of the matter was, as has been revealed by the publication of memoirs of Moshe Dyan, the Israeli Commander-in-Chief, that aggression had been planned right from 1954. It is apparent that present aggressive acts against Syria and Jordan are a continuation of the expansionist policy Israel has been following since its existence.

In August, 1966, Israel had indulged in wanton bombing of some Syrian villages and had caused considerable damage to civilian life and property. This too, was condemned by the Armistice Commission as well as by most members of the Security Council and the world community. Apparently, Israel had no justification for this attack except the lame excuse of reprisals against the so-called acts of sabotage—a charge which has not been borne out in any of the findings of the Mixed Armistice Commission.

These two attacks are however not the only examples of Israel's habitual aggressiveness towards Arab countries. Its biggest example was the attempted full-scale invasion of Egyptian territory in October, 1956. Though the whole world had condemned this aggression, the then Prime Minister of Israel, Ben Gurion, is on record that the Suez operation was to "free the Sinai Peninsula, which is a part of Eretz Israel". This statement of his is a clear indication that Israeli rulers consider territories of other countries as their own, if they can succeed in invading them, as they did in Palestine. For her aggressive acts Israel has been censured 26 times by the United Nations, including 6 times by the Security Council.

It is significant that in all investigations into peace violations in the area, the United Nations' Mixed Armistice Commission and Security Council have on no occa-

sion condemned or censured the armed forces of the Arab states, as they have done in the case of Israel and its army.

**Q. What is the dispute about the use of waters of the river Jordan, and why has there been so much tension over it ?**

**Ans.** As a matter of fact, there is no such dispute as that of waters of the Jordan river. The word 'dispute' presupposes some *prima facie* claim of both the parties to the bone of contention. But in the case of Jordan river, Israel has no moral or legal claim whatsoever.

Its claim rests squarely on its acts of aggression against Palestine. The so-called problem relating to the use of Jordan river has risen only as a direct consequence of the Israeli policy of aggression. This is more true in the case of the recent tension relating to this problem which has been directly caused by the Israeli policy of active hostility towards her peace-loving neighbours.

The trouble has arisen because of the Israeli insistence to divert the river and its tributaries for the benefit of the Zionist intruders who are sought to be settled in Negev Desert. Israel claims that due to this utilisation she would be able to accommodate more than 5 million white immigrants within its "ever-expanding borders". This will create the biggest threat to the security of neighbouring Arab countries. Economically it will spell the ruin of countries like Syria, Lebanon and Jordan whose economy to a large extent, is dependent upon the waters of the river Jordan. The total flow of water which passes down the River Jordan annually is 1880 MCM, of which 77 per cent or 1488 MCM originates from the three Arab states of Lebanon, Syria and Jordan. Yet the United Nations, in spite of repeated requests by Arab countries, has totally failed to dissuade Israel from taking up this project. So the Arab countries themselves were compelled to take steps which could prevent Israel from the misuse of Jordan waters. This is being done through the construction of an engineering project in Syria. In this

endeavour of theirs, Arab countries enjoy the fullest support of Afro-Asian nations, especially India.

As early as 1963, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru had assured the Arab countries that India's sympathies were fully with them, over the Jordan river question. The late Lal Bahadur Shastri, too, had said in the most unequivocal terms during a seminar held in New Delhi in the autumn of 1964 that India fully supported the Arab cause on this question. This support has been reaffirmed by Mrs Gandhi and Dr. Zakir Husain.

**Q. What steps should be taken to break the deadlock in the Middle East ?**

**Ans.** The basis on which a just settlement can be arrived at, has been set forth, not by the Arabs but many an impartial observer of high authority. For example long back in 1948 Count Folke Bernadotte, the United Nations Mediator had said in a statement, before he was assassinated : by Zionists, "It is however undeniable that no settlement can be just and complete if recognition is not accorded to the right of the Arab refugee to return to the home from which he has been dislodged...It would be an offence against the principle of elementary justice if these innocent victims of the conflict were denied the right to return to homes while Jewish immigrants flow into Palestine and indeed, at least offer the threat of permanent replacement of the Arab refugees who have been rooted in the land for centuries."

It was on this basis that the General Assembly adopted Resolution No. 194 (III) of December 11, 1948 on repatriation of those refugees who wish to return to their homes and the payment of compensation for the property of those choosing not to return. This resolution has been reaffirmed every year by the United Nations since it was first adopted.

Explaining the same point, an impeccably neutral authority of the stature of British historian Prof. Arnold Toynbee has said :

“In seeking for terms on which a peace-settlement in Palestine might be arrived at, we ought to be guided all the time by three principles. The first of these is justice: the vindication of people’s rights, and the righting of their wrongs. The second is humanity: the least possible suffering for the smallest number of people. The third is freedom of choice: the greatest possible number of options for people whose lives and rights will be affected by a peaceful settlement...”

“Justice declares that everyone, Arab or Jew, who was domiciled in Palestine before the war of 1948 and who owned a home, land, or other property there before that date, is still the legal owner of that property—even if he is now being prevented from enjoying the use of it :” (*The Encyclopaedia Britannica Book of the year 1959*).

