

NPK-info

Nederlands Palestina Komitee www.palestina-komitee.nl

Inhoud

Petition <http://www.miftah.org/Display.cfm?DocId=694&CategoryId=15>

Petition <http://www.petitiononline.com/warcrime>

Help the lawyers in Belgium who are suing Sharon for war crimes. Need 1,000,000 signatures; currently we have 400,000. Sign and forward the petition to all your contacts.

See "The 'JEWISH STATE' and the RIGHT OF RETURN -ISRAEL'S WAR ON PALESTINIAN REFUGEES, BADIL, Quarterly Al-Majdal: www.badil.org/Publications/Majdal/2002/majdal02.htm

Bij de SAP [Socialistische Arbeiderspartij] staat 1 mei in het teken van Palestina

Met dhr Habab (Palestijns ambassadeur), Arthur Bruls (SAP) en ooggetuigenverslag uit Bezette Gebieden door Rodrigo Fernandez.

Video: Generatie Intifada (2001)

Willemsparkweg 202, Amsterdam (tram 2, halte Emmastraat)

Video begint om 18.30 uur; het programma om 19.30 uur

Toegang: 2 euro (met eten: 6 euro; opgave daarvoor was tot 27-4)

Info/inschrijving: sap_amsterdam@hotmail.com of 06/44 572 539

Hierna

- * Between Jenin and Deir Yassin, Benvenisti, Ha`aretz, 25-4-2002
- * The Israelisation of America's war, Marwan Bishara, Al-Ahram Weekly, 25 April - 1 May 2002
- * Israeli occupation troops ransack parts of Hebron, destroy three radio, TV, stations, Occupied Jerusalem: 30 April, Khalid Amayreh
- * Apartheid in the Holy Land, Desmond Tutu, 29-4-2002, The Guardian
Quote: "Israel will never get true security and safety through oppressing another people. A true peace can ultimately be built only on justice."
- * PALESTINIANS IN JENIN CAMP TURN DOWN U.S. RELIEF AID, Reuters, 4/25/02
- * "Above the Law" for 54 Years: WHY IS ISRAEL AFRAID of the UN FACT FINDING MISSION?
Quote: "A sustained International Campaign of Solidarity with the Palestinian People can end Israel's impunity for war crimes, including those committed in the Jenin camp in 2002 and in the refugee camps of Sabra and Shatila in 1982."

En

- * Once upon a time in Jenin, Justin Huggler and Phil Reeves compelling evidence of an atrocity, 25-4-2002
http://news.independent.co.uk/world/middle_east/story.jsp?story=288592
- * Palestine Red Crescent Society www.palestinercs.org/
- * Israel and the media <http://news.haaretz.co.il/hasen/pages/ShArt.jhtml?itemNo=155638>

Voor Kamervragen zie www.overheid.nl

Stop de oorlog tegen de Palestijnen!

NPK/WL, 1-5-2002 ■

Between Jenin and Deir Yassin

By Meron Benvenisti, Ha`aretz, Thursday, April 25, 2002

It has been exactly 54 years since the Deir Yassin massacre and now the Jenin disaster has been added to the tragedy-laden Palestinian calendar, with many signs that Jenin will join Deir Yassin as an edifice of the Palestinian national ethos. Most of the Palestinian calendar is made up of national disasters and catastrophes - that, after all, has been the fate of this battered people - but there's nothing special in that. Many other nations use disaster more efficiently than victory to create a flag around which to rally their people. But it seems the Jenin disaster has an extraordinary power - even when compared to Sabra and Chatila, Karameh, or the events on the Temple Mount in 1991 - that puts Jenin almost on the same pedestal as Deir Yassin, the tragic symbol of the 1948 Palestinian disaster called the Nakba.

Seemingly, there is no comparison between a primitive massacre, conducted by Jewish gangs against defenseless Arab villagers, and the full-scale military operation that, in the course of fighting with guerrilla forces, wreaked destruction and killed innocent civilians. But the "objective facts" - which will forever remain controversial - are not responsible for building a national myth. Rather, it is the context in which partial facts and the sequence in which cause and effect are selectively placed that makes Deir Yassin and Jenin comparable; in both cases, the Palestinians identify the intent was to destroy the collective infrastructure of the Palestinian people.

