

PEACE IN PALESTINE: A REALISTIC HOPE OR AN ELUSIVE DREAM?¹
by Dr. Ismail Zayid²

For 75 years, the Palestinian people have encountered an onslaught directed at their national existence, with the clear intent to drive them out of their native land and subject them to an orchestrated genocide. The first formal step in this process was the issuing by Imperial Britain of the infamous Balfour Declaration, on November 2, 1917. The project was effected through a settler colonial Zionist movement, initially supported by Britain and finally by the United States, which helped to complete this operation and continues, to this day, to foster it.

Throughout the last three quarters of a century, the Palestinian people have continued to struggle against this onslaught, with their limited resources, and have waited for the world conscience to bring peace to their Land.

The Palestinian people, tenacious as they are, continue to hope for peace, but surely not at any price. It is this hope, to resolve this Palestinian - Israeli conflict, that is being challenged. In an attempt to resolve this conflict, I feel it is necessary for us to look at the root cause of this conflict, if we are to have any realistic hope to resolve it peacefully.

¹Lecture given on May 1, 1993, in Toronto, at the National Convention of the Palestine Aid Society of Canada.

²Professor of Pathology, Dalhousie University, Halifax, Nova Scotia.

The Israeli-Palestinian conflict is frequently described as a very complex one. I want to submit to you that the problem is fundamentally a very simple one which was well summed up, in the words of a simple Palestinian farmer in Jericho, quoted by, the late Dr. Frank Epp, the then President of Conrad Grebel College of the University of Waterloo:

"Our problem is very simple. A foreigner came and took our land, took our farms and our homes, and kicked us out. We have in mind to return. It may take a hundred years but we will return."

This, in a nutshell, is the Palestine problem and the essence of this conflict. A country, Palestine, has been dismantled, its people uprooted from their homeland and replaced by an alien people gathered from all corners of the globe and a new state, Israel, created, in its place, forty-five years ago. This tragedy, and the ensuing conflict that brought about repeated wars in the Middle East is a direct outcome of the introduction of political Zionism into the Middle East. The Palestinian, who were the primary target of this ideology, have continued to resist and thus have sustained the main impact of this onslaught and the successive wars.

Today, in 1992, of the 5 million Palestinians, nearly one-half are living in exile, uprooted from their homeland, while 750,000 are living as second-class citizens in the State of Israel and 1.75 million in the West Bank and Gaza have been living for over twenty-five years under oppressive alien and illegal military occupation, against the horrors of which

they have no protection. Waking and sleeping, they are at the mercy of a military authority which has the power, and uses it freely, to invade their homes, arrest them, detain them without trial, subject them to torture, expel them from their land, demolish their homes, uproot their trees, and impose collective punishment on their communities. Their publications are censored, they may not engage in any political activities and their right to assemble for any purpose is rigorously controlled. Their schools and universities are arbitrarily closed and disrupted and their curricula and textbooks are altered and censored, denying them the basic principle of academic freedom. Their lands are confiscated to hand over to Jewish settlers in a barefaced program of colonization. They are terrorized, their homes broken up and their fields defoliated with impunity. Their children are callously beaten and their limbs broken and they are brutalized and killed.

All these acts of violation of human rights are carried out in open defiance of international law and the Fourth Geneva Convention which stipulates how a military occupier should behave towards civilians under its occupation. After the Second World War, and to prevent the recurrence of atrocities committed by the Nazis against civilians under its occupation, both Jewish and non-Jewish, the world community formulated in 1949 an international convention, the Fourth Geneva Convention. Ironically, however, the State of

Israel today violates every article of the Fourth Geneva Convention.

We do not have the time to go through the mammoth brutality that Israel practises against the civilians of the occupied West Bank and Gaza but I can relate to you that numerous human rights organizations, including Amnesty International, the I.C.R.C., the International Commission of Jurists, the U.S. National Lawyers Guild and Israeli human rights organizations, amongst others, have repeatedly condemned Israeli practices against the Palestinians, but to no avail.

I do not think that many of you will disagree with me if I say that for such a situation to continue anywhere in the world is plainly immoral and intolerable. This is what has driven the Palestinian people in the West Bank and Gaza to rise in a spontaneous massive human uprising, the Intifada, and raise their fists with stones and in anger to stop this oppression and call on the human world conscience to come forward and speak out. In May 1990, a study by the Swedish Save The Children Organization documented that:

"The Israeli army has systematically become child killers. Between December 1987 and December 1989, one hundred fifty children under age 16 were killed by soldiers. The average age of the dead was 10 years. Between 50,000 - 63,000 children were beaten, gassed or wounded."

