CONCLUSION

The United Nations was envisaged as an international instrument to lessen the area of conflict and enlarge the sphere of peace and understanding. The horrors of two world wars had shaken the entire humanity and forced on it the indispensable need for a shock absorber. The United Nations was the result and it had the supreme task of saving the world from the third major catastrophe. It was also supposed to be the guardian of international justice and fundamental human rights. Whenever the clouds of war started gathering over the world horizon, the only glimmer of optimism came from the hope that the United Nations would somehow be able to step in and avert the disaster. The New York Times was commenting upon the United Nations' peace keeping role when it wrote (1): "The best hope, in fact, lies in a continuing role by the United Nations." But this hope was belied in regard to Palestine Question.

The Palestine problem involved not only the question of preventing a local conflict from becoming a major conflagration threatening the peace of the area. It also involved the issue of fundamental human rights of the Palestinians which were being usurped by an alien community. The British Mandatory Government in Palestine was entrusted by the League of Nations to look after the interest of local people and administrative machinery of Palestine. Great Britain collaborated with Zionism in its crimes against Palestinians. When the Frankenstein created by Great Britain struck at the roots of British imperialism in the Middle East, Britain had no option but to bring the issue to world forum.

On April 2, 1947 the United Kingdom representative requested the Secretary General that the Palestine Question should be placed on the agenda of the General Assembly - a request which was complied with. At the meeting of the General Assembly held on May 15, 1947 the UK representative said (2): "We have tried for years to solve the problem of Palestine. Having failed so far, we now bring it to the United Nations in the hope that it can succeed where we have not."

Great Britain had calculated its move very carefully. She was aware that the then composition of the United Nations would be favourable for any suggestion agreed among Big Powers. Great Britain was acting in collaboration with Zionist colonialism and had already opened the gates of Palestine to the floods of Jewish immigrants. When she found that the Zionists were powerful enough to wrest the country from its Arab inhabitants, the issue was brought into the arena of world diplomacy to lend finality and legality to the criminal design against the Arab world. The agenda before the General Assembly was (3) "the termination of the Mandate over Palestine and the declaration of its independence." The United Nations, however, adopted the Partition Resolution of November 29, 1967 which created a "Jewish State" in the heart of the Middle East. The manner in which Great Britain had referred the issue to the United Nations and the decision taken by it left much to be desired from the point of view of the Arab States and the Arabs of Palestine.

The United Nations had acted in contravention of the principle

of self-determination enshrined in the Charter of world organization. The Arabs of Palestine were asked to share their exclusive territorial sovereignty with aliens and intruders who had encroached upon their rights and territory. The United Nations had failed to protect the political, economic and religious interests of the Arabs of Palestine. The Partition resolution was a triumph for political Zionism and it had provided them a foothold for the full realization of "Eretz Israel" as Ben Gurion and Menachem Beigun had envisioned it all along, openly and unashamedly.

The United Nations had and has no doubt, the competence to discuss the Palestine question or any other issue potentially threatening world peace. This does not, however, imply that the United Nations can arbitrarily as it did regarding the Palestine Question. The United Nations is an organization which has to work under various limitations imposed and clearly laid down by the Charter. The gravest violation committed by the United Nations in adopting the Partition resolution was regarding the principle of self-determination enshrined in Article 1, Paragraph 2 of the Charter. The United Nations had assumed the role of a territorial sovereign and adopted the resolution to partition Palestine. According to Professor Brownlie, the partition resolution was ultra vires because it was beyond the jurisdiction and competence of the United Nations. He observes: (4)

"It is doubtful if the United Nations, has a capacity to convey title, inter alia because the Organization cannot assume the role of territorial sovereign... Thus the resolution of 1947 containing a Partition Plan for Palestine was probably ultra vires and, if it was not, was not binding on member states in any case."

The General Assembly under Articles 10 and 14 of the Charter is empowered to consider any question relating to peace and make recommendation. In case of Palestine, the General Assembly overstepped its jurisdiction and adopted a decision which implied coercion. The Partition resolution was not of a recommendatory character; it was a decision supported by a clause that any attempt to alter it by force would be considered as a threat to the peace and an act of aggression, within the meaning of Article 39 of the United Nations Charter. H. Kelsen, a renowned authority on international law and the United Nations observed (5): "Article 14 authorizes the General Assembly only to make recommendations. But the resolution (Partition Resolution) goes beyond simple recommendations."