As horrifying as the details may be, it is not the events in Jenin that matter, but rather the significance and the essence of what the Palestinians believe to be the true intentions of the Israelis - beyond rational military goals of control, deterrence, and prevention: To smash Palestinian society, forcing it to revert to its condition of two generations ago, after Deir Yassin. The piles of rubble in the Jenin refugee camp will become a memorial that will also commemorate the 1,000-year-old buildings of Nablus that were destroyed, the demolished

streets of Bethlehem and the computers and data banks painstakingly accumulated in Ramallah, that were ruined by the "fighters against the terrorist infrastructure." Now, after the infrastructure has been smashed, Palestinians can work at rebuilding their private and collective lives, but they will have to remember that the man with the stick can always, with one blow, destroy the entire anthill.

The comparison between Deir Yassin and Jenin is not limited to Palestinians. Many Israelis won't object to the comparison because they also perceive the events of April 2002 in direct connection to April 1948 and would be happy if the Palestinians repeated their panicked reaction to Deir Yassin by running away after Jenin. And many Israelis would agree that no distinction can be made between the terrorist infrastructure and the collective infrastructure of the Palestinian people because, in their view, the Palestinian collective, represented by its elected institutions, is a terrorist organization. Therefore, the destruction of its data banks serves the purpose of the war against terror.

Erasing the 54 years between Deir Yassin and Jenin strengthens the fear that the rational, optimistic model, which depicted the Israeli-Palestinian conflict as a national-ethnic dispute soluble through a "two states for two peoples" arrangement, was never possible, or that powerful forces managed to destroy it. The basic enmity between a settler society and an indigenous society apparently does not enable mutual recognition of equal rights, so separation based on equality is apparently not possible.

The bi-ethnic entity that exists over all Mandatory Palestine has been consolidated as a result of the events of April 2002, and the fiction of Oslo's indirect occupation has faded away with the occupation of the Palestinian Authority's territories and the destruction of its institutions.

The reality of this de facto binationalism leaves no choice but to think in terms of a unitarian geopolitical unit and to focus on the campaign to impose humanitarian norms that will not allow a third Deir Yassin. ■

The Israelisation of America's war

*As the US forges its new creed of "asymmetric warfare," Washington's eyes are trained on the Israeli invasion of Palestinian areas as a perfect case study, writes Marwan Bishara**

In the wake of UN Security Council resolution 1402, which demanded Israeli withdrawal, US President George W Bush told Israeli Prime Minister Ariel Sharon to pull the Israeli army from recently occupied Palestinian territories -- immediately. When Sharon paid no heed, US Secretary of State Colin Powell acted -- not to change the situation on the ground, but to change the administration's rhetoric. He switched from demanding Israeli withdrawal to merely offering to negotiate such a withdrawal with President Arafat on Sharon's behalf. In so doing, Powell diminished his chances for manoeuvre and ensured his mission's utter failure from the very beginning.

For those of us in the rest of the world, Israel's war in the territories seems to be putting an international damp on America's war on terrorism. Not so in Washington. Israel's failure to finish its war in Palestine in a clean and sterile fashion, leading instead to hundreds more dead and thousands injured, has forced the Bush administration back to the region to calm mounting European, Arab and international pressure. But after receiving this international quartet's support for his mission, Powell did anything but enforce the planned "immediate withdrawal" from recently occupied territories, let alone from previously occupied ones.

Israel, America's junior ally, said no to Powell's demands. Israel has, however, answered in the affirmative to Rumsfeld. The US Defence Secretary's alternative rhetoric, of "fighting terrorism," was heeded enthusiastically by Sharon.

Since 11 September, Washington's diplomacy has been defined by increasingly conservative politics and new regional strategy in the context of the war on terrorism and its "axes of evil." Violations of Palestinian human rights do not figure high on such agenda, but these violations are causing a regional and international uproar that is affecting the wider American strategy in the region, especially regarding Iraq. So why is it that everyone seems concerned about Powell's failure except the Bush administration itself?

The large degree of the Israelisation of America and the Americanisation of Israel in recent years -- particularly since 11 September -- went far beyond most observers' expectations. As the two countries' cultural affinity and military alliance converged to new strategic cult, the nightmare scenario is unravelling as the re-invasion of Palestine. American diplomacy is defined by local politics and strategic goals. Successful Israeli lobby pres-

sure on the administration through both houses of Congress has helped paralyse American mediation. The alliance between the fundamentalist (and at times Christian) Right and the hawkish Zionist trend has dominated Washington's politics since 11 September. Following the latest round of visits by the leaders of all these propaganda power houses in Washington to the White House, Bush's spokesman went so far as to declare Sharon as a man of peace! (Even in Israel itself, not even hawkish Israelis would go as far as associating Sharon directly with peace.)

