



# **ZIONISM and RACISM**

## **— a Case to Answer**

*Published by*

**EURABIA**

**(The European Co-ordinating Committee of Friendship  
Societies with the Arab World)**

16, rue Augereau, 75007 Paris

## CONTENTS

The UN Resolution
Questions of Fact
A State founded on Zionism
A Country of Double Standards
Discrimination regarding Immigration and Citizenship
Discrimination regarding Land
Israeli Settlements
Discrimination against Arab Civilians in the Occupied Territories
Discrimination in the Civil Service and in Parliamentary Representation
Discrimination in Municipal Finance
Discrimination in Social Services
Discrimination in Education
Racist Attitudes among Israeli Jews
A land without people?
A State founded on Racism
Cause and Effect
Zionism, anti-Zionism and anti-Semitism
Appendix I: Text of the UN Resolution
Appendix II: Israeli Testimony regarding Racism in Israel

### O

*"They (the Zionist Commission) seek not justice . . . but that in every question in which a Jew is interested discrimination in his favour shall be shown."*

General Sir Louis Bols, Chief Administrator of Palestine,  
reporting on the activities of the Zionist Commission in 1920.

*"There is no Zionist settlement, and there is no Jewish State, without displacing Arabs and without confiscating lands and fencing them off."*

Yeshaayahu Ben-Porat,  
*Yediot Aharonot*, 14 July 1972

## The UN Resolution

There was much ill-informed talk about Zionism - not least by the distinguished representative of the United States - in the course of the recent debate at the UN on the resolution equating Zionism with racism (for the text, see Appendix I). It is of course possible to prove or disprove almost any proposition if you define it in terms to suit your case. Yigal Allon, the Foreign Minister of Israel, recently asserted that Zionism is in reality merely "a modern expression of Judaism", "an ideal", "a concept of life" (*Europa*, 4 November 1975). If you accept that it is that and nothing more, then at once criticism is disarmed. Those who persist in attacking such an innocuous idea can be dismissed as anti-Semites; and the charge of racism can be thrown back on their heads.

It is perfectly true that Zionism may mean different things to different people. For some it may genuinely have been no more than the ideal of which Yigal Allon spoke. But for others - and these include the leaders of the Zionist Movement and those who have been in charge in Israel since its creation in 1948 - Zionism has been much more a political aim than a spiritual concept, an ideology rather than an ideal. Just because it happens to suit their tactics in the controversy over the UN resolution, they cannot reasonably demand that others should judge Zionism in terms of an abstract ideal, while they themselves treat it as a motive and a justification for political action. For example, at the 23rd World Zionist Congress held in Jerusalem in 1951 (the first such congress to be held after the establishment of the state of Israel) a programme was adopted which began by saying:-

"The task of Zionism is the consolidation of the state of Israel" . . . That is a plainly political purpose which identifies Zionism with Israel and which means that Zionism ought to be judged as a political phenomenon, even though it may claim to have a cultural and spiritual content as well.

In New York the sponsors of the resolution made it perfectly clear that what they were talking about was not Zionism in the abstract but Zionism in its practical effect - Zionism as it has worked out on the ground in Israel. They were not discussing what Zionism is or thinks it is—that may indeed be arguable—but what it does, particularly what it has done to the Arab people of Palestine. It was not Zionism in its intention - who can now say what precisely men meant fifty years or more ago? - but Zionism in its result that they were condemning "as a form of racism and racial discrimination."

On these grounds there is certainly a case to answer. It is unworthy of the United States for its Ambassador at the UN to refuse to look the facts in the face and simply to try to silence criticism of Zionism by calling it "obscene" and "infamous." That is

no way to answer a serious charge or conduct a serious discussion.

One further clarification is required at the outset of the discussion. The question at issue is not whether it was good tactics for the Arab states to raise at the UN the charge of racism against Zionism; nor whether this has served or hindered the search for peace. Those are arguable matters, but they are not here the subject of discussion. This paper is simply concerned with whether the charge is true in fact.

### **Questions of Fact**

There are three factual questions involved. First, is Israel the manifestation or embodiment of Zionism in practice? Presumably it is, since Zionists in Israel and elsewhere boast that Israel is precisely that. Second, is racism prevalent in Israel? There is abundant and irrefutable evidence to show that it is, and this is attested to by Israelis who deserve credence. Third, does this racism derive from the ideology of political Zionism? To the million and a half Palestinians who have been deprived of their homes and prevented from returning to their native land *because they are Arabs and not Jews*, the answer to this question may seem self-evident. To others - once they address themselves to the facts and cease merely reacting with outrage and incomprehension to criticism they have not tried to understand - this is the one question about which there may be room for argument and discussion.

### **A State founded on Zionism**

No sensible person would suggest that every Zionist, since the days of Herzl, consciously wished the kind of state Israel has now become. In the late nineteenth century, many Jews believed that a regeneration of the Jewish people should be linked with the establishment of a spiritual centre for Judaism in Palestine. That was an understandable and not ignoble reaction to a European situation in which Jews were sporadically persecuted and frequently the victims of discrimination. At the same time, most of the leaders among the early Zionists were not religious Jews (Herzl, for example) and, from the beginning, many of them behaved in a typical nineteenth-century colonial-settler style.

Early testimony to the colonialist attitude of Jewish settlers in Palestine was given by Asher Ginzberg, who wrote under the name of Ahad Ha'am (in Hebrew, "One of the People"). In 1891, this celebrated Jewish thinker visited Palestine. He recognised that the Arab community, Christian and Moslem, constituted more than nine tenths of the population, and that the establishment of good relations with the Palestinian Arab population should be the first

step in any project for Jewish settlement. In "The Truth from Palestine," he asked whether the Jewish settlers were seeking good relations:

"Just the very opposite!! Serfs they were in the lands of the Diaspora and suddenly they find themselves in freedom, and this change has awakened in them an inclination to despotism. They treat the Arabs with hostility and cruelty, deprive them of their rights, offend them without cause, and even boast of their deeds: and nobody among us opposes this despicable and dangerous inclination."

Israel today claims to be the embodiment of the Zionist ideal. Is it in fact behaving differently from the Jewish settlers to whom Ahad Ha'am referred, or has it institutionalized the racist despotism which he then discerned?

What is now at issue is the practical manifestation of Zionism as it has evolved in the existing state of Israel. That state describes itself as Zionist. It was founded and is governed by men and women who call themselves Zionists. They profess to be carrying out the purposes of Zionism. They are supported throughout the world by organisations which describe themselves as Zionist. The charge of racism against Zionism must be examined in the context of the Zionist state as it exists today.

### **A Country of Double Standards**

Zionist Israel is a country of double standards, one for Israeli Jews and another for Palestinian Arabs. Differentiation in favour of Jews and against non-Jews is built into the fabric of government and society. This sort of differential treatment is the essence of racial discrimination. For example, in Britain the Race Relations Act of 1968 provides that "a person discriminates against another if on the ground of colour, race or ethnic or national origins he treats that other ... less favourably than he treats or would treat other persons."