Torture is a systematic practice for thousands of Palestinian prisoners and to add insult to injury, the Israeli Landau

Commission, which investigated in 1987 the reports of torture and killing of Palestinian prisoners, confirmed this but proceeded, incredibly, to sanction the use of "moderate physical pressure" during interrogation.

Here, a judiciary commission sanctions torture giving it a new name, "moderate physical pressure", in violation of international law and every notion of civilized behaviour. This ingenious description of torture as "moderate physical pressure" reminds me of the Orwellian newspeak of 1984. Israeli leaders have a great skill at this and, perhaps while we are at it, I might give you a few examples: the territories under Israeli occupation are not occupied but "administered" territories. A policy of expelling Palestinians from their homeland is not described as expulsion, or more appropriately as a genocide against an entire nation, but "transfer". The Israeli war of aggression against Lebanon, killing 20,000 Palestinians and Lebanese civilians, was called "peace for Galilee". The stainless steel bullets, with a thin coating of rubber, that kill Palestinian children, are called "rubber bullets". Incarceration without charge or trial is "administrative detention" and the expulsion and exile of people from their homes is "temporary distancing" in Israeli lingo, and I could go on and on. I am afraid George Orwell must be turning in his grave to realize how Israel's leaders have mastered his newspeak, perhaps now better called "Israelspeak".

This is the situation that we are dealing with today and for which we must seek a resolution by peaceful means. For, otherwise, the repeated wars that we have faced during the last forty-four years, with devastating results to the people of the area, would erupt again with an increasing threat of wider conflagration and the possibility of use of more destructive weapons, including chemical, biological and nuclear warfare.

Palestinians, for decades, have proposed the most humanistic and just solution, namely that all people who live in this land, Jews, Christians and Muslims should discard their fears and hatreds and live in one secular state as equal citizens without any discrimination, based on ethnic origin, race or religion. The great Jewish humanists, Professors Judah Magnes and Albert Einstein, supported this idea of a bi-national state for Arabs and Jews and opposed the exclusivist racist ideology of a Zionist state, which maintains an official division of its population into "Jews" and "non-Jews", where some are "more equal than others".

However, for the time being this must remain a dream and we propose a more achievable solution. I know that the Palestinians are aware that the massive injustice, to which they have been subjected, is now impossible to redress completely and they have accepted to be content with a modicum of justice. This must be based on the following conditions, namely: (1) complete Israeli withdrawal from all Arab territories occupied in 1967, including

the West Bank, Gaza and Arab Jerusalem. This act of occupation is illegal and was committed in violation of the U.N. Charter. Repeated U.N. resolutions have called for this withdrawal and compliance by Israel is overdue. (2) The Palestinians should be allowed to practise their fundamental inalienable right of self-determination and the right to establish their own independent state on a portion of their own country.

As to the right of self-determination, The U.N. General Assembly in a series of resolutions has continued since 1947 Resolution #181, to affirm the right of the Palestinians to self-determination and the establishment of their independent state. U.N. General Assembly Resolution 31/20(31) on November 29, 1976, reaffirming earlier resolutions, stated:

"Reaffirming that a just and lasting peace in the Middle East cannot be established without the achievement, inter alia, of a just solution of the problem of Palestine on the basis of the attainment of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people, including the right of return and the right to national independence and sovereignty in Palestine, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations."

(3) The Palestinians must be allowed to practise their fundamental inalienable right of return. This right is fundamental in the universal declaration of human rights and a right that has been repeatedly reaffirmed by the United Nations since the General Assembly Resolution #194, on December 11, 1948, which resolved that:

"Refugees wishing to return to their homes and live at peace with their neighbours should be permitted to do so at the earliest practicable date, and those wishing not to return should be

compensated for their property."

The U.N. mediator, Count Folke Bernadotte of Sweden, stated in a report to the United Nations:

"It would be an offence against the principles of elemental justice if these innocent victims of the conflict were denied the right to return to their 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."

Count Bernadotte paid heavily for stating this obvious principle and was assassinated by the Stern terrorist gang, on direct orders of none other than Mr. Yitzhak Shamir, on September 17, 1948 in Jerusalem.