The question now is ‘if’ Israel is ready to comply with this basis minimum which could at least establish its bona fide. The answer is not hypothetical one. Israel has stubbornly defied world conscience by refusing to submit to these three basic human principles.

# Myths Vs Realities

**Q. Why do the Arabs oppose Israel when they claim that they have no quarrel with Judaism? Does not Israel represent hopes and aspirations of the world Jewry?**

**Ans.** There is a vast difference between a Jew and a Zionist. A Jew is one who believes in Judaism, which Arabs regard as one of the noblest religions in the world, whereas Zionism proclaims the supremacy of one religion and one over all others, and therefore, represents a negation of all the traditions of love and egalitarianism preached by the noble prophets of Judaism.

Arabs have, therefore, made it plain that their quarrel is only with the Zionism, which rests squarely, on religious and racial bigotry as the source of its existence. As regards the Jews they have always lived happily in Arab lands, unlike in some of the Western countries where they had to suffer various types of persecution. Even now, there is a sizable number of Jews in many of the Arab countries enjoying the fullest religious freedom. These Jews could be called Arab Jews, as opposed to the Zionist Jews who believe in fanatic nationalism based on religion and who have deprived the Palestinian Arabs of their homes and hearths.

We could, therefore, say that while a Jew is a religious term for which the Arabs have the greatest respect, a Zionist because of his faith in the exclusiveness of a religious group based on a mythical, racial entity and his belief in supremacy of one religion to the exclusion of all

others, represents the worst type of Fascistic ideology, with whom the Arabs like other secular nationalists, can have no peace and settlement because of the fact that this racist pocket has been forcibly planted in their midst.

Moreover, it is not only an error in the use of language, but also a mistake of utmost political gravity to equate Jews with the Arabs. All the Arabs do not belong to a single religion. In spite of a majority of Arabs adhering to Islam, there is a sizable number of Christians, as well as Jews among them. In fact, one Arab State, Lebanon, has a Christian majority. Even Palestine had a good number of Christians before it was usurped by the Zionists. Even now, about 25 per cent of the Arab refugees thrown out of Palestine belong to the Christian faith. They are equal sufferers from Zionist tyranny. Whenever Arabs speak about the injustice done to them, they do not plead for the justice for people belonging to a particular religion, but for the people of the area as a whole. In short, the term 'Arab' is a cultural political and to some extent a regional connotation, in which the religion does not play any part. On the other hand, the term Jew, has as much a religious bearing as for instance, a Muslim, Hindu, Christian may have. Even Israel cannot claim that all the Jews in the world support her. In fact, many of them like the great Scientist Einstein and many others of equal stature, had categorically declared their opposition to the creation of a state on the basis of religion. Even now, a good number of Jews all over the world continue to express strong disapproval of the Zionists' policies in Israel.

**Q. Since Jews were persecuted from time to time, why should not they be permitted to have a land of their own, where they could live in peace ?**

**Ans.** The Arabs have full sympathy with the Jews who had been persecuted not only by Nazis but also by most of the Western nations, which today profess to be the protagonists of Zionist interest. It is apparent that no

one has ever accused the Arabs of pursuing any anti-Jewish policy. In fact, the Jews have always enjoyed a very important and respected place in the fabric of Arab culture and have occupied the highest position in the Arab countries. It, therefore, seems completely unjust to make an attempt for the so-called compensation for the Jews at the cost of the innocent Arabs.

We, in this respect, can do no better than to quote the words of that great sage of humanity, Mahatma Gandhi. While writing in *Harjan* in August, 1947, when agony of communal riots must have been upper-most in his mind, he did not forget to mention "another suffering" caused on innocent people because of bigotry and terrorism. He wrote: "The Jews have erred grievously in seeking to impose themselves on Palestine with the aid of America and Britain and now with the aid of naked terrorism. Why should they depend on American money or British arms for forcing themselves on an unwelcome land."

In fact Jews in Palestine have adopted methods of tyranny worse than even those adopted by their own tormentors, as has been pointed out by Professor Arnold Toynbee :

"The evil deeds committed by the Zionist Jews against the Palestinian Arabs were comparable to crimes committed against the Jews by the Nazis. There was the massacre of men, women and children at Deir Yasin on the 9th of April, 1948, which precipitated a flight of the Arab population in large numbers, from districts within range of the Jewish armed forces, and the subsequent deliberate expulsion of the Arab population from districts conquered by the Jewish armed forces....." (Toynbee, Arnold, *A Study of History*, Vol. VIII, p. 290).

The Arabs would have naturally wished the persecuted Jews to be properly rehabilitated and compensated for the suffering they had to undergo in European countries. But it is glaringly unfair to select the Palestinian Arabs who

have been exceptionally tolerant to the Jews through the ages, to atone for the crimes of others. Many a European thinker believes that it would have been even in the interests of the Jews to have been rehabilitated either in countries of Central Europe or in some of the British colonies like Canada, New Zealand or Australia which had vast resources of land and finances and where the European Jews would have felt more at home culturally, socially and linguistically. Instead of rehabilitating them in their midst, the Western powers have tried to foist them on the Arab soil with the obvious ulterior motive of trying to wedge a dagger among the independent nations of Asia and Africa and to keep a permanent enclave of theirs in the Middle East.