In summary, the nature and extent of racial discrimination which is built into the administrative and social framework of the Zionist state of Israel are these:-

- (1) An Arab living under Israeli rule in Israel may be arbitrarily excluded from land which he and his forbears have owned for generations. He may have his land confiscated and handed over to Jewish settlers. He may then be prohibited from even working on that land. His whole village may be razed to the ground. (385 Arab villages in Israel have been wiped out in this way). He and his whole community may suffer gross discrimination in housing, municipal services, education and social welfare.

He may be refused nationality and citizenship even though he was born in the territory of Israel and has lived there all his life and even though any Jewish newcomer from anywhere in the world automatically receives Israeli nationality. (Thousands of Palestinian Arabs are in this stateless condition in Israel).

- (2) An Arab living under Israeli rule in the occupied territories may be arrested arbitrarily and detained without trial. He may be deported *from his native land* without judicial process or appeal. His home may be blown up or bulldozed on a simple order from the local military commander. His land may be confiscated for ostensibly military purposes, but in fact for the purpose of Israeli Jewish colonisation. His freedom of movement may be restricted. He cannot express political opinions or engage in political activities without risk of arrest and detention or deportation.
- (3) An Arab refugee living in exile whose home is in Israel or the occupied territories and who was uprooted from it in the wars of 1948 and 1967 is prevented from returning home *because he is an Arab and not a Jew* - and this in spite of repeated UN resolutions calling on Israel to allow him to return. Meanwhile any Jew is free to enter and settle in Israel, even though he has never seen the country before in his life.

The way in which this racial discrimination works in Israel and the occupied territories was well described at the UN by Mr. Clarence Mitchell, a colleague of Ambassador Moynihan in the U.S. delegation. On 28 November 1975 he said "while there is abundant evidence of repressive acts by those who enforce the law in the country, it must be remembered that what these officials do is sanctioned by law instead of being prohibited." He went on to explain that "the judiciary had no constitutional basis on which to protect the individual's internationally recognised human rights such as freedom of movement, freedom of expression, freedom from arbitrary arrest and detention, and freedom from discrimination on the basis of race." (*The Times* (London), 29 November 1975).

Mr. Mitchell was in fact speaking about *apartheid* in South Africa. But his remarks aptly describe how racism operates in Israel too. Repression is legalised and then Israeli officials simply apply the law - but against Arabs and virtually never against Jews.

### **Discrimination regarding Immigration and Citizenship**

The first and crucial area of discrimination between Jews and Arabs in Israel is in regard to the basic rights of entry into the

country and acquisition of citizenship. The notorious Law of Return admits into Israel any Jewish immigrant, wherever he may have been born, and automatically confers Israeli nationality on him. But there is also an unwritten "Law of Non-Return". Arabs born in the territory of Israel, who were uprooted from their homes by war, are denied the right to return - in defiance of repeated UN resolutions calling on Israel to allow them to do so.

The discrimination here involved is epitomised in a remark by a Palestinian lawyer, Ahmed Khalil, now living in Amman, which was quoted by *The Guardian* (London) on 22 December, 1973:-

"I was born in Haifa, and so was my father and my grandfather. Now I am a refugee. Golda Meir was born in Russia, educated in America and now she is Prime Minister of my country. I studied law with Abba Eban at Cambridge. He was born in South Africa and educated in England. Now he lives in my country and I can't."

Even those Palestinian Arabs who remained in their own land were not granted citizenship as of right but had to apply for naturalisation for which they had to satisfy certain stringent requirements. The Law of Nationality has deprived many thousands of Arabs still living in Israel of the right of citizenship and has rendered their children "stateless".

A non-Jew living in Israel is considered as a citizen only if (1) he was registered under the Registration of Inhabitants Ordinance at 1st March, 1952, and (2) he was living in Israel on 1st April, 1952, and (3) he was living in Israel or in an area which subsequently became Israeli territory from the date of the establishment of Israel (29 November, 1947) up to 1st April, 1952.

Many Arab inhabitants of Israel never registered during the first years of the State's existence, very often because of difficulties created by the military authorities. Many more are denied Israeli citizenship because they were, for example, studying outside Israel on the day the Law of Nationality came into force. Others have been refused citizenship on the grounds that they were living outside the borders of Israel at the date of the establishment of the State even though the areas where they were living were later incorporated into Israel.

More outrageous still, the children of such parents are born "stateless" and, like their parents, have no right to a passport. The Ministry of the Interior refers to them as "foreign citizens" without, of course, saying whose citizens they are supposed to be! Since 1968, and only since 1968, these unfortunate people, whose ancestors may have lived in Palestine for generations, have been allowed to apply for Israeli citizenship between the age of 18 and 21, provided they have lived in Israel for five consecutive years. Needless to say, the

Israeli authorities do nothing to notify them of this "privilege." Their parents are expected to apply for naturalisation which is dependent on the will of the Ministry of the Interior, even if they fulfil the other conditions. Most Arab applicants are refused citizenship. Their status as "permanent residents" then allows them to travel outside Israel only for the strictly limited period of one year and one day. If they overstay this period, they may never be allowed back.

### **Discrimination regarding Land**

The second area in which the Israeli authorities most evidently practise discrimination between Jewish and Arab citizens of Israel is in the matter of the ownership and use of land. Three quarters of the land in Israel is owned by the State and a further 14 per cent by the Jewish National Fund, which the State has authorised as "the exclusive instrument for the development of Israel lands". Land controlled by the JNF is declared to be "the inalienable property of the Jewish people" and the JNF is precluded by its own constitution from selling or leasing any part of this land to non-Jews or even allowing such non-Jews (i.e. Palestinians) to work on it.

Regarding the effect of the Zionist land alienation rules, Sir John Hope Simpson, in his elaborate report to the British government in 1929 on the situation in Palestine, observed that:

"The result of the purchase of land in Palestine by the Jewish National Fund has been that land has been extra-territorialised. It ceases to be land from which the Arab can gain any advantage now or in the future. Not only can he never hope to lease or to cultivate it, but by the stringent provisions of the lease of the Jewish National Fund, he is deprived forever from employment on that land. The land is in mort-main and inalienable. It is for this reason that Arabs discount the professions of friendship and good will on the part of the Zionists in view of the policy which the Zionist Organisation deliberately adopted."

Theoretically, it is still illegal for any but Jewish labour to be employed on this land—although in practice Arabs are widely, if surreptitiously, employed in menial capacities by the Jewish administrators of State and JNF land. Kibbutzim and moshavim (co-operative settlements) have on occasion been taken to court and penalised for employing Arab labour. Thus non-Jews (and this is the official term by which the 500,000 Palestinian Arabs still resident in Israel are designated) are excluded by Israeli law from owning or leasing or even working on 89 per cent of the land in the country in which they live and (unlike many of their Jewish fellow-citizens) have always lived. Nor do these provisions apply only to the Israeli countryside. There is the town of Carmiel—a suburb of Haifa—in

which residence is restricted to Jews; Arabs are not allowed to live or work there. (What would Jews say if certain areas in Western countries were formally and by law closed to them?) On the other hand, extreme measures have been taken to render uninhabitable areas where Arabs have been living. No less than 385 Arab villages in Israel have been destroyed by the Israeli authorities.

