

EXCESSIVE SECRECY,  
LACK OF GUIDELINES

A REPORT ON MILITARY CENSORSHIP IN  
THE WEST BANK

Second Issue

(Appending related correspondence)

by Virgil Falloon

Virgil Falloon was a legal research volunteer with AL-HAQ Law in the Service of Man.



**AL-HAQ/ LAW IN THE SERVICE OF MAN**

**West Bank affiliate of the  
International Commission of Jurists**

P.O.Box 1413 Ramallah, West Bank, Via Israel.

This article first appeared in the August 1984 Issue of  
"Index on Censorship" (London). We reprint it here by  
permission of the editor of "Index"

Date of first Issue : January 1985

Date of second Issue : November 1986

---

PREFACE TO THE SECOND ISSUE

The following article by Virgil Falloon, "Excessive Secrecy, Lack of Guidelines: A Report on Military Censorship in the West Bank", first appeared in the August 1984 issue of the London-based Index on Censorship. LSM/al-Haq published a reprint of this article in January 1985, and made it available to its associates. Al-Haq has now decided to reprint once more the article since the topic is still as current as it was in the Summer of 1984. It will be necessary, however, to provide the reader with a short update of the situation, since the Israeli authorities introduced some changes in the prevailing law regarding censorship at the beginning of 1985, and again in June 1986.

On 21 April 1985, the Chief Censor of the military government of the West Bank announced that a change had been made in Military Order No. 101 of 1967, the "Order Regarding Prohibition of Acts of Incitement and Hostile Propaganda." In this amendment, Amendment No. 69 (the "Order Regarding Prohibited Publications"), the Chief Censor authorized a reduction of the existing list of publications (issued in 1977) that are explicitly banned in the West Bank, from over 1,000 down to 350 titles.

What are the implications of this reduction? It is al-Haq's perception that, first, the new list does in fact constitute a reduction of the hitherto existing list of publications banned in the West Bank, but, secondly, that this is not a complete list of prohibited publications. As Virgil Falloon pointed out in the article, the Israeli military authorities have made it "illegal to possess any publication in the West Bank without a permit regardless of whether or not the publication is contained in the prohibited publications list." The relevance of the list that existed before April 1985 is merely that no publications contained in that list could receive a permit. The significance of the updated Israeli list of 1985 is that the number of books for which no permit can be obtained has been reduced.

But this is beside the point. The real issue is one of selective enforcement, of requiring a permit for publications not appearing on the list when this is convenient to the military authorities. Al-Haq has documented several cases where West Bank Palestinians were arrested and prosecuted after April 1985 for possession of books which do not appear on the updated list. They are said to have violated the law for the simple reason that they had failed to obtain a permit for these books, which included in one case "It Is Your Right To Remain Silent" by Lea Tsemel (in Arabic), and the historical work "Palestine Between Mandate and Zionism, 1917-1948" by 'Issa Siferi. In this particular case, the authorities searched the house of a Palestinian villager, and when they could not find what they appeared to have been looking for, they took the villager and confiscated a number of the books he had in his house. He was then interrogated about activities which stood in no relation to the books, but was subsequently tried and sentenced to prison for the period of pre-trial detention on the charge of possessing illegal publications. From this and similar cases it seems that the Israeli authorities apply the censorship regulations arbitrarily, at times detaining Palestinians, about whom they may have certain suspicions but against whom they have no evidence, merely on the basis of their possessing books for which they do not have a permit, i.e. in all likelihood all the books in their possession.

In addition, it now appears to al-Haq that in fact a growing number of West Bank Palestinians are being subjected to prosecution under Military Order No. 101, but in the majority of cases not for their possession of books, but for possession of magazines and newspapers - even those published in East Jerusalem, which are fully legal there.

In June 1986, the list of banned publications was again increased to include sixty-seven new titles. Military Order 101 was adjusted through Amendments 70-76 to ban such books as "An Arab in Israel" (in Arabic) by Fawzi al-Asmar, "The Dabolia Operation in the Words of Those Who Carried it Out" (Arabic) by Jerusalem lawyer Darwish Naser who defended the accused in

court, collections of poems by Mahmud Darwish, as well as the introductions to the Arabic editions of Ezer Weizman's "The War for Peace" and Aluph Hareven's "Is There a Solution for the Palestinian Problem?", and the entire fourteen volumes of the "Palestinian Encyclopedia", edited by Ahmed al-Mar'ashali.

In light of the above, Al-Haq came to the conclusion that Israel's policy of censorship in the occupied West Bank has remained substantially unaltered. It was therefore decided to carry out a second printing of Virgil Falloon's article, including the correspondence that ensued in the pages of the Jewish Chronicle (London) following the publication of Mr. Falloon's article in Index on Censorship. There is appended one letter sent by al-Haq to the editor of Index on Censorship which has not previously been published, to respond in detail to some of the charges made in the Jewish Chronicle.

Al-Haq hopes that the following article will serve as a resource for those who oppose censorship, in the Occupied Territories or anywhere else in the world.