**Q. Since Jews had to suffer at the hands of the Nazis, in what ways, if any, Zionism is opposed to Fascism?**

**Ans.** It is a misconception that Zionism is opposed to Fascism. The fact is that the nearest ideology to Zionism is Fascism. Zionism and Fascism are similar to each other in ways more than one. They sustain each other through their constant emphasis on hatred, violence and mythical, racial superiority. Like Hitler's obsession with the "Aryan" race, Zionists too speak of the Jews as the "chosen people" and claim racial purity and superiority for them on a completely irrational basis.

In its working too, Zionism resembles Fascism to a remarkable degree. Like the Nazis, Zionists, too, command global loyalties from people living in far away lands, on the basis of hatred against fellow human-beings. Zionism too draws its substance from the urge for territorial expansionism and considers physical violence as the ultimate of all reason and logic. Like the Nazis, Zionists too have both secret and front organisations in different countries, whose job is to mislead public opinion at home, to raise funds and organise support for the state with which these people have no links except a mythical religious connection.

Zionism in action resembles Fascism in another remarkable way. This is particularly true in the matter of treatment which it offers to over a quarter of a million Arabs belonging to the Christian and Muslim faiths living in Israel. There have been numerous instances of the inhuman treatment meted out to these Arabs by the Israeli authorities. Some of these complaints have been taken note of by the various organisations of the United Nations.

One cannot ignore the striking similarity between Dr. Herzl's book *The Jewish State* (Herzl is considered the Father and Prophet of Zionism) and Hitler's *My Struggle*. Though this book was published about a couple of decades later, it shows the basic similarity between Zionism and Fascism.

**Q. Palestine after all, it is sometimes said, is not the only country in the world which has been partitioned. Then why do the Arabs treat this partition as especially tragic and regrettable ?**

**Ans.** It is true that Palestine is not the only country which has been partitioned. There are many countries like Korea, Germany and Vietnam where the division has proved distressing and painful. The partition of the Indian sub-continent, too, is a pertinent example. But, there is a basic difference between the division of other countries and the so-called partition of Palestine.

In the first place, it is a misnomer to use the word 'partition' in relation to Palestine. In Palestine it has not been a case of partition. It is that of usurpation. The usurpers were not the people who belonged to the area. In fact, many of them had not seen Palestine till they usurped it. They came from far away countries of Europe and America with which the local inhabitants had no quarrel. The outsiders with the help of world power and the active patronage of their Western masters deprived the local inhabitants of their homes and hearths where they had been living for centuries. It is this aspect of the

usurpation of Palestine which makes it entirely different from the partition of any other country in the world.

In the case of partitions of other countries, two facts are common to all. Firstly, on both sides of the partitioned states, lived inhabitants originally belonging to the area. To that extent, the tragedy was somewhat diminished, since no foreign usurpers had come and settled there in place of the original inhabitants. Secondly, as the case is with the Indian sub-continent, the partition, however painful it might have seemed to some people, was voluntarily agreed upon by leaders of the sub-continent. Both have given unstinted recognition to each other's existence as independent, sovereign and lawful states. In the case of Palestine, the situation was entirely different. The original inhabitants in Palestine were forcibly thrown out. No one ever asked their consent or bothered to convince them about the need for such a step. This is the only case in history, where the inhabitants of a country were driven out to make room for intruders who never had any connection with this particular country. The Zionist usurpation of Palestine is therefore much more tragic and much more brutal than any other partition of a national entity anywhere in the world.

**Q. While admitting that injustice was done to the Arabs, would it not be realistic to accept the state of Israel as *fait accompli* ?**

**Ans.** This question has been posed by a number of well meaning persons all over the world. It is understandable that not knowing proper facts, they may be feeling at a loss to know why after all Arabs do not accept the *fait accompli*. The real situation is, however, quite different. Firstly, 18 years is too short a period to say that Israel has been established for all times to come. One should not forget that it had taken Arabs about 70 years to get the holy land vacated from the European imperialists during the time of the so-called crusades.

In the case of the liberation of Palestine, the period of waiting is bound to be much shorter. For one thing,

time is on the side of the Arabs. The Arab people, with the strident efforts they are making towards their own progress and development, and the vast riches of their lands will inevitably outdo Israel on every front.

Secondly, and that is more important, justice is on their side. Arabs know the inalienable law of history that march of time can deny rightful place to justice for some time, but in the end, the right must prevail over the wrong.

As regards the theory of *fait accompli* one must not forget that its acceptance will set up a dangerous precedent. This might mean the acceptance of the hated policy of apartheid, of white rulers in South Africa. It may also provide a perverted logic for acceptance of the white supremacy in Southern Rhodesia and could also perpetuate the colonial rule in all the countries which are still under the imperialist yoke. After all, the white-settlers in Southern Rhodesia have achieved as much a *fait accompli* as the Zionists have done in Palestine. Then why not accept their illegal regime ?