It was interesting that at the time of the First Multilateral Conference in Ottawa dealing with the Refugee Question, Mr. Joel Cuperfain, and ardent Zionist, wrote in The Globe & Mail, of May 22, 1992, that it is "outrageous and unprecedented" for the Palestinians to claim the right of return. This is ironic when the Zionist ideology entitles every Jew from any corner of the globe, including millions of Russian Jews who, and their ancestors, had never set foot in Palestine, to have their "right of return", while the Palestinians who were born there and their forefathers had lived and cultivated the lands of Palestine for thousands of years, are now denied this right, which is described as an "outrageous claim". Only in Zionist philosophy and rewriting of history can such an incredible statement be made.

It should be stated that, in accordance with international law, the denial of the right of self-determination and the right of return, are international crimes.

The question must be raised, at this stage, why has this conflict continued, despite repeated United Nations and Security Council resolutions and despite the unquestionable assertions in international law of these fundamental rights for the Palestinians? This question, I think, deserves careful scrutiny.

The title of our deliberation, today, speaks of peace, presumably through conciliation. Ironically, the United Nations Security Council and General Assembly created in its Resolution #194 of 11th of December 1948 the mechanism of a Palestine Conciliation Commission based in Lausanne, Switzerland, which was to achieve the object of conciliation and resolution of this conflict by peaceful means, having failed to achieve this by the use of the U.N. mediator, Count Bernadotte, who was assassinated, on the orders of Mr. Shamir.

It is interesting to note that Israel, in its application for membership to the United Nations, undertook to comply with the General Assembly resolutions relating to the partition of Palestine, Resolution #181, and the right of return for the Palestine refugees, Resolution #194. The representative of the government of Israel stated in the General Assembly on the 13th of April 1949 that his government would pursue

"no policies on any questions which were inconsistent with the resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council" and with particular reference to resolutions #181 and #194. Accordingly and conditional on this, the state of Israel was admitted to membership of the United Nations in a Resolution #273, of 11th May 1949 which stated:

"Recalling its resolutions of 29th November 1947 and 11th December 1948 and taking note of the declaration and explanations made by the representative of the government of Israel before the ad hoc Political Committee in respect of the implementation of the said resolutions, the General Assembly decides that Israel is a peace-loving state which accepts the obligations contained in its charter and is able and willing to carry out those obligations."

It is interesting to note that within hours of the passage of this resolution, the state of Israel refused to continue to participate in the Palestine Conciliation Commission in Lausanne. I do not need to remind you that since that date, the state of Israel has continued to refuse to comply with repeated U.N. General Assembly and Security Council resolutions and has been condemned more than any other state by such bodies. In fact, Israel is the only state that was accepted into United Nations membership on a conditional basis and thus it is easily argued that having not complied with these conditions, its membership is null and void, on this basis. To this day, Israel continues to treat the U.N. and its resolutions in contempt. This contempt cannot be more flagrant than the statement by Mr. Abba Eban, Israeli Foreign

Minister, who stated in the very U.N. General Assembly on June 16, 1967:

"Even if the U.N. votes by 121 votes to 1, we will not withdraw from the territory we have occupied."

A British Member of Parliament, Mr. F. Hooley, wrote to the Guardian on August 16, 1967 and stated:

"During the ten days of intensive discussions that I have had with Israeli politicians and leaders, I found nothing but contempt for the United Nations."

This is, in essence, the reason why conciliation has so far failed to resolve this issue because the state of Israel refuses to comply with international law and repeated U.N. resolutions, and is unquestioningly supported by the U.S., which continues to give the political, military, and financial support to allow Israel to continue this defiance of U.N. international law and maintain its illegal occupation of other nations' territories.

It is relevant to note, that when in 1956 Israel invaded and occupied Sinai, in collusion with Britain and France, Mr. Ben Gurion declared at the time that this is 'liberated' territory from which he would not withdraw. It took President Eisenhower to go before American TV, on February 20, 1957, and raise the question of economic pressure and he stated:

"Should a nation which attacks and occupies foreign territory, in the face of U.N. disapproval, be allowed to impose conditions on its own withdrawal? If we agree that armed attack can properly

achieve the purpose of the assailant, then I fear we will have to turn back the clock of international order."

And I am afraid this is exactly what has happened since then; the clock of international order has been turned back and subsequent American governments have allowed Israel to continue its violation of international law, the integrity of the Charter of the United Nations and the human rights of some of its citizens and those under its military occupation, despite condemnation by various international bodies.