More importantly, Secretary Rumsfeld and his powerful companions at the Pentagon and in the National Security Council, including Condoleezza Rice, do not care for diplomacy in the Middle East or even in the context of their own "war on terrorism." They see Sharon's war in the West Bank, dirty as it is, as a continuation of their own war on terrorism. The White House would like to see tranquillity in the eastern Mediterranean region, preferably by Israeli force or, if necessary, by American diplomacy. Note: they seek tranquillity, not peace or justice. A mere long term cease-fire is satisfactory for both Sharon and Washington for the time being.

Meanwhile, the Bush administration is keeping its eyes on Iraq and on finishing up the last touches on a new doctrine that will deal with all new threats facing America in the new century. This last point has been the focus of American policy in the region and around the world.

Before 11 September, the Pentagon had already defined America's new enemy as "asymmetrical." It was seen as mobile, trans-national, or sub-national. But now that the curtains have closed on the 20th century and its Cold-hot wars, a whole new era of asymmetric conflicts has begun in New York/Afghanistan and Israel/ Palestine, according to US military experts.

The last symmetrical war took place against the Iraqi army in Kuwait and Iraq. Today, regardless of the vast differences between the Taliban and Al-Qa'eda in Afghanistan and the PLO and Hamas in Palestine, the new generation of military experts in the United States are watching the convergence between the US and Israel military outlooks and doctrines in confronting their enemies. In the media both are referred to as the "war against terrorism," and in the Pentagon and military establishment both are part of the "era of asymmetric conflicts." So decision-makers in Washington are not

** The writer teaches at The American University of Paris and is the author of Palestine/Israel: Peace or Apartheid.*

making any distinction between the acts and the actors. The asymmetric war scenario is one that certain American strategists have warned against in the last decade. When it came, it hit where it hurt most, the pride of America's might, the Pentagon and Wall Street. Now, as Washington tries to adapt to an evolving, globalised world, it has also been introducing a revolution in military affairs (RMA).

There were two distinct concepts in asymmetric conflict theory. The first was fourth generation warfare, stateless or asymmetric, to be fought by an opponent who might have a non-nation-state base, such as an ideology or religion. In February 2001, standing before a Senate committee on world threats, CIA director George Tenet said what struck him most forcefully was the accelerating pace of change in so many arenas that affect US national interests. To the US, asymmetry means Osama Bin Laden and other international terrorists, Mafiosi and drug dealers. But the idea also covers other non-state actors like those the US has already encountered in Somalia, Kosovo, Colombia and Lebanon in 1983, when a bomb killed 239 US Marines.

Those analysts who think the future will be asymmetrical propose a rethink of the usefulness of billion-dollar fighter planes and advanced frigates if two men and a boat could kill 17 men and damage the USS Cole (as happened on 12 October 2000 in Aden).

The second concept has been the anti-missile defence shield, or "son of Star Wars," to protect America from incoming ballistic missiles carrying chemical, biological or nuclear weapons. The Bush administration, with Vice-President Dick Cheney and Defence Secretary Donald Rumsfeld, has concentrated its efforts on this project -- which, of course, has the added merit of subsidising the military-industrial complex. There was international condemnation of this return to policies of proliferation, so Bush explained that his shield was not intended against other nuclear powers, but against rogue states or, worse, groups capable of launching missiles against American soil or interests abroad.

Asymmetry must be distinguished from di-symmetry, which means a quantitative difference in firepower and force, a strong state against a weak one (such as the US against Iraq). The Pentagon says their mighty response is justified because the new enemies don't fight fair; their strategy, based in a globalised world, uses all possible sophisticated modern means:

communication, transportation, information, psychological terror, international media and the Internet.

If you put together all the characteristics that the American strategists attribute to the new model asymmetric enemy, they really add up to a profile of Osama Bin Laden -- who is, paradoxically, an ex-ally of theirs. If he didn't exist, of course, it would be necessary to invent him. As we all now know, he was groomed by the CIA in the 1980s, only to turn against his creators after the Gulf war.

What about the rogue or failed states? The US interven-

tion in Somalia taught the US a hard lesson. When, in October 1993, Hussein Adeer humiliated the US, killing 17 American soldiers, the Clinton administration became convinced that it could not manage, let alone win, a war against militias not accountable to the conventions of a state.