Moreover, the crime of white rulers of Southern Rhodesia and South Africa, in spite of its being the most abhorrent, is not at all greater than those of the Zionists in Palestine, since the white settlers have only subjugated the local population, whereas the Zionists have not only subjugated them, but have killed and thrown out a majority of the local inhabitants. In these circumstances, the acceptance of the theory of *fait accompli* could prove as dangerous to the people of Asia and Africa, as it is immoral and impracticable.

**Q. Since Israel was created through a resolution of the United Nations, does not non-recognition of Israel by countries like India amount to a defiance of the world body ?**

**Ans.** If Israel had claimed some legitimacy due to U.N. resolution, it has forfeited it by refusing to implement the resolution in full. The only part of the Resolu-

tion which Israel observed was the one which refers to the creation of a Jewish state. Neither in territory nor in its obligations to the Arab population and its respect for United Nations jurisdiction in Jerusalem is Israel a fulfilment of the blueprint of the United Nations in terms of which it came into being. In fact, she has proved to be the biggest defier of the United Nations authority. Making matters still worse, Israel is pursuing her policy of defiance, adding arrogance to the sin.

There are not one but many instances to show how Israel has consistently been refusing to comply with the United Nations resolutions. Firstly, let us take the U.N. resolution 194(III) of December 11, 1948 which had stated that "the refugees wishing to return to their homes and live in peace with their neighbours should be permitted to do so, at the earliest practical date, and that compensation should be paid for the property of those choosing not to return and for loss of damage to property which, under principles of International Law, and in equity, should be made good by the governments or authorities responsible."

What was Israeli response to this? Mr. David Ben Gurion, the then Prime Minister of Israel, declared that "force of arms, not formal reasonable resolutions, will decide the issue."

Take another instance of Israel's defiance of the U.N. resolutions. According to the U.N. resolution No. 18(II) of November 29, 1947 which recommended the partition of Palestine, Israel was allotted only 55 per cent of total area of the country. But today it is in occupation of more than 77 per cent of the area. It is a common misconception that this area was enlarged after the Arab-Israeli conflict. Records, however, tell a much different story. Zionists had already occupied most of the territory before any Arab soldier set foot on the Palestine soil.

About the city of Jerusalem, the U.N. resolution had stated that it will be established as Corpus Separatum under a special, international regime and shall be administered by the U.N. Trusteeship Council.

Israel "complied" with the resolution in its own peculiar way with the occupation of the zone even before the British left and any soldier from any Arab state was on the Palestinian soil. Along with it they had occupied other areas reserved for the Arab state and rendered lakhs of Palestinian Arabs refugees.

On December, 7 1949, Israel shifted its Parliament and capital to Jerusalem. In face of such an arrogance, the Trusteeship Council was forced to adopt a resolution on December, 20 1949 censuring Israel for her act. But Israel ever since stubbornly refused to implement the resolution.

It should not be forgotten that Israel was made a member of the U.N. under certain specific conditions which were clearly defined. The preamble made reference to the resolutions of November, 29 1948 (on repatriation and compensation to refugees). Israel agreed to fulfil these preconditions. But as soon as she gained admission, her Government declared that their country was a sovereign one and the U.N. had no jurisdiction to interfere in "their" territory. Apart from these resolutions which have been consistently defied by Israel, the Security Council on six occasions passed strictures against Israeli attacks on the territories of Arab neighbours. The U. N. has condemned Israel more than 26 times for the same offence. These condemnations become more weighty and noteworthy when one realises that how difficult it is to get a resolution through U. N. Security Council, because of the veto power of the five permanent members, some of them being staunch Israeli supporters. Yet the Security Council censured Israel 6 times, the latest being in November, 1966. This repeated condemnation shows the utter defiance and arrogance of Israel towards the United Nations.

In any case Israeli rulers themselves have declared on numerous occasions that the U.N. resolutions are dead and gone. Take for example this pronouncement of Mr. Ben Gurion : "These (UN) resolutions no longer live, nor will they rise again". (Quoted in the *Jewish Observer* and *Middle East Review*, May 6, 1955).

# ‘Development’ or Robbery ?

**Q. Israel claims many achievements in the matter of progress and development of its economy. Can you explain how that progress was made possible ?**

**Ans :** While considering Israeli claims about their so-called development and progress, one should not overlook the fact that it is comparatively easy for any community comprising highly educated and technically advanced personnel immigrating from developed countries to make some advance in certain fields. On surface, their advance would always present a glaring contrast to the conditions in their Afro-Asian neighbourhood.

For example, white-settlers in South Africa and Southern Rhodesia can claim a level of far greater advancement than their coloured victims. Similarly, the French colonies in Africa and Portuguese colony in the former Portuguese enclave of Goa could point to many of their achievements in the field of economy and technology as compared to the local inhabitants. In fact, through constant pumping in of large sums of money, at least superficially those enclaves seemed far more prosperous than the neighbouring areas. This, however, did not and does not absolve them of their obnoxious character of being colonial territories.