False hopes were also raised when on January 16, 1991, President Bush ordered his troops to proceed with the most massive bombardment and destruction of a whole country, namely Iraq, because of Iraq's illegal occupation of neighbouring Kuwait and its refusal to comply with the Security Council Resolution # 660. Mr. Bush stated then:

"No nation must be permitted to brutally invade its neighbour."

He went on to say that: "we cannot allow Security Council resolutions to remain unimplemented".

However, it was clearly evident then that the destruction of Iraq was on the U.S. agenda for different reasons and the moralizing about the integrity of the U.N. and its resolutions and the unacceptability of invasion of neighbouring countries was entirely hypocritical and cynical. All the

Security Council resolutions calling on Israel to withdraw from Lebanese, Palestinian and Syrian territory were of no consequence, nor were the repeated resolutions about compliance with the Fourth Geneva Convention. Obviously, none of these resolutions were worthy of the attentions of Messrs Bush, Major and Mulroney.

I want to submit to you that we do not need half a million troops to be sent to Israel to enforce Security Council resolutions, as we did in Iraq, but what we need is a single standard for the resolution of international conflicts and a true genuine understanding of a "New World order", not the "New World order" of Mr. Bush and his associates, where American interests only come first and last. What the United States and European powers and Canada need to understand is their obligation to comply with international law and cease the massive economic aid that allows Israel to maintain its illegal occupation, the confiscation of other people's land, and the continuing acts of aggression and international piracy by bombing refugee camps and villages in Lebanon and the bombing of Tunisia and the assassination of Palestinian leaders in Europe and elsewhere.

Yes, ladies and gentlemen, we need conciliation to achieve peace in the Middle East. But conciliation must come from the aggressor who must be made to pay heed to International law. As resolved by the permanent Court of International

Justice:

"A state which violated rights is required under international law to restore the situation as it was before the illegal act."

Restoration must

"... as far as possible, wipe out all the consequences of the illegal act and establish the situation which would, in all probability, have existed that act had not been committed."

We cannot continue to call on the victim for continuing victimization and increasing concessions that violate the sanctity of human decency and morality. The Palestinian people have made tremendous concessions in their search for conciliation and peaceful resolution. They have declared in the Algiers Palestine National Council Conference, in 1988, their acceptance of Israel's existence and are willing to accept the establishment of a state in little more than one-fifth of their country, namely the West Bank and Gaza, constituting 22% of their land. The Palestinian people have offered to co-exist peacefully with a neighbouring Israel, if this recognition is reciprocated and it was not reciprocated. They have accepted to participate in the so-called Peace Conference, orchestrated by the U.S., under humiliating conditions that should have never been accepted. The same U.S. administration that sent half a million troops to enforce the Security Council resolution in The Gulf, has allowed Israel to dictate the exclusion of the United Nations from the so-called International Peace Conference, where the U.N. was allowed to participate only as a silent observer. This is the

very body that we thought its resolutions must be implemented under any circumstances, even if that required the use of military force. Israel stipulates who should represent the Palestinians. This is a unique experience. In the history of human conflict, it has never been tolerated that a party to the conflict dictates who represents its foes. But these are strange times.

However, it was not a revelation to us who have lived this conflict with the Zionist movement, to hear Mr. Shamir, the then Prime Minister of Israel, declare after his defeat in the recent elections that it was his clear policy to continue to procrastinate during these negotiations for at least ten years so that the occupied territories will be fully occupied by new Jewish settlers. This will explain to you the nature of this conflict and why conciliation, on the part of the Palestinians alone, has not achieved any results and will not achieve peace. What Mr. Shamir is stating is a frank and honest expression of the true nature of the ideology of Zionism, an ideology that first refused to acknowledge the existence of the Palestinian people and then chose to dehumanize them, a policy that continues to this day to practise expansionism and racism.