Operation Just Cause in Panama in December 1989 was also an asymmetric war, even though it was the largest American operation since Vietnam. The same methods used by America around the convent where Noriega took refuge in order to force him to surrender are being used, as I write these words, in Bethlehem against Palestinians who took refuge in the Church of the Nativity.

Washington's new apparent target is none other than Saddam Hussein. The US PR machine is learning a lot from Arab reaction to what's happening in Palestine today in preparation for conducting its war to topple Saddam. If a new chaos emerged in Baghdad, the war around Ramallah and other Palestinian cities could also be a good information gathering ground for how to contain people or opposition in Iraq.

Learning from Israeli strategies against a "new" enemy has centred on the need for a new type of precision weaponry designed for maximum deadliness.

Intelligence services must be reinforced with software reconnaissance and satellite spies, and also human spies. Police work, including racial profiling, is recommended. The strategists want to spy on potential sources of support for the new enemy, including NGOs and charities, expatriate communities and Internet sites. (A US senator complained recently that the CIA was replacing the State Department in diplomacy). Today, Israel is teaching America new tactics to deal with these threats. Itself, it is using them against a people under military occupation.

The US has also been working with Israel for a long time on Research and Development (R&D) projects including the Arrow anti-missile missile.

Israel's fighting style, especially in the West Bank and Gaza, is of special interest to US experts, who detect asymmetry in Israel's wars.

Under the headline "How to Fight an Asymmetric War," General Wesley Clark, commander of NATO's forces in Kosovo, explained to Time magazine on 23 October 2000, only few days after the present Intifada broke out, that the Palestinians inside Israel (he had obviously not realised that the West Bank and Gaza are not in Israel) had learned how to resist Israel's non-lethal force. It was a tactic aimed at exploiting world sensitivities and forcing Israeli security forces to overreact.

"Occasionally non-lethal force was supplemented with armed men among the rock throwers or terror bombings. Responding with fighter planes, tanks and artillery was impossible; responding with troops on the ground risked casualties. No society is more reluctant than Israel to accept losses, so the country developed new equipment, forces and tactics. To secure its bor-

ders, Israel deployed more heavily armoured tanks and troop-carrying vehicles and procured Apache helicopters, unmanned aerial vehicles and very long-range optics. To protect itself internally, Israel issued its infantrymen with plastic bullets and riot-control gear. Special security forces were organised to help relieve the conventional Israeli units of responsibility for keeping order," said Clark.

Clark's admiration for Israel's skills is deeply worrying: this policy has led to perhaps 2000 Palestinian dead, and tens of thousands injured. And in the absence of an Israeli political or diplomatic option, other than Sharon's stalling for time like his mentor Yitzak Shamir, Israel's excessive use of force has not improved its security situation.

Anthony Cordesman, a leading defence analyst at the Centre for Strategic and International Studies, suggested that Israel was forcing the Palestinian Authority to suppress Palestinians and curb democratic freedoms to attain stability. When the Intifada continued, he said, the Palestinians had two options: "peace with violence" or war. Cordesman described a situation in which Israel would do the dirty work both for the PA and against it. That is also asymmetric warfare. It means more social control, more assassinations and crippling of the econo-

my. That's what happened in the last several weeks and months in Jenin as well as in Bethlehem and other towns and camps.

Listening to President Bush and Defence Secretary Rumsfeld, the US strategy might be heading towards Israeli-style asymmetric warfare, even though it failed in Palestine. This choice would be nothing short of a catastrophe.

The world's grey areas created by war, globalisation and impoverishment, are now seen as danger zones. Public institutions and development and democracy are more necessary in grey areas than are military interventions. Like in Palestine, independence and freedom from military occupation through political negotiations are the best -- and perhaps the only -- way out.

The new asymmetric enemy cannot be beaten by force, even less by technology, without a political project. In Palestine, the newly designated enemy is the Palestinian people with all their political organisations and most of their NGOs. In other words, Israel's new enemy is Palestinian civil society and its social and economic infrastructure. If this is the new conflict and the style of the new war, everybody must run for shelter. This is the new "permanent war" of the 21st century and no one is safe. ■

Israeli occupation troops ransack parts of Hebron, destroy three radio, TV, stations

Occupied Jerusalem: 30 April

By Khalid Amayreh

Israeli occupation forces on Tuesday vandalized homes and ransacked businesses in downtown Hebron on the second day of their reoccupation of this town of 170,000 Palestinians.