The Palestinian Arab living in Israel is subject to a series of confiscatory land laws that may deprive him completely of his rights to land that may have been owned and occupied by his family for generations. It is a "Catch 22" situation where the Arab landowner cannot win and the Zionist land-grabber cannot lose. There is the Law on the Acquisition of Absentees' Property enacted in 1950. The effect was to cause the confiscation of the property not only of Palestinian Arab refugees living outside Israel but also of Palestinian Arabs *still living in Israel* who left their property temporarily in 1948 in order to escape from the fighting. In 1951 a Member of the Knesset said:-

"This law is a symbol; it is an expression of the discrimination practised against the Arabs of this country....By virtue of the provisions of this law, thousands of the Arab inhabitants of Israel are regarded as absentees and are deprived of their rights to legally dispose of their property. This law does not allow them to enjoy their rights to their lands and their homes and they are quite unjustifiably regarded as 'absentees'.

The main function of the Custodian of Absentees' Property is to steal more and more . . . . "

(Knesset Debates, 16 January 1951).

Then there is Article 125 of the Defence Law (State of Emergency) which authorises the military authorities to declare "closed areas." This has been used to prevent Arabs from returning to their land when it has been earmarked for Jewish settlement. There are the Emergency Laws (Security Areas) which enable the Minister of Defence to declare "protected" and "security" areas and then to expel the Arab inhabitants from them. There are the Emergency Articles for the Exploitation of Uncultivated Lands which have been used to hand over to nearby Jewish colonies land from which the Arab owners have been excluded and which they have been prevented from cultivating. There is the Law for the Requisitioning of Land in times of Emergency which allows the government to "requisition" Arab lands under the pretext of security and national defence. The Law for the Acquisition of Land (Operations and Compensation) then authorises the irrevocable transfer of requisitioned land to the State.

Other laws deny Arabs any share in Jewish-owned land. There is the Agricultural Settlement Law (Restrictions on the Use of Agricultural Land and of Water). Its ostensible purpose is to ensure

efficient cultivation but the real effect is to prevent Jewish occupants from sharing their land in any manner with the local Arab inhabitants. It was described by Uri Avnery in the Knesset as a "Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde Law" designed to expel Arab cultivators from "land that was confiscated and handed over through favouritism to Jews who then leased it back to the Arabs who have thus become its cultivators." Another Member of the Knesset commented:-

"The official blue paper, the language of law and justice . . . takes care not to refer in black and white to the racism and national discrimination that the enforcement of this law will lead to. This law is not intended to serve agricultural planning, or the principle that the owner should work his own land. The bitter truth that many are trying to evade or conceal is that this law is really intended to prevent Arab labourers from working on land that is called "land of the nation," "redeemed land," to use the terminology of experts in the eviction of Arab farmers from the land."

(Knesset Debates, 31 October 1966).

The case of the Arab Christian villages of Bir'em and Ikrit, which culminated in the Israeli Army destroying all the houses in the two villages in order to circumvent a Supreme Court decision which would have allowed the villagers to return when their villages were no longer in a specifically designated military area, aroused considerable criticism of the Government from Israeli Jews as well as Arabs. One Israeli Jew, not wholly unsympathetic to the villagers, put it like this:-

"Here, in the wish of the Arabs to return to their land, is the crux of the conflict with the Arabs. This point basically denies the Zionist principle.

" . . . We must say to the people of Bir'em and Ikrit and to many Arabs who were driven from their lands: 'We are ready to help you in everything so that you can rebuild your lives, either in another place inside the boundaries of Israel or outside them. But to return to your land means, from our point of view, the destruction of Zionist theory. We must not in any way agree to that'."

Mr. Shimon Peres, now Minister of Defence, was less sentimental: "The use of Defence (Emergency) Regulation 125 (i.e. the legislation by which Arab land is most frequently expropriated) is a direct continuation of the struggle for Jewish settlement and Jewish immigration."

### **Israeli Settlements**

With regard to the Israeli practice of planting exclusively Jewish settlements in the occupied territories, the American international

lawyer, Professor W. T. Mallison of George Washington University, has pointed out that these infringe Article 49(6) of the Geneva Convention concerning civilians living under enemy occupation, which provides that: "The Occupying Power shall not deport or transfer parts of its own civilian population into territory it occupies." He goes on to comment:-

"The negotiating history of this provision shows that it was adopted in reaction to the notorious Nazi practice of removing the "inferior" indigenous population and transferring racial "aryans" or Germans into the territory. It is a prohibition upon "creating facts" in occupied territory by the establishment of colonies comprised of the occupant's nationals."

The seizure of Arab land in the occupied territories for the establishment of these Israeli Jewish colonies is a racist act. Racial discrimination may then ensue in the treatment of the dispossessed Arab land-owners. For example, in order to carry out General Dayan's grandiose scheme to house a quarter of a million Israeli Jews on Egyptian territory at Yamit in the Rafah Approaches (Pithat Rafiah), 1,500 Beduin families were ejected from their land and 33,000 acres were seized. According to the Israeli writer Amnon Kapeliouk (*Le Monde*, 15 May 1975), Israeli soldiers "drove off some ten thousand farmers and bedouin, bulldozed or dynamited their houses, pulled down their tents, destroyed their crops and filled in their wells." The "compensation" initially offered to the evicted Beduin amounted to about five dollars (US) a head. But later, as a result of protests and public pressure by Israeli critics of Dayan's policies, the military authorities were compelled to undertake a rehabilitation programme for some of them (about one fifth of those evicted). This took the form of resettling them alongside one of the Israeli settlements in the area, the Kibbutz Kerem Shalom. Oded Lifshitz, writing in *New Outlook* of December 1975, comments:-

"The plan itself allots each family 5 dunams of land, of which only two are irrigated, and 1000 cu. meters of water a year. The plan does not include housing for those evicted. To compare: a moshav family in the Pitha receives 25 dunams of land, 10 - 17,000 cu. meters of water, chicken houses, orchards, and other sources of income.

Even if we believe that a Bedouin family can succeed in building a farm on a professional level equal to the area's Jewish farms, the Bedouin family's income level would still be between one-tenth and one-twentieth of a Jewish family's."