Some say we have a new government in Israel and Mr. Rabin will bring a new face to Israel. Yes, it is true Mr. Rabin brought a new face to Israel but only, I am

afraid, a new appearance but not a new reality. Let us look at Mr. Rabin's history. It was Colonel Rabin whose troops, in 1948, drove the citizens of Ramleh and Lydda at gunpoint from their homes, after massacring in cold blood scores of them who had sought refuge in the Lydda Dahmash mosque. It was also Rabin's soldiers who then brought about 50 city residents to clean the mosque and bury the remains and when they finished their work, had them shot and thrown into the graves they, themselves, had dug. It was General Rabin who conducted the war of aggression of 1967 that brought about the current occupation of the West Bank and Gaza. It was General Rabin who ordered the destruction of total Palestinian villages, including Imwas, Yalu, and Beit Nuba (my own village), committing another war crime, by all recognizable tenets of international law. At the site of these villages the Jewish National Fund created later, with my own and your tax-deductible dollars, the profanity called Canada Park, to Canada's collective shame. It was Mr. Rabin, as Prime Minister of Israel, who continued the expropriation of Palestinian land and the creation of illegal Jewish settlements in the West Bank and Gaza. It was Mr. Rabin, as Defence Minister, who in 1988 ordered the brutal beating and breaking of bones of Palestinian children who dared to throw stones at his soldiers. Mr. Rabin says he is stopping all political settlements and allowing only strategic settlements. This is a charade; all settlements on illegally-occupied and expropriated

land are illegal. There will be no new settlements, we were assured by Messrs Rabin, Bush, and Baker, but existing settlements may expand. One settlement in the West Bank, which existed on one hill, has now expanded to six hills. Twelve thousand housing units are allowed. A network of major highways, crossing the West Bank to Israel and splitting Palestinian villages, are now under construction. Does that spell to you any intent of withdrawal or peace, I ask you?

Since coming to power, Mr. Rabin, not a novice at brutality, has excelled Mr. Shamir in the killing of Palestinian men, women, and children, and the demolition of their homes. Not only that, but he has been inventive in developing a most brutal method of indiscriminate destruction. On December 13, 1992, scores of homes in Khan Younis were destroyed by missiles and the process continues. Have those who have been talking of war crimes paid heed to this?

On Dec. 17, Mr. Rabin ordered the indiscriminate gathering of hundred of Palestinian men from their homes, schools, and mosques and transported them on buses, bound and blindfolded for more than 24 hours, and expelled them to the freezing mountains of Lebanon, in complete defiance of international law and all civilized norms.

This expulsion, we were told, was a punishment for the killing of Nissim Toledano, an Israeli soldier, two days before. Dare we ask how many Israeli soldiers and settlers have been expelled or their homes demolished for the killing of Amer Yusuf,

aged 13, 2 weeks earlier, or Amal Ahmad, 10 years old, shot dead on her way to buy milk for her family or the killing of hundreds of Palestinian men, women and children, before and since.

Justice, Israeli, style, means Palestinians' life is worth nothing. The execution, at the edge of Sussy settlement, last month, of a Palestinian, after his hands and feet had been bound and he was stripped naked, passed barely noticed. Rafael Eitan, leader of Tsomet party, says: "terrorists who attack Israelis 'should not get out alive'". Mr. Rabin said "private citizens should rely on themselves to overcome terrorists" and his chief of police Yaakov Terner called on every Israeli citizen to carry a gun and use it. Today as I write this, (April, 1993) the news report the killing of Raeda Omar Al-Qara, a 13 year old schoolgirl, shot in the back of the head by Israeli soldiers, shooting at schoolgirls throwing stones at the soldiers, in a school at Abu Suheila refugee camp in the Gaza Strip.

Palestinian blood is Cheap. Rabbi Yitzhak Ginsberg, an Israeli seminary's spiritual leader, (quoted in the Globe & Mail June 3, 1989) justified the slaying of a 13 year old Palestinian girl by Jewish settlers and said "the blood of Jews and non-Jews cannot be equated. We have to recognize that Jewish blood and the blood of a goy (non-jew) are not the same thing." He told Israeli radio "Every law that is based on equating goys and Jews is completely unacceptable." That says it all.

Dare one ask, if these policies and actions were those of any other country, what would our leaders of the so-called free

world say? I heard Mr. Mulroney describe Israel as a democracy with which we share common ideals and values. I, and many Canadians, I am sure, would dissociate ourselves from this statement and these values. If these are Mr. Mulroney's ideals and values, they are not ours.

The expulsion of the 400 Palestinians to Lebanon was not, if I need to tell you, a novel experience. In 1948, 750,000 Palestinians were evicted from their homes, and many of you are, I am sure, a direct proof of that. We are now hearing of the policy of "ethnic cleansing" in Bosnia as if it is a novelty. Israel mastered this technique long before. In 1948, 418 Palestinian towns and villages were erased from the face of the Earth. In 1967, three hundred thousand Palestinians, mostly refugees a second time, were "cleansed" to Jordan and the policy continues unabated.