In the case of Israel, it should be noted that it is a colonized enclave, where the invaders have not only usurped the land, but have also eliminated, through brute force, local inhabitants. Secondly, most of the so-called progress has been achieved because of a simple fact that Israel

remains dominated by Western immigrants. Their level of education and technology is understandably superior to that prevailing in any of the Afro-Asian countries who have remained under imperialist yoke for centuries. For example, according to the Israeli Year Book, 1964-65, about 63 per cent of all immigrants between the period 1948 to 1963 had come from countries of Europe and America. In a population of little over 2 million, Western Jews are over 14,00,000 in number. If one ignores about a quarter million of Arabs who enjoy no political status in the Zionist State, the overwhelming predominance of the white Jews becomes glaringly clear.

It is this aspect of the racial composition of Israel which must be kept in mind while falling into the temptation of making rash comparisons between the so-called "progress" made by Israel as compared to Arabs.

Thirdly, the contribution of the huge amount of money poured into Israel by western sources cannot be overlooked. As we shall see, on average the total aid, both military and economic, direct and indirect, official and unofficial, given to Israel, works out to be about one hundred million dollars per day. With all this money, any community of about 2 million people could work "wonders." In view of all this the so-called Israeli development has been rightly called a case of "glass house growth" which could never become a yardstick for Afro-Asian countries, whose problems are much greater and resources much poorer, in comparison to Israel.

**Q. Israel has often been termed a Western enclave. On what basis is the allegation made ?**

**Ans.** The very process of imperialist mechanisations which created Israel shows that Western Powers wanted it as an enclave of theirs. Had not Britain, and later America, thought of a special use of the crucially important geographical position of Palestine occupied in the Middle East, they would have never liked to turn that country into the so-called national home for Jews.

It is on record that prior to World War I, there was an active movement for the establishment of a Jewish national home either in Uganda or in Canada. Only after 1915 the geographical importance of Palestine as a bridge of land between Asia and Africa, and as a powerful spring-board to dominate the whole of the region East of Suez, was realised by Western powers. This realisation prompted active support of these countries for the creation of Israel. Moreover, Western powers would not have financed Israel to the tune of 100 million dollars a day for the last nineteen years, had it not suited their imperialistic aims. Israel's record of voting in the United Nations where it has almost consistently voted against Afro-Asian countries is a pointer to the fact that Western calculations were not made in vain.

In 1956, it was Israel which provided the vanguard for the Anglo-French aggression on Suez. Again it is Israel which, because of its constant aggressive threat, has been acting as a tool for the Western powers for retarding the peace of economic development in Arab countries, and has thus been most useful for the protection of Western economic interests.

Moreover, Israel's leaders are themselves obsessed with the strong feeling of being a non-Asian community. It is apparent from these words of Mr. Ben Gurion: "The state of Israel is a part of the Middle East only in geography. From the decisive aspect of dynamism, creation and growth, Israel is a part of world Jewry". It is apparent, Israeli conception of the "World Jewry" is mainly dependent upon Western Jews, who are considered the mainstay of Zionist imperialism.

**Q. How is it that Israel receives the highest amounts of aid compared to any other country in the world?**

**Ans.** Western aid to Israel is given under many heads. The most menacing foreign assistance being the outright arms aid provided by countries like America and West Germany to their outpost in West Asia.

In May, 1966, America had supplied over 200 Patton tanks and over 50 bomber fighter aircraft of the most modern type, the F-104s. It is also well-known that Western countries especially France have been cooperating with Israel over her plan for development of nuclear weapons. Israeli army is supposed to be the most heavily equipped army in the Middle East. In terms of per capita expenditure on defence and in terms of her capita quantity of arms for citizens, Israel spends highest in the world. Obviously this huge expense has been totally underwritten by Western sources.

On the other hand according to official reports the total amount of foreign aid received by Israel from the U.S. Government, from money collected by Philanthropic Zionist Organisations, and from the German Reparations Agreement equalled 7,000 million dollars, till 1965. It will be interesting to know the break-up of the heads under which this aid is given to Israel. Take for instance, the aid which was given to Israel between the period of 1948-58. According to *Israeli Economist* 1958, that country was provided with a total foreign assistance of 550 million dollars during a period of ten years from 1948 to 1958.

This huge amount was contributed in the following manner :

1300 million dollars from Jews Appeal Fund.

3500 million dollars as remittance from Jews abroad, German Reparations and U.S. Grants and agricultural surpluses.

700 million dollars foreign assistance for rehabilitation of new immigrants from wealthy Jews in the U.S.A., France, Britain etc.

After 1958 the aid under all these heads has greatly been increased. For example, 90 per cent of her requirements of food have been totally under-written by the U.S. Similarly, the so-called private Jewish investment into Israel from Western countries has reached over 1,000

million dollar mark. It has, therefore, been calculated that if all the arms aid as well as all the economic help to Israel given during 1948-1966 is taken into consideration even on the most conservative estimate, it would work out to the tune of 10 million dollars a day. In per capita terms as well as in absolute terms this is the highest amount of aid received by any country in the world.