### **Discrimination against Arab Civilians in the Occupied Territories**

The Emergency Regulations, which have already been mentioned as an instrument of Zionist land acquisition, are also a

most effective legal weapon in the oppressive and discriminatory treatment of Arabs in Israel and occupied territories. These regulations were inherited from the British Mandate Administration which first introduced them in order to cope with the Arab Rebellion in the 1930s. Later when these regulations were used against Jewish terrorists, a leading Jewish lawyer in Palestine, Mr. J. Shapira, declared that "not even in Nazi Germany did such laws exist". Afterwards he became Minister of Justice in Israel and applied the self-same regulations to Arabs in Israel and the occupied territories. On only one occasion were they applied against Jews—there was an immediate outcry and those involved were at once released.

These Emergency Regulations are the basis for confining Arabs to particular villages or districts (so that they have to get permission to travel), for applying curfews, for closing schools and for detaining Arabs without trial. They are applied in the occupied territories as "sanction" for the blowing up of Arab houses and the forced deportation of Arabs from their native land, in explicit contravention of the IVth Geneva Convention.

As Dr. Israel Shahak, Chairman of the Israeli League for Human and Civil Rights, wrote in a foreword to the book *With My Own Eyes* in which the Israeli lawyer, Felicia Langer, describes her experiences in defending Palestinians:

"Israeli practices in the conquered territories grew naturally from the discriminatory laws and practices of the State of Israel itself."

### **Discrimination in the Civil Service and in Parliamentary Representation.**

The extremely meagre representation of Arabs in Israeli Ministries is indicative of the Zionist resolve to exclude Arabs from positions in which they could play an effective part in determining policy. Bearing in mind the fact that the Arabs in Israel represent about one sixth of the total population, the following figures from the Israel Year Book of 1971 are revealing:

Office	Total number of Officials	Arab Officials
1) President's Office	10	0
2) Prime Minister's Office	148	0
3) Treasury	206	2
4) Service Superintendent	19	0
5) Education and Culture	104	0
6) Agriculture	74	0
7) Trade and Industry	97	0

8) Justice	108	0
9) Social Help	59	0
10) Work	197	1
11) Social Security	40	0
12) Home Affairs	82	2
13) Development	36	0
14) Communication	75	0
15) Tourism	69	0
16) State Account Office	75	0
17) Bank of Israel	41	0
18) Health	86	2
19) Post	62	0
20) Foreign Affairs	82	0
	<u>1,622</u>	<u>7</u>

As for the representation of the Arab population in the Knesset, Mrs. Shulamit Aloni, a member of the Knesset and leader of the Civil Rights Movement, wrote in *Yediot Aharonot* on 10 October, 1975:

"It is no secret that the Knesset Members from the minorities do not represent the interests of the Arab public in Israel. In reality they represent only the apparatus of the Arab section of the Israeli Labour Party."

### **Discrimination in Municipal Finance**

In her article, which has already been quoted above, published in *Yediot Aharonot* of 10 October 1975 under the title "The Ministry of the Interior discriminates against Arab localities", Mrs Shulamit Aloni wrote:

"A comparative analysis of the budget of the local municipalities for the year of 1974-75 in the Jewish and Arab sectors demonstrates clearly gross discrimination against the Arab sector . . . Before we analyse the figures, it should be remembered that the levy of taxes by the local municipalities constitutes approximately 15 per cent of their general budget, usually less."

(The point of the comment about local taxation is to show that these municipalities are primarily dependent on grants from the Ministry of the Interior).

Mrs. Aloni then went on to quote the following figures:

Locality	No. of Inhabitants	Ordinary Budget in IL	Budget per Capita per annum in IL
Shafa'amr (Arab)	15,000	3,900,000	213 approx.
Kufr Kana (Arab)	7,000	1,225,000	140.50
Azatah (Jewish)	5,500	17,000,000	3,100
Daliyat al-Karmil (Arab)	7,000	1,650,000	235.75
Migdal ha-Emek (Jewish)	12,000	15,107,539	1,220 "

### **Discrimination in Social Services**

Discrimination has been cleverly built into the administration of social benefits. For example a system of cash grants for discharged soldiers and their families is being used to subsidise Jewish families, while virtually all Arab Israeli citizens are by definition ineligible. In the Knesset Uri Avnery commented:-

"The intention is to encourage births among one part of the population of Israel and to effect the opposite among the other part, to pay grants to the hungry children of one part of the population and withhold them from the hungry children of another part, the distinction—it is obscure but quite obvious to anyone who knows the facts—being an ethnic one . . ."

(Knesset Debates, 14 July 1970).

### **Discrimination in Education**

Education is firmly linked to the ideology of the Zionist state. Educational statistics distinguish between Jewish and non-Jewish education with, of course, a vastly disproportionate expenditure between the two. This becomes particularly noticeable in higher education; out of a total student population of 37,343 in 1969/70 in all Israeli higher academic institutions, the total Arab student population was a mere 700.

It is perhaps surprising that there were even as many as that, since Uri Jubrani, former Special Counsellor on Arab Affairs to the Prime Minister, had explained:

"It would perhaps be better if there were no Arab students, but there are things which do not depend on us. We can't avoid them but we must do what we can to reduce the inconvenience."

Arab students in the humanities spend more time studying Jewish history than Arab history, have to learn Hebrew and study Jewish literature, while Jewish students have a minimal course in Arab history, learn no Arabic and study no Arab literature. The exception to this rule is revealing. The "Orientalist Stream" which exists in a very limited number of Jewish secondary schools was

created largely to satisfy the Army's urgent need for Arabic speakers. A senior Intelligence officer is now posted to every such school. His task is to nurture among the students "an awareness for Middle East affairs" assisted by written material specially prepared by the Intelligence Department. Such is the all-embracing corruption imposed by a racist philosophy in Israel—in sad contrast to the great traditions of Jewish scholarship.

### **Racist Attitudes among Israeli Jews**

No one familiar with the attitudes of Israeli citizens, as revealed in their press and other news media and in their day-to-day conduct, could deny that they often reveal an extreme contempt and hostility towards the Arabs, particularly the Palestinians. What could be more racist than Mrs. Golda Meir's attitude towards them, expressed in her notorious assertion that "There was no such thing as Palestinians...They did not exist"?

*(Sunday Times (London) 15 June 1969)*

Such an attitude of contempt for the Arabs was a characteristic of the early Zionists, too. Theodor Herzl sought support in Europe for his project by arguing that: "For Europe, we should be in Palestine a sentinel of civilization against barbarism."

Further examples of the anti-Arabism which afflicts so many Israeli Jews today are these:

*The Israeli Army Rabbinate* in its official magazine:

"The Arabs who inhabit this country today are an essentially alien element to it and its fate, and should be dealt with according to the rules which applied to the aliens in Antiquity."

*The Chief Rabbi of Israel's Central Command* in an official booklet issued by the Israeli Defence Force:

"When our forces come across civilians either in the course of war or during a raid, and so long as one cannot be certain that such civilians are incapable of hurting our forces one may and, in keeping with Halacha (Jewish religious law), one must, in fact, kill them."