The genesis of this exodus emanates from the inherent concept of the Zionist ideology of creating a pure Jewish state in Palestine, free of Arabs. The current powerful political agenda that exists in Israel today, as the policy of "transfer of Palestinians from Israel and the occupied territories, is not a new one. Theodore Herzl wrote in his diaries in 1897:

"We shall try to spirit the penniless (Arab) population across the border by procuring employment for it in the transit countries, while denying it any employment in our own country."

Joseph Weitz, who was the Jewish Agency chief representative, reported in the September 29, 1967 issue of Davar, organ of the

Histadrut, that he and other Zionist leaders concluded, in 1940, that there was "no room for both peoples together in this country". The achievement of Zionist objectives, he realized, required "a Palestine, of at least Western Palestine (west of the Jordan River) without Arabs". He wrote that it was necessary "to transfer the Arabs from here to the neighbouring countries. To transfer all of them and only after such transfer would the country be able to absorb millions of our brethren". This, in essence, is the foundation for the policy of "ethnic cleansing" that the Zionist forces adopted in 1948 to remove, by massacre, or the threat of massacre, and by psychological warfare, virtually the entire population in the area of Palestinian territory that they conquered by military means, 78% of Palestine.

Having looked at what Mr. Rabin did, who is the dove, we are negotiating with, let us look at the U.S. and what did the U.S. do? Mr. Bush having achieved an Israeli major objective, by destroying Iraq, proceeded to enforce the Shamir plan for the so-called peace process. He then granted Rabin the \$10 billion dollars needed to accomplish the settlement program he adopted. Mr. Bush was adamant at enforcing a no-fly zone in Southern Iraq, lest Saddam Hussein attack or molest the Shiites of Southern Iraq, and bombed Baghdad, jointly with his British and French allies. He did not give a thought to the Shiites of Southern Lebanon, who were left open practice targets for Israeli bombers. Why, pray, are the Shiites of South Iraq so deserving, unlike the

Shiites of South Lebanon?

The new Clinton Administration, packed with AIPAC recruits and ardent Israel supporters is overlooking even the half-hearted pretence of the impartial sponsor of the peace process and arbiter.

It is true, the U.S. condemned Israeli expulsion of the 400 Palestinians and supported security council resolution #799, calling on Israel to allow the immediate safe return of those expelled to their homes. However, this resolution, like all its predecessors, against Israel, was obviously meant for the books only. The U.S.-Israeli dictionary now defines immediate to mean one year and the enforcement of one quarter of a Security Council Resolution as a positive action and a generous contribution by Israel. Apparently, Security Council resolutions no longer require implementation. Messrs Clinton and Christopher, and Mr. Mulroney for that matter, tell us that "no one can tell Israel what is best for its national security". Are you surprised? Israel is the only country in the world, apart from the U.S. of course, which has the unique right to take whatever action it deems appropriate for its security, regardless of international law and the U.N. Charter.

Having seen the actions of Rabin, the dove, and the so-called even-handed policies of Mr. Bush and the newcomer president Clinton, how about the policies and actions of our own Palestinian and Arab leaders, with regards to this so-called peace process?

If there is to be peace, there has to be compliance with international law and justice. Israel's continuing intransigence is not a recipe for peace, but for continuing conflict. Similarly, the continuing escalation of concessions that the Palestinians and the Arabs are continuing to accept will not satisfy Israel but will simply wet its appetite for more concessions. The Arab and Palestinian leaders are fulfilling the dictum that Henry Kissinger, who is not known for his attachment to the principles of justice or morality in the conduct of international affairs, stated, with Anwar Sadat in mind, in the mid seventies: "Those who negotiate for peace without power will have the terms of peace dictated to them". This is a concept the Arab leaders have failed to understand because they have failed to understand the true meaning of the Zionist ideology, based on expansionism, exclusivism and racism.

The current peace - process, in its current formulation, is tailored to Israeli designs and those of its U.S. sponsors. Rabin's designs for the solution of the Arab - Israeli conflict are strategically identical with Shamir's, though the words may sound less harsh and more adept to U.S. hypocritical political dialogue. They include:

1. Peace with Israel's Arab neighbours, on Israel's own terms, maintaining occupation of Arab land and Israel's unchallenged military and technological superiority and

increasing development of chemical, nuclear and microbiological weaponry.