American authorities have usually been very candid about the reasons why this huge amount of aid is being provided to Israel. One such frank confession of Western aim of using Israel as a spring board for her own military strategy, came from Robert S. McNamara, the U.S. Secretary for Defence, who while delivering a major policy speech in Montreal on May 18, 1966 had declared that one of the basic reasons which prompted the U.S. Government to supply Israel with arms, is the conviction of the U.S. Defence Department of the necessity to lessen the policy of dependence on the Sixth Fleet in the M.E. area by encouraging and achieving "a more effective partnership with those nations who can, and should, share international peace-keeping responsibilities".

**Q. What is the state of Israeli economy specially in view of the vast economic aid Israel has received ?**

**Ans.** Based as it is on the most irrational and aggressive foundations, the so-called state of Israel can never become economically viable or self-sufficient. How serious is the economic crisis in Israel, in spite of her being the biggest recipient of foreign aid in the world, is evident from a report published in such a staunch pro-Israeli paper as the American news magazine, *Newsweek*.

Reporting on the current state of affairs in Israel, *Newsweek* in its issue of January 16, 1967 makes some shocking revelations about the economic 'development' in Israel. Debunking these claims the report says, "Israel's chronic import-export gap is spreading at an astonishing rate. Economists estimate the total 1967 drain on Israel's hard currency reserves will reach 660 million dollars". Giving

examples of the Israeli habit of jugglery with figures, *Newsweek* reports : "Eshkol's critics complain that he has been less than candid in explaining the crisis to Israel's two and one-half million people. Controversies are shunted from public parliamentary debate to closed committees, where the Prime Minister's patchwork coalition majority stifles most of them. When they are in the open, government spokesmen appear to rely heavily on doubletalk. During one recent week, Labour Minister Yigal Allon announced there were 15,000 unemployed Israelis. A day later, the State Bank put the figure at 35,000 to 40,000 ; and two days later the government's own Economic Planning Authority decided the figure was closer to 60,000 (nearly 10 per cent of the national labour force) and growing."

**Q. Israel claims to be a socialist country. What is the truth behind such an assertion ?**

**Ans.** Like many other claims of Israel, her boast of being a socialist country is also a hoax. We need not go here into a detailed examination of the Zionist ideology, which we have seen is nearer to Fascism than any other faith in the world. It should be obvious that a state which rests its total claim on the basis of the mythical supremacy of one religion over all others, can have little in common with a modern and progressive ideology like Socialism.

Obviously a state professing open policy of discrimination not only against its Arab citizens belonging to Christian and Muslim faiths, but also against Jews hailing from Afro-Asian countries like India, could scarcely call itself a socialist society. Moreover, its heavy dependence on countries like the U.S.A. Britain, France and West Germany both for money and arms should automatically make it suspect in the eyes of all genuine socialists. Even the direct American investment in that country works out to be over 27% of her total economic resources which is the highest percentage in the world.

# Choice Before India

**Q : Israel has made offers of economic aid to India. Why should not India accept such offers ?**

**Ans.** It is true that Israel claims that she can help Indian economy if India establishes diplomatic relations with her. Besides taking into consideration political implications of these economic aid offers by Israel to India, the best will be to first examine the validity of all such offers. The fact is that they amount to no more than mere illusions. In actuality, many of these aid offers are non-existent. Only last year, for example, the then Food Minister, Mr. Subramaniam contradicted a wide-spread rumour that Israel had offered aid of food. Being an importer of food herself, she could hardly be expected to do so. Mr. Subramaniam, however, admitted during his reply to the same question asked in the Lok Sabha on May 10, 1966, that some "paltry" quantity of fertilisers was offered, but India rightly declined to accept it on wider considerations of policy.

This is only one instance of how the Israeli propaganda is trying to raise mountains out of the molehills over the alleged generous inclinations of Israel towards India. About the so-called offers of aid from Israel, Prime Minister, Mrs. Gandhi, has rightly remarked that if need be, India could directly take such items from their original sources rather than from Israel. Obviously, the fact of Israel's total dependence on western aims for her so-called aid-giving activities, had been keenly taken note of by Mrs. Gandhi, while making the statement. While viewing Israeli offers of aid, one should not lose sight of the fact that no country in the world is as much dependent upon foreign aid as Israel. But in spite of this colossal amount of foreign assistance, the state of Israeli economy remains far from satisfactory.

Due to a large preponderance of imports over exports, her adverse balance of trade has been rising ever since its inception. According to the official Israeli review of the country, it has been to the tune of around 500 million dollars annually since 1957 to 1965-66. This chronic import-export gap is continuing to spread at an astonishing rate. According to *Newsweek* of January 16, 1967, Israeli economists estimate that the total 1967 drain on Israel's hard currency resources will reach 660 million dollars by the end of the current financial year (1966-67).

As regards trade prospects, Israeli economy is being fashioned along the lines of an industrialised Western pattern, leaving little scope of imports from India. She has no use for Indian manufactured goods, a field in which India is particularly interested in the matter of exports. Israel, on the other hand, has been eager to push forward in world markets, a number of industrial goods such as light machinery and household gadgets at highly subsidised rates, to the direct deterrent of Indian goods of that variety. Instead of buying Indian products, it is in effect eager to exploit the Indian market for her goods.