Palestinian sources reported that Israeli soldiers raided civilian homes, smashing furniture, computers, television sets and other appliances.

"They (Israeli soldiers) are acting like street criminals, this is not an army of disciplined soldiers, this is an army of criminals and gangsters," said Ahmed Hirbawi, a shop keeper.

"I can't understand how they will convince us of their desire for peace by acting like barbarians."

Earlier, Israeli troops destroyed the antennas of al-Mustakbal Television station and arrested its proprietor, Amjad al Kurd.

Troops also vandalized the Nawras Television station and two other radio stations, Marah and al-Hurriya, apparently for reporting Israeli atrocities against Palestinian civilians.

The Israeli army said it arrested hundreds of people in Hebron on suspicion of involvement in "hostile activities," an allusion to Palestinian resistance against Israeli occupation and apartheid.

Among the people reportedly arrested are Mustafa Shawar, a professor at the University of Hebron and several officials at the Islamic Charitable Society, Hebron's largest philanthropic institution.

At least ten Palestinians were killed and scores injured in the initial Israeli incursion into Hebron.

Hospital sources said at least six of the victims were innocent civilians killed when an Israeli helicopter gunship fired several missiles at a home at the Bussa neighborhood.

The Israeli army alleged a "gunman" was hiding in the vicinity of the house, a claim Palestinians labeled as "cheap and mendacious."

"It is an act of sheer criminality to attack a civilian home with rockets just because there is suspicion that a resistance activists might be in the vicinity of the home.

Those who did and order it are criminals," said a neighbor who wouldn't give his name, fearing possible Israeli reprisal.

An Israeli military spokesman said Tuesday said the army would leave Hebron tonight.

Meanwhile, Israeli troops continued to rampage through the nearby town of Dura (pop. 30,000), conducting house-to-house searches for weapons and "wanted"

<http://www.guardian.co.uk/israel/comment/0,10551,706911,00.html>

Apartheid in the Holy Land

Desmond Tutu, Monday April 29, 2002, The Guardian

In our struggle against apartheid, the great supporters were Jewish people. They almost instinctively had to be on the side of the disenfranchised, of the voiceless ones, fighting injustice, oppression and evil. I have continued to feel strongly with the Jews. I am patron of a Holocaust centre in South Africa. I believe Israel has a right to secure borders.

What is not so understandable, not justified, is what it did to another people to guarantee its existence.

I've been very deeply distressed in my visit to the Holy Land; it reminded me so much of what happened to us black people in South Africa. I have seen the humiliation of the Palestinians at checkpoints and roadblocks, suffering like us when young white police officers prevented us from moving about.

On one of my visits to the Holy Land I drove to a church with the Anglican bishop in Jerusalem. I could hear tears in his voice as he pointed to Jewish settlements. I thought of the desire of Israelis for security. But what of the Palestinians who have lost their land and homes?

I have experienced Palestinians pointing to what were their homes, now occupied by Jewish Israelis. I was walking with Canon Naim Ateek (the head of the Sabeel Ecumenical Centre) in Jerusalem. He pointed and said: "Our home was over there. We were driven out of our home; it is now occupied by Israeli Jews."

My heart aches. I say why are our memories so short. Have our Jewish sisters and brothers forgotten their humiliation? Have they forgotten the collective punishment, the home demolitions, in their own history so soon? Have they turned their backs on their profound and noble religious traditions? Have they forgotten that God cares deeply about the downtrodden?

Israel will never get true security and safety through oppressing another people. A true peace can ultimately be built only on justice. We condemn the violence of

Palestinians, the term the Israeli army uses for Palestinian freedom fighters.

At one point an Israeli Merkava-tank overturned in the center of Dura.

There were no reports of casualties.

(end) ■

suicide bombers, and we condemn the corruption of young minds taught hatred; but we also condemn the violence of military incursions in the occupied lands, and the inhumanity that won't let ambulances reach the injured.

The military action of recent days, I predict with certainty, will not provide the security and peace Israelis want; it will only intensify the hatred.

Israel has three options: revert to the previous stalemated situation; exterminate all Palestinians; or - I hope - to strive for peace based on justice, based on withdrawal from all the occupied territories, and the establishment of a viable Palestinian state on those territories side by side with Israel, both with secure borders.