2. Full commercial relations with the Arab regimes, in which oil-money will pay for Israel's technological supremacy and economic needs.
 3. Palestinian "autonomy" in the West Bank and Gaza, entitling the Palestinians to collect their garbage, as well as Israel's along with some control over municipal affairs. They will be denied any real control over their land and water resources. The creation of Jewish settlements will continue unimpeded, though with a new name, and funded naturally by American tax payers. The "autonomy of a POW camp", as Danny Rubinstein described it, or an Apartheid system of the Bantustan style.
 4. Final and complete exclusion of the Palestinian refugees, in the diaspora, denying them their inalienable right to return to their homes.
 5. Annulment of the P.L.O. as the sole and legitimate representative of the Palestinian people.
 6. The right of self determination and the right of return for the Palestinians are not for discussion.
-

7. Jerusalem, including Arab Jerusalem, is Israel's eternal capital.

Israel has already achieved most of its objectives:

1. It has already forced the Arab countries to negotiate directly and separately, contrary to repeated Arab assertions in the past.
 2. It has excluded the U.N., because it has no intention to comply with the U.N. Charter or its resolutions.
 3. It has excluded the Palestinians in the diaspora and thus their right of return.
 4. It has excluded Jerusalem and its Arab residents from the agenda of discussion.
 5. Settlements continue to be built and 70% of the land of the West Bank has been expropriated. Yet, we hear of Palestinian Delegation calls for cessation of new settlement but, amazingly, not dismantlement of ALL settlements.
 6. The P.L.O. has been excluded and by its own agreement. The exclusion of Mr. Sanbar from the Multilateral Conference on
-

Refugees in Ottawa and the suspension of Mohammed Hallaj's membership in the P.N.C. are admissions of this exclusion.

7. Israel's recognition by scores of Asian and African nations has completed the cycle of Israeli legitimization, as a result of the P.L.O.'s recognition of Israel's right to exist. After all, these nations could not be more Palestinian than the Palestinians.

Golda Meir said after the 1967 war that she will be looking forward to the day when she will go shopping in Cairo and Damascus. Mr. Rabin can certainly go and shop in Cairo today and will be, before long, shopping in Amman, Damascus and Riyadh.

Abba Eban said in 1968:

"If you imagine railway communications running from Haifa to Beirut, Damascus and Istanbul in the north, to Amman and beyond in the east and traffic resumed on the Haifa-Cairo line, you can see at once that trade and commerce of the area, as well as its cultural interchange, would be strengthened beyond measure. Similarly, resumption and expansion of road communications between Cairo, Jerusalem and Beirut and between Haifa and Baghdad would stimulate the life and commerce of the Middle East above any level so far attained.

In the context of a peace settlement there would be no justification for portraying the southern part of Israel as though it were some kind of a 'wedge' between various parts of the Arab world... Indeed, within the context of the settlement which I am here presenting, Israel would regard itself as a bridge, not as a wedge".

This dream is no longer far-fetched and King Hassan of Morocco stated in November, 1977 that he was looking forward to see the day when "Jewish genius and Arab resources could work together for the benefit of mankind"; a virtually identical view of the role Herzl saw for the Arabs as "the hewers of wood and drawers of water".

This is not the peace for which the Palestinian people have long struggled, made tremendous sacrifices and endured massive injustice. This is a sell-out, brought about by the failure of Palestinian and Arab leaders to comprehend fully the true nature of Zionism and the true political power system in the United States. The Palestinian leaders have, for long, craved for the U.S. to talk to them. This became an end in itself. I have heard, in 1978, senior Palestinian leaders willing to recognize Israel, if the U.S. would only talk to them. Ten years later, this was achieved in 1988, in an abject manner, by reading the words as dictated by George Schultz, and in return for nothing. The acceptance of the current peace process, as dictated by Shamir, through James Baker, is a continuation of this desire. Yet, the U.S. has adamantly and continuously asserted the denial of the national rights of the Palestinians.

As to the Arab leaders, they have prostrated themselves at the feet of the U.S., as their protector. The desires of the U.S. became their ultimate goal. their servility, gullibility, and amnesia defy credibility. They have forgotten our history,

culture, achievements and pride. They remain unaware of the orchestrated U.S.-Zionist plan to dominate the Arab world: the pax-Israel-Americana.