*Ha'olam Haze, 15 May 1974*

*The Israeli Minister of Agriculture:*

"The preponderance of Arab workers in Jewish agriculture is a cancer in our body."

*Ma'ariv, 3 July 1975*

*A young Israeli farmer* in a radio programme when asked if he would be prepared to live in the same way as the Arab farm labourers whom he employed:

"No, I wouldn't be prepared to live in such conditions, even if someone paid me, 200 pounds a day. I just can't live like that."

I have needs. I need to rest—to drink coffee and watch television. Yes, and also a glass of cold beer now and then. That's what I need. But they—they don't care. They are used to it . . . They always lived like that."

(*Khotam*, the weekly supplement of *Al Hamishar*, 15 August 1975)

Dr. *Hisrael Eldad*, a prominent Israeli Zionist:

"Israel is the Jews' land—not a land of Jews. It may one time have been a land of Arabs, but it was never an Arab land. *Israel was the Jews' land even when no Jews resided in it.* It was never the Arabs' land even when virtually all its inhabitants were Arab. Israel belongs to four million Russian Jews despite the fact that they were not born here. It is the land of nine million other Jews throughout the world even if they have no present plans to live in it."

*The Times of Israel*, 29 August 1969

*David Ben Gurion*, writing in his diary before the outbreak of the conflict in 1947:

"The Achilles heel of the Arab coalition is the Lebanon. Muslim supremacy in this country is artificial and can easily be overthrown. A Christian State ought to be set up there, with its southern frontier on the river Litani. We would sign a treaty of alliance with this state. Thus when we have broken the strength of the Arab Legion and bombed Amman, we could wipe out Transjordan; after that Syria would fall. And if Egypt still dared to make war on us, we would bomb Port Said, Alexandria and Cairo. We should thus end the war and would have put paid to Egypt, Assyria and Chaldea on behalf of our ancestors."

*Diary*, 21 May 1947

Dr. *David Hacohen*, Chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the Knesset, of whom a British Member of Parliament told this story in the House of Commons:

"Six weeks after that war (June 1967) six hon. Members of this House, three from each side, including myself, went to Israel and to Jordan as the guests of those countries. There was a horrifying moment for me. We were all present as guests at lunch of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the Knesset in Jerusalem. After lunch the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the Knesset spoke with great intemperance and at great length to us about the Arabs. When he drew breath I was constrained to say, 'Dr. Hacohen, I am profoundly shocked that you should speak of other human beings in terms similar to those in which Julius Streicher spoke of the Jews. Have you learned nothing?' I shall remember his reply to my dying day. He smote the table with both hands and said, 'But they are not

human beings, they are not people, they are Arabs.' He was speaking of the Arab refugees."

From a speech by the Conservative MP,  
Mr. R. J. Maxwell Hyslop, in the House of  
Commons on 18 October, 1973

(The remarks here attributed to Dr. Hacohen have been denied by him. But Mr. Maxwell-Hyslop has confirmed in a letter to the Times (9 Jan. 1976) that they are a verbatim record, which he checked with others present immediately afterwards and of which he kept a copy).

*A Times/Louis Harris opinion poll*, conducted in association with Public Opinion Research of Israel Ltd., in which a selected sample of 1,177 Israeli Jews were asked for their views on various issues affecting their relations with Arabs. The results were published in *Time*, 12 April 1971.

"Some 25 per cent of them, a high enough proportion in all conscience, admitted that prejudice existed against the Arabs. But actual attitudes presented a still darker picture. Some 23 per cent said that they would be bothered if an Arab sat beside them in a restaurant; 26 per cent, if they had to work closely with one; 49 per cent, if an Arab family moved next door; 54 per cent if their children had an Arab teacher; 74 per cent, if their children became close friends with Arabs; and 84 per cent, if a friend or relative were to marry an Arab. Asked whether they agreed with specific statements, the results were:

Statement	Yes	No
Arabs are lazier than Israelis	53%	36%
Arabs are less intelligent than Israelis	74%	19%
Most Arabs have a blind hatred towards Israel	68%	26%
Arabs are more cruel than Israelis	75%	17%
Arabs are not so brave as Israelis	80%	12%
Arabs are more dishonest than Israelis	66%	20%
Arabs are inferior to Israelis	67%	23% "

(*Whose Jerusalem?* by Ronald Segal, p.13)

The contempt and hostility towards Arabs which have been implanted in the minds of Israelis, and which are so strikingly illustrated in Dr. Hacohen's remark: "They are not human beings, they are not people, they are Arabs," are no doubt the root cause for the wanton cruelty which the armed forces of Israel sometimes exhibit in their treatment of Arab lives and property. There was the dastardly and totally unprovoked massacre of unarmed Israeli Arab citizens at Kafr Kassem on 29 October 1956. After the June War the

roads of the West Bank were littered with private cars abandoned by their Arab owners which Israeli soldiers had then pointlessly smashed by driving their tanks over them. There was the unbelievably ghastly action in an Israeli invasion into the Lebanon on 17 September 1972 when an Israeli tank was deliberately driven over an Arab taxi crushing to death the seven occupants, including a woman and two small children. There was the infamous affair at the West Bank village of Akraba in 1972 when an Israeli military aircraft sprayed with poison the crops of Arab farmers who were protesting against the seizure of their lands for an Israeli Jewish settlement. These are but a few items in a sad record of inhumanity which bears out the comment on Kafr Kassem by the Canadian General E. L. M. Burns (who was Chief of Staff of UNTSO at the time): "The spirit that inspired the notorious Deir Yassin massacre in 1948 is not dead among some of the Israeli armed forces."

To their great credit there are Israeli Jews who themselves recognise this ugly side of Israel and have the courage to speak out against it. Appendix II to this paper contains a selection of their statements.

### **A land without people?**

It cannot seriously be argued that the characteristics of the Israeli State described above are not racist. The critics of Zionism maintain that the apparatus of racial discrimination which exists in Israel and has now become institutionalized there derives from the original aim of the Zionist Movement in seeking to establish an exclusively Jewish state in Palestine. It is true that some leading members of the Zionist Movement were prepared to envisage a bi-national state which would accommodate in equality both Jews and Arabs. But they were an ineffectual minority and were brushed aside when the leadership of the Zionist Movement was seized by militants determined to establish a state which would be, if not exclusively, at least overwhelmingly Jewish.

The trouble was that the chosen land was not a *terra nullius*. As Christopher Sykes has remarked: "This was indeed the whole problem of Palestine: it was inhabited." The reaction of the militant Zionists was to insist that the Arab population must be removed to make way for Jewish settlers. This "transfer of Arabs"—that was the euphemism they used—became an article of faith among them. The records of the Congress of the World Council of the United Po'ale Zion held at Zurich in 1937 show that Ben Gurion and his associates were then already determined to bring this "transfer" about, that they were fully prepared to use force to that end and that their only doubts on that score were whether it would be effective, not whether it was morally justified. In 1940, Joseph Weitz, the man whom Ben

Gurion later put in charge of consolidating the Israeli seizure of the lands from which the Arab refugees were uprooted in the conflict of 1947-48, confided to his diary:-

"Among ourselves, it must be clear that there is no place in the country for both peoples together . . . With the Arabs we shall not achieve our aim of being an independent people in this country. The only solution is Eretz-Israel, at least the west part of Eretz-Israel, without Arabs . . . And there is no other way but to transfer the Arabs from here to the neighbouring countries. Transfer all of them, not one village or tribe should remain . . ."