The decision of the General Assembly was aimed at transforming the status quo and redistributing political power in Palestine without consulting the people living in the area and almost bypassing their rights and wishes. The General Assembly again violated the United Nations Charter and its principles when it provided for the creation of a five-member committee to administer Palestine during transitional period. The Assembly's decision that the United Nations shall administer a territory for the purpose of vivisecting it into two halves was not within the competence of the General Assembly. The Syrian Representative attacked the committee and its composition. According to him the constitution of the committee entrusted with the task of administering Palestine was illegal, its members having been appointed by the President of the Assembly and not by the Assembly itself which "was

a breach of Article 84 of the Rules of Procedure." (6)

The General Assembly requested the Security Council to adopt enforcement measures to implement the Partition resolution.

The Charter of the UN has clearly laid down that the responsibility of the Security Council was to maintain peace. The Security Council, whether requested by the Assembly or on its own, was not empowered to implement a decision or recommendation. As Hans Kelsen said (7): "The Charter does not empower the Security Council to enforce a political settlement, whether it was in pursuance of a recommendation made by the Assembly or of one made by the Council itself... The Council's action should not have as an aim the imposition of partition but the maintenance of peace."

The United Nations had flagrantly violated the rights of the majority by granting international status to the Jews who had come and forcibly settled down in Palestine. The Partition resolution of November 29, 1947 had assigned the Jewish state definite areas but the chronology of events in Palestine during the six months preceding the end of the mandate enabled Jewish forces and terrorist groups to grab most of the Arab cities of Palestine before May 15, 1948. The Arabs of Palestine were forcibly expelled from their homes and the United Nations could not do anything to resettle them in their homes. The Palestinian refugees constitute a heavy lump of flesh on the conscience of the United Nations. In his report of September 16, 1948 the UN Mediator suggested (8) certain revisions in the boundaries as envisaged
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by the resolution of November 29, 1947. It also recommended (9) the repatriation of the Palestine refugees. The United Nations failed to act according to the recommendations made by the UN Mediator. Israel was allowed by the United Nations to act as its spoilt child. The United Nations has always spared the rod and allowed Israel to enjoy the fruits of aggression. Israel's expansion and advance inside the Arab Land went unchecked and every time it has confronted the United Nations with a fait accompli and won recognition. Israel was a creation of the General Assembly resolution which had also imposed upon it duties and obligations towards its Arab inhabitants. The UN recognition of Israel was conditional to its capacity and willingness to fulfil these obligations. As Hedley Cooke pointed out (10): "Israel's sovereignty, as contrasted with France's and Switzerland's, is permanently limited by her duties as embodied in the Charter of Existence towards the Arab residents of the area which she controls...."

Israel was bound by the UN resolution to abide by its provisions and respect the territorial integrity of neighbouring states. Israel flouted all its obligations and the United Nations failed to make it accept civilized norms but the world body was not "prepared", as suggested by Davis, former Commissioner General of UNRWA, (11) "to impose corrective measures on Israel against her will."

The United Nations owes a tremendous responsibility towards the Palestine Arabs who were expelled from their home and deprived of their
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political power. As a guardian of international order and fundamental human rights, the United Nations should make efforts to rectify the wrongs done to the Arabs of Palestine by the Big Powers in collaboration with Israel and the United Nations.

The United States of America and the USSR are among the most significant original sinners against the Arabs of Palestine. Both powers voted in favour of the Partition resolution establishing the Jewish State.

The United States of America took a more than normal interest in advocating the Jewish case in the United Nations and outside. Many states which had voted against the partition proposal in UNSCOP were pressurized to vote in favour of the plenary session of the General Assembly. Truman has admitted it in his memoirs. He badly needed the Zionist support in his Presidential election; he, therefore, (12) "instructed the State Department to support the Partition Plan". The US State Department employed more intimidation than persuasion and in that manner states like Liberia, Haiti, Luxembourg, Belgium, Paraguay, etc. were won over to the side of the Zionists.