We in South Africa had a relatively peaceful transition. If our madness could end as it did, it must be possible to do the same everywhere else in the world. If peace could come to South Africa, surely it can come to the Holy Land?

My brother Naim Ateek has said what we used to say: "I am not pro- this people or that. I am pro-justice, pro-freedom. I am anti- injustice, anti-oppression."

But you know as well as I do that, somehow, the Israeli government is placed on a pedestal [in the US], and to criticise it is to be immediately dubbed anti-semitic, as if the Palestinians were not semitic. I am not even anti-white, despite the madness of that group. And how did it come about that Israel was collaborating with the apartheid government on security measures?

People are scared in this country [the US], to say wrong is wrong because the Jewish lobby is powerful - very powerful. Well, so what? For goodness sake, this is God's world! We live in a moral universe. The apartheid government was very powerful, but today it no longer exists. Hitler, Mussolini, Stalin, Pinochet, Milosevic, and Idi Amin were all powerful, but in the end they bit the dust.

Injustice and oppression will never prevail. Those who are powerful have to remember the litmus test that God gives to the powerful: what is your treatment of the poor, the hungry, the voiceless? And on the basis of that, God passes judgment.

We should put out a clarion call to the government of the people of Israel, to the Palestinian people and say: peace is possible, peace based on justice is possible. We will do all we can to assist you to achieve this peace, because it is God's dream, and you will be able to live amicably together as sisters and brothers.

Desmond Tutu is the former Archbishop of Cape Town and chairman of South Africa's truth and reconciliation commission. This address was given at a conference on Ending the Occupation held in Boston, Massachusetts, earlier this month. A longer version appears in the current edition of Church Times. ■

PALESTINIANS IN JENIN CAMP TURN DOWN U.S. RELIEF AID

Reuters, 4/25/02

JENIN, West Bank (Reuters) - Palestinian officials at Jenin refugee camp Thursday turned down a U.S. aid shipment of tents, food and children's toys, saying the camp had been destroyed by Israel with U.S.-made weapons.

They said residents refused to unpack the shipment, which included 800 tents and other relief supplies from the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID), after it arrived in U.N. trucks Tuesday.

"Residents do not accept this assistance presented by

the United States because their camp has been demolished, its youth killed by American weapons in Israeli hands," said Fakhri Turukman, a Palestinian legislator from the camp.

"We would rather die of hunger than be fed by our killers," said Ibrahim Hussein, a member of the camp's relief committee.

BADIL Resource Center

For immediate release, 27-4-2002 (E/33/2002) ■

"Above the Law" for 54 Years:

WHY IS ISRAEL AFRAID of the UN FACT FINDING MISSION?

At least 52 dead - 26 of them civilians, more than 200 injured, a yet unknown number of persons considered missing, and 4000 - 5000 Palestinian refugees again made homeless by the destruction and damages (sources: Palestinian National Monitoring Committee of Israeli War Crimes; UNRWA) - these are some of the hard facts in the Jenin refugee camp as of today, while we have yet to see the arrival of the UN Fact Finding Mission appointed by UN General Secretary Kofi Annan in accordance with UN Security Council Resolution 1405 of 19 April 2002.

Following a week of official protests and efforts to renegotiate the terms of reference of the UN Mission, the Israeli cabinet is to decide tomorrow, Sunday, whether it will accept to cooperate. A negative Israeli decision would return the ball into the yard of the United Nations.

Since the onset of the strong international criticism about Israel's military conduct in the Jenin refugee camp, official Israeli spokespersons and the media have missed no opportunity to underline that they have nothing to hide. "The destruction caused there was an unavoidable result of the tenacious fighting by the Palestinians who had dug in there. As far as it is known,

no massacre occurred in the camp, nor are there signs that the IDF soldiers engaged in irregular conduct" (Uzi Benziman, Ha'aretz). Israeli army spokespersons volunteer maps which show that in fact only a minor portion of the camp (10 percent) was destroyed and hold that all those killed, except for three civilians, were "wanted terrorists" or Palestinian combatants. So what is Israel's problem with a UN Mission that should do no more than "develop accurate information regarding recent events in the Jenin refugee camp" (UN Resolution 1405)?