There is ample evidence from Israeli sources\* that when the fighting broke out in Palestine in 1947-48 the Israeli forces pursued a deliberate strategy of seizing as much Arab territory as possible and clearing it of its Arab inhabitants by force and terror. After the end of the fighting, Chaim Weitzmann, who had then become the first President of Israel, made a revealing remark to the US Ambassador to Israel. He said that the exodus of Arab refugees was a "miraculous simplification of Israel's tasks" (James McDonald, *My Mission to Israel*, p.176). This could only mean that the removal of a great mass of Arab people from their homes and land was among the tasks which the Zionist leaders of Israel had set themselves.

### **A State founded on Racism**

To the critics of Zionism this means that the Zionist state of Israel is founded on an act of racial discrimination: one people were to be removed from their native land in order to supplant them there by another. Apart from actual genocide, is there a worse racist crime than this—to take one people's homeland away from them for the benefit of another people? There is a real dilemma here for Zionists and their supporters. If Zionism meant or implied the seizure of Palestine from its Arab inhabitants in order to establish there an exclusively or preponderantly Jewish state, then inescapably it stands convicted of racism. The Arabs were to be evicted or to be reduced to a minority in their own land *because they were Arabs and not Jews*. If on the other hand this is not what Zionism meant, then the Jewish seizure of Palestine is revealed as a naked act of colonialist aggression.

### **Cause and Effect**

The question remains whether the racism which is prevalent in the Zionist state of Israel is inherent in or derives from Zionism or

---

\* See, for example, Yigal Allon, *Ha Sepher Ha Palmach*; Harry Levin, *Jerusalem Embattled*; Ben Gurion, *Rebirth and Destiny of Israel*; Menachem Begin, *The Revolt: Story of the Irgun*; and Nataniel Lorch, *The Edge of the Sword*.

whether it is due to some other cause, such as the emergence of an extreme form of nationalism in Israel or a persecution complex inherited from the past history of the Jewish people or a defensive reaction by a people living in a garrison state surrounded by enemies or the result of anti-Arab indoctrination by Israeli news media and official propaganda. Certainly racism in Israel, as elsewhere, may be the product of a number of different causes. But even so this does not mean that Zionism may not be one of the causes or indeed may not be at the root of other apparent causes.

In practical terms, as the PLO representative in London has pointed out, it does not matter to the Palestinians "whether the racists who usurp our land and oppress our people call themselves Zionists or colonialists or Israeli nationalists. To its victims racism by any other name will smell as foul".

From a different standpoint, the distinguished French orientalist, Professor Maxime Rodinson, himself a Jew, has made a similar point: "When a people is subjected to foreign conquest, the moral wound it receives is in no way alleviated by the spiritual tendencies observable within the conquering group, nor by the motives for the conquest or the aspirations which they express." (*Israel and the Arabs*, Pantheon pp. 219-220).

But even though the practical effect of Israeli racism may be the same whatever its origin, the case against Zionism needs to be examined and answered. Zionists and their supporters cannot expect to have it both ways. They cannot claim on the one hand that Zionism is a benign spiritual concept incapable of causing the evil of racism; and on the other that in Israel racial discrimination is natural, necessary and justifiable because of the unique Zionist character of the State.

The claim to be a Chosen People is a heady notion which, under the influence of bigots and demagogues, may easily degenerate into the mental attitude of a *Herrenvolk*. It may be true that relatively few Zionists in Israel and elsewhere nowadays consciously believe in the concept of the Jews as a people enjoying the special favour and interest of an omnipotent deity. But subconsciously their minds may still have been impregnated with the idea as part of the cultural and religious heritage which they absorbed at an early age. The text-books in use in schools in Israel and, even more, the works of fiction produced for Israeli children to read stress the uniqueness and superiority of the Jewish people in terms which border on racist propaganda. And a people brought up on the Old Testament (as nearly all Israelis are, even if later in life they reject its teaching and regard themselves as irreligious) cannot but be familiar with the concept of *justifiable* racism—that is, racism practised in obedience to the dictates of a jealous god. The Old Testament abounds in examples of conduct which is presented as pious and praiseworthy

on the part of the ancient Israelites but which would be condemned outright as racism by the very different standards of today.

Even in its spiritual and cultural manifestation Zionism was not free from the taint of racial superiority. The liberal Ahad Ha'am, who was later such an outspoken critic of political Zionism and of its attitude towards the Arabs, was attracted by Nietzsche's idea of the superman but saw the Jews as a collective image of the superman:

"There must be one nation whose inherent characteristics make it better fitted than the others of moral development, and whose scheme of life is governed by a moral law superior to the common type of morality, so that it may provide the ideal conditions for the growth of the superman we want."

Ahad Ha'am, *Essays, Letters, Memoirs*  
London: East and West Library, 1946 pp. 76-82.

However benign the intent, this is still racism—"the theory of the hierarchy of races which leads to the obligation to protect the so-called superior race against interbreeding, and to its right to dominate others" (the definition given in the French Petit Robert dictionary).

When political Zionism is implanted in this fertile soil of received ideas of racial superiority and justifiable racism, it is not surprising that Israeli society has developed a high degree of tolerance for racial discrimination provided this can be shown to be serving the purposes of the Zionist idea. In Israel decent men and women, who in their ordinary lives would never dream of robbing their neighbours of their property or driving them from their homes, are prepared to tolerate, applaud and even themselves commit precisely such acts of inhumanity when undertaken in the sacred cause of Zionism—the consolidation of the Zionist state and the ingathering of the Jews from exile.

It is the necessity of arguing that racism is justifiable in the special case of Israel that really betrays the nature of political Zionism. It was a fundamentally racist enterprise which Zionism engineered and which it has now largely succeeded in carrying out. It is this which Mr. Eban and others ask the world to regard as just a normal manifestation of nationhood and which Mr. Allon describes as merely "a modern expression of Judaism." It is this which Zionist propagandists (with an eye to the Third World and anti-colonial sentiment) now label "the Jewish national liberation movement"—a euphemism which conceals the fact it was designed to "liberate" a territory which was not theirs at the cost of dispossessing and expelling the indigenous population and rightful owners. As Maxim Ghilan remarks in his book "How Israel Lost Its Soul": "The basis of Zionism, the very root of the Jewish movement of Liberal (*sic.*—perhaps 'National' was intended) Liberation, was the

expropriation of the natives" (p.30). The point was made even more bluntly by Yehoshafat Harkabi, a former Chief of Military Intelligence in Israel:

"Because we took the land, this gives us the image of being bad, of being aggressive. The Jews always considered that the land belonged to them, but in fact it belonged to the Arabs. I would go farther: I would say the original source of this conflict lies with Israel, with the Jews—and you can quote me."