The United States was firmly committed to support Israel which was regarded as a bastion of western democracy in the feudal society of the Middle East. According to Professor Howard (13): "Israel, it is said, is the natural ally of the United States a kind of western outpost on the Eastern Mediterranean. The idea antedates the establishment of the State of Israel, going back at least as far as the Balfour Declaration in November 1917. When among other things, a Jewish

'homeland' was to serve British Imperial interests in the neighbourhood of the Suez Canal. In later years it was to become a "little bastion" of "embattled democracy" in the 'hostile' and 'feudal' Arab world, said to be anti-democratic, and western and anti-American."

The United States of America emerged, following the withdrawal of Britain from the Middle East, as a major power in the area. Its chief aim was to contain communism which brought her in direct conflict with Arab nationalism. The Truman Doctrine of "containment of Communism" brought military alliances like Baghdad Pact into existence. The twin objectives of the US policy in the Middle East were to contain communism and support and safeguard Israel. Enormous financial and military aid was pumped into a small State like Israel (14). "From 1948 to 1962 apart from the high level direct investments, Government grants and loans totalling 880 million dollars and private gifts (tax free) and bond purchases totalling approximately 1.5 billion dollars have flowed into that small country. Given a population of some two million people, this represents something like, 1,200 dollars for every Israel man, woman and child. According to a U.S. Aid Financial report, covering the period 1949 to 1963, "the total value of all US dollar programme to Israel was $1,002,600,000". (15) To this should be added the 1964 and 1965 grants of "$116,200,000", (16) making a total of $1,118,800 for 1949 to 1965. (17)


The US interest in the Middle East is strengthened by its capital investment in the oil industry. In 1965 the US investment in oil amounted to $1,590,000,000. Between 1954 and 1956 relations between the US and resurgent Arab nationalism were far from happy. The US had the primary objective of saving the Arab world from the 'clutches' of expanding and penetrating communism which had allied itself with Arab nationalism and its main aspirations. The USA was, however, regarded by the Arabs as the chief ally of Zionism which constituted the most potential threat to Arab territorial sovereignty.

The United States of America was committed to Israel's security and had always given it maximum military support enabling it to materialize its expansionist designs. The USA had shown intolerable indifference to the rights and aspirations of the Arab people. Israel has always exploited the US support and in order to maximise it the myth of being a bastion of western democracy and modernization has been created. The USA commands enormous influence in Israel and its determined efforts at persuading Israel to act as a civilized country are bound to succeed. But the US leaders have allowed Israel to take American support for granted.

The United States adopted a more or less disinterested attitude and was never disturbed about the major Israeli raids against the Arab States. In 1966 when Israel attacked Sammu', a Jordanian village, the US Ambassador to the UN Arthur J. Goldberg on November 16, 1966 deplored Israeli "retaliation raid" (18) against Jordan but Washington never took strong measures to discourage Israel in its avowed policy of "reprisal" and "retaliation." The US was, in effect, adopting the

Machiavellian tactics of duplicity. She was showing verbal sympathy towards the Arabs preventing them from total surrender to the Soviet Union. On the other hand, she was giving moral, military and political support to Israel in its tirade and aggressive designs against the Arab States.

The US game of duplicity was exposed during the June War of 1967 when massive collusion between Israel and the USA became known to the world. The United States of America had full knowledge of Israeli military strength and its aggressive intentions.

The Johnson Administration did not make it clear as to what it was prepared to do in case of aggression by one side against the other. Israel escalated political confrontation into a massive military confrontation and the Middle East stood on a volcano. The United States was the only power capable of sounding warning and restraining Israel from launching an aggression on the Arab States. But the policymakers in the US chose otherwise and no measure was adopted to deter aggressor unless he be Arab for whom there was the Sixth Fleet in the area. Israel was encouraged, allowed, and given full military support to carry out its plan against the Arab States. There was an active military collusion between Israel and the US. Louis Heren, Washington correspondent of the London Times wrote (19):

"Most diplomats stationed in Washington are persuaded that the United States was in collusion with Israel... This was obvious in the United Nations. Security Council, or, rather, behind the scenes, when Washington began to press Jerusalem to accept the cease-fire resolutions only when the victory of Israeli arms was assured. Really heavy American pressure to stop the fighting was not applied before Friday, when Israel began to move into Syria... clearly some assurances were given to the Israelis before the hostilities began.

"The more faint-hearted in Jerusalem could rest assured that an Israel defeat would never be allowed. General Moshe Dayan must have been fairly sure of about 96 hours in which to achieve his objectives before the Security Council could call a halt."