**Q. What economic gain does India derive from Arab countries ?**

**Ans:** It is a matter of common knowledge that 'economic gain' does not only mean the economic aid a country receives from the other. India has much to gain economically from the Arab countries. They have become the biggest buyers of her goods, especially of India's non-traditional exports. For example, only in (1965), the total trade between India and U.A.R. alone was 34.5 crore rupees. This figure has been doubled this year and is expected to reach a hundred crore mark in a couple of years. Similarly Iraq imports goods worth 2.6 million pounds from India. These include tea, jute and light machinery, especially electric fans, cycles and diesel machines. Besides this, there is a large number of Indians working in Iraq. The large Indian business community doing brisk trade in

Baghdad and Basra, numbers over 35,000. In Kuwait there are 30,000 Indians prospering in that oil-rich country.

With the Sudan, Indian's trade was to the tune of 30 crores of rupees last year. With Kuwait, the value of trade has been over 35 crores of rupee. Kuwait has recently decided to invest over a hundred crores of rupees in different industries in India and concluded agreement for setting up various Indo-Kuwaiti joint ventures in both the countries. It also goes to the credit of an Arab country like Kuwait to have put forward and invested a large amount of sterling in Government of India's securities. Similar trade and economic relations are expected to develop with other Arab countries as well. Last year, for instance, India sold sewing machines, bicycles, electric fans and some other light mechanical goods worth about 230 crores of rupees to the Arab countries. It is important to emphasize that India enjoys a tremendously favourable balance of trade with all the Arab countries. Since many of them are in a position to pay for imports because of their wealth, this trend is likely to continue. Compared to all this, Israeli imports from India, during 1965-66 had accounted for a meagre 13 lakhs of rupees.

It should also not be forgotten that Israel is in no position to provide employment to Indian personnel whereas Arab countries continue to offer almost unlimited field of employment for Indian technicians, doctors, engineers and teachers. Iraq, Sudan, Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, Bahrain, and Aden have already thousands of Indians employed in most lucrative jobs. The demand for Indian teachers is continuously rising in the Arab world, thus providing great scope to India for earning valuable foreign exchange.

**Q. Since Arabs pursue a neutral policy towards India's disputes with China and Pakistan, would it not be logical for India to adopt a similar neutral stand vis-a-vis the Arab-Israeli dispute ?**

**Ans.** The Arab position vis-a-vis inter-Asian disputes has been that of wishing them to be settled amicably

between the parties concerned. For example, some of the Arab Governments have been trying their level best to bring India and China on a conference table to settle their dispute. The UAR, particularly, has been trying to do whatever it could, to persuade China to settle with bilateral discussions with India. Its role in the Colombo Conference, as well as President Nasser's subsequent efforts in this regard, have been well appreciated by India. An Arab country like Jordan has condemned China in severest terms.

As regards Indo-Pakistan disputes, the position the Arab States have collectively taken is clear and unequivocal. They have often declared that they do not want to pronounce any opinion on the merits of the dispute, since in their opinion, that would impede the possibility of their settlement between the parties. Obviously, this stand has been well appreciated by the Indian Government which itself has often been declaring that the dispute should be settled bilaterally between India and Pakistan without outside interference.

About India taking a stand of neutrality in the Arab-Israeli conflict, one should remember that the position is completely and diametrically different from any of the disputes India or any other country has with her neighbours. In the case of the Arab-Israeli conflict, it is not a dispute between two countries. It has arisen merely because an alien minority has been transplanted on a soil to which it had no claim whatever.

This alien minority under the flag of Zionism has been following a policy of Fascistic terrorism, imperialistic expansionism and racial and religious discrimination, which present as abhorrent a challenge to India's socialist, secular and progressive nationalist policies based on peace and justice, as they do to the entire Afro-Asian community.

The posture of neutrality in this so-called dispute would be as illogical to the Indian stand, as it would be in the case of South Africa or Southern Rhodesia. There too a white minority is pursuing a policy of racial domina-

tion over a coloured majority. It has, therefore, been rightly expressed by Indian leaders, to whose stand, Arabs remain deeply grateful, that the question of neutrality in this dispute does not arise at all, since the rights and wrongs are so clear that it will be negation of truth to remain neutral in such a conflict where the basic issue centres round a liberation struggle.

**Q. Many countries of the world have recognised Israel, why should not India do so ?**

**Ans.** India's attitude towards this problem cannot be governed merely by the example of some other countries, who have either been pressurized by the interested big powers, or have not had a proper comprehension of the problem or whose stakes in the Arab world are not as high as are ours. India's policy of lending full support to the Arabs stems from three most important factors. They are :

1. India has consistently supported the Palestinian cause even during the time when we ourselves were struggling for our liberation. Since Independence Indian leaders and spokesmen have made it repeatedly clear that we consider Israel not a state in the normal sense of the term. We consider it as an illegitimate political creation foisted by force on the people of Palestine. Having diplomatic relations with such an obnoxious political entity would impair the truth of the stand to which we have been committed for over three and a half decades.