(Quoted in *Armed Forces Journal International*, October 1973, p.30).

### **Zionism, anti-Zionism and anti-Semitism**

By and large, in their reactions to the UN resolution, Western governments and news media have not attempted to address themselves to the facts but have preferred merely to strike an attitude of outrage and incomprehension. It would have been more honest to admit outright that they were not prepared to listen to criticism of Zionism because it involves a political attack on Israel (which it undoubtedly does). But where have they been most at fault is in swallowing and then regurgitating the propaganda line that anti-Zionism is the same thing as anti-Semitism. For some time past it has been a major preoccupation of Israel/Zionist propagandists to confuse the two and we are now witnessing a well-orchestrated attempt to achieve this in the wake of the debate in New York. But to equate opposition to political Zionism with hatred or contempt for the Jewish people remains, as it has always been, a disgusting red herring. It is deeply resented by the many honourable men and women who condemn Zionism for the evil and injustice it has brought about and who have the courage to speak out against it in the face of abuse and misrepresentation.

In a recent article in *The Times* of London (29 December 1975) Abba Eban, the former Foreign Minister of Israel, jocularly asked "What is the PLO really trying to liberate?". In a reply Said Hammami, the PLO representative in London, said:-

"Obviously it is, first and foremost, our people and our land. But I hope Mr. Eban will not take it amiss if I add also—his *own* people, now caught in the predicament which Zionism has created for them.

In our opposition to the present state of Israel we distinguish very clearly between Zionism and the Jewish people, both in Israel and elsewhere. As we see it, Zionism is their enemy as well as ours and will one day be their undoing as it has been ours. Nowadays it is not anti-Zionism which creates anti-Semitism, but Zionism itself. Whether or not one agrees that Zionism is racist in intention, there is no doubt that it has proved racist in result. That being so, it may all too easily provoke a racist response. (The parallel with South Africa is striking.

There the pernicious policy of *apartheid* and white supremacy has itself produced black racialism as a reaction). The danger which Zionism creates for Jews throughout the world was foreseen with remarkable clarity by Edwin Montagu, the one Jewish Minister in the British Government, at the time of the Balfour Declaration. In his Cabinet memorandum "The Anti-Semitism of the Present Government" he warned his colleagues that their pro-Zionist policy 'is anti-Semitic in result and will prove a rallying ground for Anti-Semites in every country of the world.' He went on to say: 'I am not in the least surprised that the non-Jews of England may welcome this policy. I have always recognised the unpopularity, much greater than some people may think, of my community . . . When the Jew has a national home, surely it follows that the impetus to deprive us of the rights of British citizenship will be enormously increased. Palestine will become the world's Ghetto. Why should the Russian give the Jew equal rights? His national home is Palestine.'

"In the end it is not others but the Jews themselves who must liberate their people from the twin dangers of Zionism and anti-Semitism. The answer lies in their hands. Throughout history—and not least today—individual Jews have been revered for their courage in speaking out against false gods. We Palestinians esteem and admire those brave and honest Israeli Jews who today protest against the racism and injustice of Israel's present policies. They are doing their own people a notable service by demonstrating to the Arab World that it is Zionism which is the enemy and not the Jewish people themselves. And indeed their courage serves the whole world—for in them lies the best hope of peace for the Middle East."

Sympathisers and supporters of Israel who have adopted an attitude of outrage and incomprehension in the face of the charge equating Zionism with racism would do well to look again at the facts - rather than their own prejudices and emotions. They should ask themselves whether they are truly serving the interests of Israel and the Israelis by their uncritical defence of Zionism, right or wrong. They might well take to heart this cautiously hopeful prognostication -

"It seems possible that the Israel with which the Arabs will be dealing in the next chapter of Middle Eastern history may prove a less bad neighbour than the Israel that has been dominated by the pioneer generation of fanatical Ashkenazi Zionists. This is the glimmer of light that catches my eye on the sombre Middle-Eastern horizon."

(*Middle East International* (London) May 1973).

All who care for peace in the Middle East, for justice and human rights and, ultimately, for the future of the Israelis themselves, must hope that Dr. Arnold Toynbee's hope comes true and that Zionism, with its concomitant racism, gives way "in the next chapter of Middle Eastern history" to a wiser and more humane national ethos in Israel.



## **Text of the UN Resolution**

## **APPENDIX I**

### **ELIMINATION OF ALL FORMS OF RACIAL DISCRIMINATION**

#### *The General Assembly,*

*Recalling* its resolution 1904 (XVIII) of 20 November 1963, proclaiming the United Nations Declaration on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, and in particular its affirmation that "any doctrine of racial differentiation or superiority is scientifically false, morally condemnable (and) socially unjust and dangerous" and its expression of alarm at "the manifestations of racial discrimination still in evidence in some areas in the world, some of which are imposed by certain Governments by means of legislative, administrative or other measures",

*Recalling also* that, in its resolution 3151 G (XXV111) of 14 December 1973, the General Assembly condemned *inter alia* the unholy alliance between South African racism and zionism,

*Taking note* of the Declaration of Mexico on the Equality of Women and their contribution to Development and Peace proclaimed by the World Conference of the International Women's Year, held at Mexico City from 19 June to 2 July 1975, which promulgated the principle that "international co-operation and peace require the achievement of national liberation and independence, the elimination of colonialism and neo-colonialism, foreign occupation, zionism, *apartheid*, and racial discrimination in all its forms as well as the recognition of the dignity of peoples and their right to self-determination",

*Taking note also* of resolution 77 (X11) adopted by the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity held in Kampala from 28 July to 1 August 1975 which considered "that the racist regime in occupied Palestine and racist regimes in Zimbabwe and South Africa have a common imperialist origin, forming a whole and having the same racist structure and being organically linked in their policy aimed at repression of the dignity and integrity of the human being",

*Taking note also of the Political Declaration and Strategy to strengthen International Peace and Security and to intensify Solidarity and Mutual Assistance among Non-Aligned Countries, adopted at the Conference of Ministers for Foreign Affairs of Non-Aligned Countries held in Lima, Peru, from 25 to 30 August 1975, which most severely condemned zionism as a threat to world peace and security and called upon all countries to oppose this racist and imperialist ideology.*

1. *Determines* that zionism is a form of racism and racial discrimination.



## APPENDIX II

### **Israeli Testimony regarding Racism in Israel**

The prevalence of racism in Israel is attested to by Israelis who have the honesty and courage to acknowledge the facts. Here are some examples of what they have to say.