The United States and Britain were ready to provide air protection to Israel against any surprise Egyptian attack. Yugoslav observers in Libya noted unusual air activity at the Wheelus base and there was similar unusual air activity at British air bases in Cyprus.

The USA has helped Israel and done the greatest harm to the Arab world. The Johnson Administration, under the formidable Jewish triumvirate who helped to formulate and execute Americans Middle East policy - Arthur Goldberg, Walt Rostow and Eugene Rostow also known as American gentlemen of Jewish persuasion, did not ask Israel to withdraw from Arab territories. The USA has remained callously indifferent to the fate of Arab refugees from Palestine. It did not specifically ask for the return of the refugees to the territories occupied by Israel. The USA holds the key to the solution of the Middle East conflict. Moshe Dayan in an interview said (20): "The United States held the key to the question of whether Israel could continue to insist that there would be no withdrawal from occupied Arab land as long as there was no peace settlement."

The United States of America has chosen to put all its eggs in the Israeli basket and seeks comfort in the Jewish State as the bastion of western democracy and vanguard of modernization. She has, however, not shown equal or similar interest and understanding for the forces engaged in the process of radicalization of political and

social set-up of the Arab world with the result that the USA is
totally alienated with the emerging political pattern in the Arab
States. She is, therefore, rightly regarded by the Arabs as an ally
of politically reactionary forces like Zionism which stands for the
revival of exclusive religious and racial identity of the Jews.

The interest of the Soviet Union in the Middle East is not
of recent origin. It can be traced to pre-Bolshevik past when Russia
was trying hard to gain access to the warm waters of the Mediterranean
and the Persian Gulf. In the post war II era the interest of the
Soviet Union increased and she became a party responsible for the
creation of Israel and was the first to grant de-jure recognition to
Israel in May 1948 when the United States had accorded to Israel only
de facto recognition. "The Soviet Union", wrote W. Z. Laqueur (21),
"was described as the only true friend of Jewish National Independence,
the United States, on the other hand, merely pretend to support the
State of Israel."

The period of Soviet Israeli friendship came to an end when the
Cold War was extended to the Middle East. The Soviet Union was dis-
illusioned because of Israel's economic and political commitments.
The Soviet Union considered Israel no more as a "democratic and inde-
pendent state; and those who came to power in Israel were bourgeois
Jewish nationalists who enjoyed Anglo-American support and persecuted
local communists." (22)
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The Soviet Union was fighting a battle of survival as an influential power in the Middle East and its purpose was better served by coming into agreement with Arab nationalism. This support to Arab nationalism was motivated by the desire to counteract the Americans backed military alliance called the Baghdad Pact. The Soviet support to the Arab progressive forces came in a big way in the year 1955 when the Soviet Union announced to help Egypt in its development programme and also agreed to provide military aid. In the Arab Israeli conflict the Soviet Union showed its "sympathies with the Eastern nations fighting for liberation from colonialism." During the Suez crisis the Soviet Union supported Egypt and threatened to take stern measures to repulse the tripartite attack.

The Soviet Union had acquired higher stakes in the Middle East crisis and given military and financial aid to the Arab countries especially the UAR. Despite its pro-Arab postures the Soviet Union has acted with extreme caution avoiding a direct confrontation with the USA. It seems that the Soviet Union and the USA have developed some understanding and identity of interest during the 1967 June crisis. The area of conflict is being slowly and gradually replaced by ever enlarging area of understanding between the USA and the USSR. The USSR like the USA sounded the UAR not to strike first and secured a firm assurance from Nasser on this point.

The Soviet Union has, no doubt, condemned Israel as an aggressor and always insisted on its withdrawal from occupied territories. It had administered a strong warning on Israel to the effect that if

24. Ivanov, K., "Imperialist intrigues and the policy of Israel", International Affairs (Moscow), No. 12, 1957, p. 62.
hostilities did not cease, it would take drastic action, and if necessary, resort to sanctions. Such sanctions was confined only to severing off diplomatic relations with Israel. The Soviet Union has also replenished the military losses of the UAR and Syria, and massive military assistance is being pumped into the the Arab States.