2. India's relations with Arab countries are of a special nature. No other non-Arab Asian country has such close economic relations and such great stakes in the Arab world as we have. Even at the moment thousands of Indians are working in various parts of the Arab world. Our trade with the whole of the Arab region is of over 200 crores of rupees annually. Oil rich countries like Kuwait have come forward even to invest large amount of money in India. In the United Nations, Arabs command directly or indirectly, over 30 votes. All this has made it imperative for India not to take any step which may harm not only her policy but also her interests.

3. Israel which is fully dependent on Western aid can be of little use to India in any of our important economic or financial needs. India has rightly preferred the friendship of over 10 million people of the Arab world, as compared to one and a half million Israeli intruders. This has endeared India in the Arab world with which we have had the closest contact from times immemorial.

Obviously, such contacts have never existed between the Arabs and those countries who have recognised Israel. It, therefore, matters little to the Arabs what stand some of the comparatively unimportant countries take. But as regards India, the level of expectation due to the closest of economic, political and historical relations is so high that any false step, of which however no possibility exists, would impair the centuries, old relationship.

**Q. Since India follows a policy of non-alignment, why should it not be non-aligned in the matter of Arab-Israeli dispute ?**

**Ans.** The essence of India's non-alignment was best summed up by the great architect of this policy, the late Jawaharlal Nehru. While speaking in November, 1956 in the Indian Parliament over the tripartite aggression on Egypt he had said: "India's non-alignment is not a passive attitude. It stems from the belief that one cannot remain neutral between justice and injustice, right and wrong, peace and war."

He then explained the reasons which prompted India to support Egypt whole-heartedly and unequivocally. The foremost among them was that aggression looked like an attempt to re-impose colonialism in the Afro-Asian part of the world. In such a conflict between freedom and colonialism, India could never be non-aligned or neutral. It has also been made repeatedly clear that our non-alignment only means that we judge every issue on merits from the standpoint of freedom, justice and

Basing her policy on these postulates India has been extending full support to those struggling against the racist regimes in South Africa and Southern Rhodesia as also to people fighting against colonialism in other parts of the world. It is therefore natural that India has neither been neutral nor non-aligned in the Arab-Israeli confrontation. This is because Israel too follows a theocratic and racialist policy obnoxious to the principles of secularism and human rights. She is also pursuing a constantly aggressive attitude towards her Arab neighbours, is refusing to implement the United Nations resolutions and is stubbornly denying the rights of the local inhabitants of Palestine to their homes and hearths.

No wonder India is lending its full support to the cause of the Palestinian Arabs who are engaged in a grim battle against the Israeli colonialists, implanted on their land through the force of naked arms from Europe and America.

Mrs. Indira Gandhi has admirably summed up the Indian position in this, when she told a special correspondent of the Cairo Daily Al-Ashram that "we oppose Israel not only because of our friendship with the Arabs. But also because we are opposed to the creation of states on religious basis. Neither can we recognize territorial gains made through aggression."

(Al-Ahram, Cairo  
July 10, 1966)

It is thus clear that both in its basic "philosophy" and in the execution of her internal and external policies, Israel stands directly opposed to India's policies and interests. In such a direct conflict the question of remaining non-aligned does not arise at all.

It is obvious that the problem of Arab evictees from Palestine is fast developing as a very potential threat to peace in the area. In a conflict like that, which due to Israel's arrogantly aggressive posture, can break out any

day, the peace of the whole world can be threatened. India with her problems of development, will suffer a great deal from any worsening of world situation, especially if the Middle East is involved in the conflict. This would directly harm our national interests, especially in the economic sphere. It is therefore essential that we continue to offer our fullest support to the cause of justice for the Palestinian people.

Since India is regarded as a great champion of truth, her continued indictment of Israel for her sins against peace and humanity, would go a long way in strengthening the forces of justice, which alone can insure peace in the Middle East. This way India would not only protect her own national interests, but would also render a great service to the cause of world peace.

Topical publications are planning to bring out booklets in English and Hindi on some of the important problems of the day. Written lucidly in the form of questions and answers, these booklets are meant as general knowledge aids to the students preparing for post-graduate and competitive examinations, as also for providing information to laymen on the background of the problems one hears every day, but about which so little is known. Forthcoming publications in the series are :—

1. Vietnam—Issues and Solution
2. Disarmament—Background and Perspective
3. Southern Rhodesia—Past and Present
4. Germany—Two States or one ?

Trade enquiries may please to addressed to the Business Manager, Topical Publications, 5, Madras House, Darya Ganj, Delhi.



- ★ Why should not India establish diplomatic relations with Israel ?
- ★ What are India's stakes in the Arab world ?
- ★ Can there a Tashkent like settlement between Arabs and Isreal ?
- ★ Has Isreal any political, moral or religious claim over Palestine ?
- ★ What should be done to ensure peace and lessen tension in the Middle East ?
- ★ Why should not India be non-aligned in the Arab-Israeli conflict ?
- ★ What is the truth about Israeli claims of progress ?

These are questions troubling India and the world to provide objective and many other related Indian point of view. In the data and records, the reader will find it not only immensely informative, but also highly engrossing.



Library

IIAS, Shimla



00022060