I wrote 13 years ago, in 1980, in "Zionism: The Myth and the Reality" what remains true to day, if not even more true, I quote:

The Arab elite today desperately craves a settlement, in any form, because they lack confidence in themselves and their peoples and have no comprehension of a historical depth to conceive a viable alternative solution, other than capitulation to this highly sophisticated racist and expansionist Zionist movement. This alien ideology is presenting the Arab and Muslim people with a menacing threat challenging our faith and values and creating a foreign intrusive wedge in the heart of our land. The challenge MUST be met, or we shall go down in history books as a forgotten worthless nation.

Today, as I write this, the question is raised will the Palestinian and Arab leaders agree to return to the Washington Peace Conference on April 20? I do not think you need to be a prophet to answer in the affirmative. Husni Mubarek has already received the orders in Washington 2 days ago and the instruction will go to Tunis and they will all be trotting to Washington. Yes, they will be handed a few crumbs off the Israeli table, like having Feisel Husseini to lead the Palestinian delegation and similar irrelevancies.

The proposed "autonomy" and the "interim arrangement" legitimize Israeli occupation and should not be accepted as the subject of negotiation. The only topic for discussion, if there has to be any, must be termination of Israel's illegal occupation and the assumption of the Palestinians' inalienable right of self

determination on their own land. Anything less than that is a travesty and the Palestinians must not accept to be a party to it.

It was Dr. Frank Epp, who wrote twenty years ago:

"Rarely has a people suffered so much injustice so passively for so long, waiting for the powers-that-be to redress the inflicted wrong."

Similarly, it was the distinguished philosopher Lord Bertrand Russell who stated addressing an international conference, in 1970, the following:

"The tragedy of the people of Palestine is that their country was 'given' by a foreign power to another people for the creation of a new state. The result was that many hundreds of thousands of innocent people were made permanently homeless. With every new conflict their numbers increased. How much longer is the world willing to endure this spectacle of wanton cruelty? It is abundantly clear that the refugees have every right to the homeland from which they were driven, and the denial of this right is at the heart of the continuing conflict. No people anywhere in the world would accept being expelled en masse from their country; how can anyone require the people of Palestine to accept a punishment which nobody else would tolerate? A permanent just settlement of the refugees in their homeland is an essential ingredient of any genuine settlement in the Middle East."

It is true, my friends, that the Palestinian people have endured so much wrong and injustice but I assure you that the Palestinian people's tenacity is unyielding. Our people are willing to struggle and sacrifice and you cannot defeat

a people with this tenacity, when a child turns his little hand into a fist, with a stone, that defies the oppressor. The oppressed people of South Africa were able to teach F.W. de Klerk a lesson that had made Mr. de Klerk declare that the book on Apartheid is closed. I am afraid the book on the Zionist ideology is not yet closed but I can assure you that Zionism, like Apartheid, is running against the natural course of history and I am optimistic that right will overcome wrong. I am also optimistic because there are Jewish voices who are speaking out. The late great Jewish journalist, I.F. Stone, wrote a few years ago:

"How can we talk of human rights and ignore them for the Palestinians? How can Israel talk of Jewish rights to a homeland and deny one to the Palestinians?"

Similarly, Professor Israel Shahak Chairman of the Israeli League for Civil and Human Rights said:

"The majority of the Israeli public are shutting their eyes to the simple human cry of the Palestinian."

He warned his people "not to allow the experience of the German people between the two worlds to befall them. I am not afraid to say publicly that Israeli Jews and with them most Jews throughout the world, are undergoing a process of Nazification". He went on to state that he is saying this:

"so that no one can say as the German people did, 'I did not know'. And like Albert Speer, I am trying to act before it is too late."

This is the kind of authentic Jewish voice that I am happy to say gives me hope that, in time, there will be more people like I. F. Stone, Israel Shahak, Felicia Langer, Lea Tsemel and other great Jewish men and women of conscience. For if the other voice, the voice which has come to dominate Israel and Zionist thinking, arrogant with power which thinks only of territorial expansion and practises discrimination and terror, the voice of Ariel Sharon, Yitzhak Shamir and Yitzhak Rabin, if that voice should continue to speak for Israel, then Israel will bring, I am afraid, tragedy on herself and the Palestinians and very likely on the rest of the world.

The Palestinian people, I repeat, are calling for a modicum of justice, for without this modicum of justice, I am afraid, there will be no peace for Arab or Jew in the Middle East. Failing this, the struggle must and will continue and I am sure that right will triumph over wrong and we shall overcome.