According to Israeli political analyst Aluf Benn (Ha'aretz, 25 April), the shift in Israel's stance from initial agreement to suspension of its cooperation with the UN Fact Finding Mission was prompted by the intervention of Daniel Bethlehem, an expert in international law at Cambridge University and Israel's external legal advisor on the UN inquiry. In the past, Bethlehem helped Israel compose its submissions to the Mitchell Committee of inquiry into the violence between Israelis and Palestinians. He also helped Israel draw up plans for cease-fires and the re-start of the peace process that would guarantee that none of the latter would materialize. As in the past 50 years, US-backing in the United Nations and expert advice helped Israel to overcome

initial international sympathy with the Palestinian people also at the beginning of the current Palestinian uprising, and UN activity was eventually diverted into the Mitchell plan. Israel was able to rebuff the immediate international pressure to have its conduct investigated, and the Sharon government even managed to effectively shelve the Mitchell plan and empty it of political content.

However, Israel's legal advisor Bethlehem was alarmed by the terms of reference of the current UN Fact Finding Mission into the events in the Jenin refugee camp. "Unlike the Mitchell inquiry," he writes, "this exercise is not focused on finding a pathway back to negotiations. It is an exercise inquiring into allegations of war crimes." He goes on to warn, "If the committee's findings uphold the allegations against Israel - even on poor reasoning - this will fundamentally alter the dynamics of the Israeli-Palestinian leadership and may make it impossible for Israel to resist calls for an international force, the immediate establishment of a Palestinian state and the prosecution of individuals said to have committed the alleged acts... Israel has already lost the public relations battle. Whether or not there was a massacre in Jenin as the Palestinians contend, there is a widely-held perception in the international community that Israel's use of force in Jenin was excessive, disproportionate and indiscriminate and that this was compounded by a failure to provide, or allow provision of, humanitarian assistance in the aftermath of the conflict. Even assuming that all the facts are in Israel's favor, it will be difficult to redress the balance."

Given the United Nations' 54 year-old record of non-enforcement of its own resolutions vis-a-vis Israel, the Palestinian refugees of Jenin might well never see the honorable members of the UN Mission set foot in their squalid camp, or they might find a Fact Finding Mission whose report will eventually whitewash the conduct of Israel's army during "Operation Defensive Wall."

END ISRAEL'S PRIVILEGE: "Above the Law" and "Immune"

Only a sustained International Campaign of Solidarity with the Palestinian People, including education about root-causes of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict and a broad Israel- Boycott Campaign, can bring about the enforcement of international law and UN resolutions vis-à-vis Israel, including not only of UNSCR 1405 (2002, Jenin), but also UNSCR 242 (1967, Israeli withdrawal from the occupied territories) and UNGAR 194 (1948, Right of Return of Palestinian Refugees). It can end Israel's 54 year-old privilege of "being above"

international law and UN resolutions.

A sustained International Campaign of Solidarity with the Palestinian People can end Israel's impunity for war crimes, including those committed in the Jenin camp in 2002 and in the refugee camps of Sabra and Shatila in 1982. The UN Commission on Human Rights has considered Israel's continued grave breaches of the 1949 Fourth Geneva Convention as rising to the level of war crimes since 1972 and affirmed this view during a Special Session of the Commission in October 2000. Since 1948, Israel's record of grave breaches, war crimes and crimes against humanity includes: forced displacement and consequent denial of return of some 6 million Palestinians; illegal expropriation/control of some 90 percent of Palestinian-owned land in Israel and in the 1967 occupied Palestinian territories; construction and population of illegal colonies (settlements); and, denial of the Palestinian people's right to self-determination.

For action plans, resources and information about ongoing campaigns see:

"End the Ongoing Nakba" - Campaign against Israel's Brand of Apartheid

www.badil.org/Resources/WCAR/WCAR2001.htm

Boycott Israeli Goods Campaign

<http://www.BoycottIsraeliGoods.org>

Contact: info@BoycottIsraeliGoods.org

Israel's March-April 2002 Military Campaign and War Crimes

www.badil.org/Publications/Monographs/SR_April02.htm

International Campaign - Justice for the Victims of Sabra and Shatila

<http://www.indictsharon.net>

Contact: coordinator@indictsharon.net

Palestine Right to Return Coalition

<http://www.al-awda.org>

BADIL Resource Center aims to provide a resource pool of alternative, critical and progressive information on the question of Palestinian refugees in our quest to achieve a just and lasting solution for exiled Palestinians based on their right of return.

PO Box 728, Bethlehem, Palestine; email:

info@badil.org;

Website: www.badil.org

Tel/fax: -2-2747346; -52-360769. ■