But there exists a credibility gap between the Soviet Union's utterances and actions. The Soviet Union's political support to the Arabs is couched in general terms and offers only vague assurances.

The Soviet Union's support to the Arabs does not emanate from philanthropic or altruistic considerations, it forms an important part of the power politics game being played between the USA and the USSR. The Soviet inhibition of avoiding direct confrontation with the USA is the result of its lack of military strategic mobility. The Soviet Union can give military aid but its men cannot go and fight on foreign soil and this factor is not conducive to active armed involvement.

The Soviet Union and the USA are the two Super Powers who hold the key to the solution of the Middle East problem. Both of them seem to have arrived at some tacit understanding which was exhibited during Johnson-Kosygin talks at Glassboro. Both the Super Powers have developed a vested interest in restricting the scope of the Arab-Israeli conflict. The Soviet Union faces the most challenging task in the Middle East. It is confronted with a new factor which may ex-
challenge that the four Great Powers - the USA, the USSR, Britain and France - decided early in 1969 to consult together on how they could bring about a peaceful settlement in the Middle East. The basis of the four Big Powers talks was the Security Council resolution of November 27, 1967 which was rejected by the Palestinians. The Palestinians found it difficult to accept the resolution because it did not promise liberation of their own homeland - Palestine. The Middle East conflict is essentially a struggle between Zionism and the Arabs of Palestine who had been forcibly thrown out of their homes. The people depended on the United Nations and the Big Powers to get justice but they were proved wrong. The Palestine Arabs living as refugees in the Arab States gradually realized that no power on earth would help them get justice if they themselves were not willing to fight their own battle. In the post-June War period the Resistance Movement gathered enormous momentum. The Palestinians intensified their armed resistance movement and declared it a part of the heroic movement which the people of Vietnam were conducting to liquidate American colonialism.

Israel, according to the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO), is an Imperialist base created to defend the monopolistic petroleum concessions and to weaken the Arab movement for national liberation. Al-Fateh had always tried to set up the nucleus of a political organization, and from 1962 onwards the movement concentrated all its efforts on the setting up of a military organization to fight against Zionist imperialism which is in collaboration with neo-colonialism. The nucleus of al-Fateh, 'Harakat al-Tahrir al-Falastini' gave rise to the nucleus of the military organization, al-Asifa.

Towards the end of 1966 two other groups appeared: Heroes of the Return, and the Palestinian branch of the Arab Nationalist Movement.
These groups, later on, set up the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine (PFLP). After June 1967 the more extremist group, PFLP caught popular attention and the young, male and female, were attracted to Marxist-Leninist doctrine which became a guide for all those engaged in the struggle of liberation for their homeland; from the clutches of Zionist colonialism. There exist ideological differences between al-Fateh and PFLP but ideological cleavages mean little because their objective is the same, namely, liberation of Palestine and the establishment of a democratic, secular state in Palestine.

The Palestinian Resistance Movement constitutes the most welcome development in the Middle East. It is a national movement and asserts the Palestinian personality. The Movement is a ferment and will become a catalyst for the radicalization of politics and help to escalate the struggle of Arab peoples for the introduction of basic economic, social and political changes in Arab world.

The confrontation in the Middle East is between the forces of modernity and feudalism. The emergence of the Palestinian Resistance Movement would strengthen and consolidate the forces of progress and modernity in the Arab States. It poses danger to colonial powers abroad as well as to feudal and traditional regimes at home. The recent flare up in Jordan shows nothing but deep rooted antagonism existing between modernites represented by Arab Commandos and traditionalists represented by King Hussein. It is a verdict of history that ultimate victory belongs to those who stand for moving ahead and symbolize a progressive and modern outlook. The Palestine Resistance Movement has a popular support and believes in the people's army. They are determined to fight till they get justice denied to them all these years. They do not depend on any country, they now depend on
their own strength and determination. Any probable future solution of the Middle East problem cannot bypass the aspirations of the Palestinians who have become a force to reckon with. The first and the foremost prerequisite for any solution is full restoration of national rights and homes to Palestinians. Until it is done they are determined to continue their armed struggle for the liberation of Palestine in order to establish a secular democratic state where Jews, Christians and Muslims could all live together in peace and complete harmony, and it would be a real service to the cause of international peace and prosperity, for which the UN was established, if the world organization could help in making this transition both speedy and peaceful.