*Mrs. Shulamit Aloni*, Member of the Knesset and leader of the Civil Rights Movement in Israel:

"In the twenty eight years since the creation of the State of Israel we have not yet learned that one should behave towards Arabs as citizens with equal rights and duties and treat their problems like those of all other citizens, directly and without discrimination."

*Yediot Aharonot*, 10 October 1975

*Maxim Ghilan*, left wing journalist who was at one time secretary-general of the Israeli New Left Party, in his book "*How Israel Lost Its Soul*", published by Pelican Books, London:

"Israel has gradually become a more and more openly racist country. Anyone not Jewish is at best second-class in Israel." (p.165)

"Now, in the State of Israel, those who are tempted along the hallucinatory path of power and conquest have to justify their course by calling on the same devils who, in the Diaspora, were directed against themselves." (p.170)

"The State of Israel is presented, both at home and abroad, as the embodiment of social democracy, a mixture of all that is good in capitalism and in socialism, the original, the archetypal Welfare State. This suggestion is, of course, a lie." (p.193)

"Israeli society is basically a settlers' society. It does not primarily concern itself with the 'Indians' or 'Niggers' of the land. Its first priority is the creation of a united economic establishment for the Jewish Israelis. Only then does it concern

itself (almost as an afterthought) with the captive Palestinians.”  
(p.194)

*Ben Azai*, the pen name of an Israeli journalist in London, who writes the *Personal Opinion* column in the *Jewish Chronicle*:

“Jewish residents of Upper Nazareth have forcibly prevented one of their neighbours from renting his flat to an Arab family. This reminds me of an incident at the end of the last century when Jews tried to move into a house in Cable Street but were chased out by their Irish neighbours. In the latter case, however, the local police came to the aid of the Jews. There is no evidence that the Israeli police came to the aid of the Arabs.

“It is always sad when people gang up against any newcomer who wants to settle in their midst. It is infinitely sadder when the newcomer happened to have been there before them. I am beginning to feel that Israel could do with a Race Relations Act.”

*Jewish Chronicle*, 3 October 1975

*Natan Yalin-Mor*, a former member of the Stern Gang and now a journalist in Israel well known for his criticism of the Israeli Establishment:

“I fought against an oppressor—but not in order that my own people should in turn oppress another people: I fought to establish the roots of my people in its homeland.

“I am convinced that the struggle against chauvinism in Israel, which is driving my nation beyond reason, and for the rights of the Palestinian people, is the real struggle for the good of the State of Israel and its future.”

*To Make War or Make Peace*, published by *New Outlook*, 1969

*Dr. Israel Shahak*, Professor of Chemistry at the Hebrew University, Jerusalem, and Chairman of the Israeli League of Human and Civil Rights:

“I consider the annexation of East Jerusalem by my Government to be an immoral and unjust act. It is the people who should determine their own fate... Accordingly, my first demand is to give to the non-Jews of Jerusalem freedom: freedom from unjust and arbitrary imprisonment and threat of prison, from the constant threat of permanent exile, freedom to form their own associations and parties, freedom for their relatives to settle in Jerusalem (now denied to non-Jews!). Until those demands are granted not only will any attempted ‘solution’ be futile and only serve to perpetuate oppression, but the present situation of one community oppressing the other will poison us all - and us Jews first of all!”

*Christianity and Crisis*, 20 March 1972

"It is my considered opinion that the State of Israel is a racist state in the full meaning of this term: In this state people are discriminated against, in the most permanent and legal way and in the most important areas of life, only because of their origin. This racist discrimination began in Zionism and is carried out today mainly in co-operation with the institutions of the Zionist movement."

-----

"I do not wish to debate any justifications for that racist policy. The most important fact is that it *exists*. Therefore the first step consists in admitting the truth: The State of Israel is a racist state, and its racism is a necessary consequence of the racism of the Zionist Movement. Facts are facts. After this we can debate, if we wish to do so, why such a racism is "forbidden" *against* the Jews and becomes a good deed when it is carried out *by* the Jews."

*The Racist Nature of Zionism and of the Zionist State of Israel*, article published in *Pi-Ha'aton*, the weekly newspaper of the students of the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, on 5 November 1975

Moshe Smilansky, who has been described as "one of the Pilgrim Fathers of Zionism", commenting on the Land Requisition Law passed by the Knesset in 1953 to facilitate expropriation of Arab-owned lands:

"Do we sin only against the refugees? Do we not treat the Arabs who remain with us as second-class citizens?...Did a single Jewish farmer raise his hand in the Parliament in opposition to a law that deprived Arab peasants of their land? . . . How lonely, in the city of Jerusalem, sits the Jewish conscience."

In an essay entitled "*Zion and the Jewish National idea*" in the *Menorah Journal*, Vol. XVI, 1958, reprinted in *Zionism Reconsidered*, Macmillan, N.Y. 1970

*The Editor* of the religious newspaper *Ner* in January, 1961:

"Only an international revolution can have the power to heal our people of their murderous sickness of causeless hatred... How great was our responsibility to those miserable wronged Arab refugees, in whose towns we have settled Jews who were brought from afar; whose homes we have inherited, whose fields we now sow and harvest; the fruit of whose orchards, gardens and vineyards we gather; and in whose cities that we robbed, we put up houses of education, charity and prayer, while we babble and rave about our being the 'People of the Book and the Light of the Nations'."

*Nathan Chofshi*, a contemporary and associate of Ben Gurion:

"In the last analysis, these are the bare facts which strike our eyes; here was a people who lived in its own land for 1300 years. We came and turned the native Arabs into tragic refugees. And still we dare to slander and malign them, to besmirch their name. Instead of being deeply ashamed of what we did and of trying to undo some of the evil we committed by helping these unfortunate refugees, we justify our terrible acts, and even attempt to glorify them."

*Jewish Newsletter*, 9 February 1959

*Rabbi Benjamin* writing in the religious newspaper *Ner*:

"In the end we must come out publicly with the truth: that we have no moral right whatever to oppose the return of the Arab refugees to their land . . . that until we have begun to redeem our sin against the Arab refugees, we have no right to continue the Ingathering of the Exiles. We have no right to demand that American Jews leave their country to which they have become attached, and settle in a land which has been stolen from others, while the owners of it are homeless and miserable."

*Ner*, Summer issue, 1955

*Azriel Karlibach*, editor of *Ma'ariv*, writing under the pseudonym of *Rabbi Ipcha Mistraba*, in an article entitled "Cry the Beloved Country":-

"But if we are asked: 'Did you, in all this wide country with her many deserts and her few Jewish farmers, did you have to make a mockery of all your oaths before yourselves and before the council of nations? Did you have to betray all the prophecies of your prophets who foresaw the return of the people to the land? Did you have to desecrate all law and all justice - in order to steal a few thousand dunams from a handful of miserable Arab villagers?'

"When we are asked that, we shall not be able to lift our heads."

*Ma'ariv*, 25 December 1953

"Ye shall have one manner of law, as well for the stranger, as for one of your own country".

*Leviticus*, 24 : 22