Al-Haq

Ramallah, November 1986

## INTRODUCTION

An expanding collection of military orders has governed the West Bank since the Israeli Defense Forces assumed control of the area following the 1967 Israeli-Arab War. Among them are a number of military orders that institute an extensive and complex system of censorship. Taken together, the orders cover most methods of expressing or communicating ideas, giving Israeli military censors restrictive control over all publications which they consider to have any political meaning. Israeli soldiers have been granted broad warrantless search and arrest powers to uphold these orders. These military orders instituting censorship in the West Bank are part of a more comprehensive system of censorship that also includes a corpus of pre-1967 censorship law still enforced within the West Bank as well as within Israel proper and annexed East Jerusalem. While this system of censorship applies to all forms of public expression, its most commonplace application is in restricting the publication and distribution of printed material.

This article outlines the practice of censorship as applied to importing, distributing, publishing, and possessing printed materials in the West Bank. While the international community holds East Jerusalem to be part of the occupied West Bank, Israel has unilaterally extended Israeli law to East Jerusalem. This situation necessitates a brief introduction of the distinct system of censorship applied in East Jerusalem and Israel, where the offices of all of the West Bank's licensed Arabic-language newspapers are in fact located and where most other publications directed to the West Bank readership originate. Censorship practices with regard to other forms of public expression, including assemblies, demonstrations, strikes, plays, music, and art demand a separate discussion.

## I. CENSORSHIP IN ISRAEL AND ANNEXED EAST JERUSALEM

Current censorship practices in Israel and annexed Jerusalem are based on the 1945 mandatory British Defense (Emergency) Regulations (hereafter, the Regulations). The Regulations were enacted on the termination of World War II by the British Mandatory Government of Palestine "in order to safeguard public security, the defense of Palestine, the preservation of public order and the suppression of uprisings, rebellions and disturbances."(1) They have been incorporated into Israeli law and are applicable throughout Israel and annexed Jerusalem.

Part 8 of the Regulations (Articles 86-101) serves as the legal basis for the institution of censorship. Article 88 provides in part:

(1) The censor may by order prohibit the importation or exportation or the printing or publishing of any publication (which prohibition shall be deemed to extend to any copy or portion of such publication or of issue or number thereof), the importation, exportation, printing or publishing of which, in his opinion, would be or be likely to be or become, prejudicial for the defense of Palestine or to the public safety or to public order.

(2) Any person who contravenes any order under this regulation and the proprietor and editor of the publication, in relation to which the contravention occurs, and any person (unless in the opinion of the court he ought fairly to be excused) who has in his possession or his control or in premises of which he is the occupier, any publication prohibited under this regulation or who posts, delivers or receives any such prohibition, shall be guilty of an offense against these regulations.

Articles 94-100 of the Regulations govern the publication of newspapers. Both Arab and Israeli newspapers published in Israel and East Jerusalem are subject to these regulations despite repeated attempts by some Knesset members to have these regulations repealed. Permits to publish and pre-publication censorship are the most significant subjects of the articles. Requiring a permit to publish is highly contested by both Israelis and Palestinians as a prior restraint on the press. Secrecy continues to surround the criteria used in granting or denying permits to publish despite appeals to the Israeli High Court to have the criteria revealed. Pre-publication censorship manifests a distinctly different set of standards for the Arab press.

Article 94 forbids printing or publishing any newspaper without a permit. A permit to publish may be granted, refused, or revoked by the District Commissioner at any time without giving a cause or explanation. The Israeli High Court upheld the "no cause" rule in October 1982 when Dr. Najwa Makhoul petitioned the Court to require the Jerusalem District Commissioner to show cause why he had refused to grant her a permit to publish an Arabic weekly.(2)

Article 97 grants the censor the power to review materials before publication. A Chief Censor and a number of other censors under his direction have been appointed and authorized to censor materials submitted to them.

Each night, the Arab newspapers published in Jerusalem must submit to the Israeli censor at the Government Press Building in Beit Agron two copies of every news article they intend to print the following day. This includes sports news, advertisements, comics, obituaries, announcements, and weather reports. Feature articles that could appear at a later date may be submitted to the censor during regular office hours. The newspapers may pick up the reviewed materials before midnight. In the event a late news item appears, after midnight or during a Jewish holiday when the censorship office is closed, the item may be cleared for publication the following day by calling the censor at his home.



Israeli newspapers, right and left alike, are not subject to the same strict censorship that Arab newspapers must undergo. In an agreement worked out with the Chief Censor and the Committee of Editors of Daily Newspapers, Hebrew language newspapers and the Israeli English daily, The Jerusalem Post, are only required to submit articles about "military security" matters. Other news, political commentaries, and feature stories are not sent to the censor.

Entire news articles from the East Jerusalem Arabic-language press are commonly stricken by the censor. News articles of events in the West Bank that do appear in the Arabic-language newspapers frequently have details expunged. Curfews, strikes, protests, Israeli seizure of water supplies, settler violence against West Bank Arabs, and police brutality are typical of the stories that are reduced to a single paragraph simply recognizing that the event took place.

On the other hand, the Israeli press freely publishes news about the West Bank without having to clear the stories through the censor. In light of this, Arab journalists often supply Israeli journalists with daily reports of events on the West Bank. News of the West Bank published in the Hebrew-language newspapers or in the English-language Jerusalem Post may in turn be translated into Arabic and republished in Arabic-language newspapers at a later date. However, there is no guarantee that a story translated from the Hebrew-language press for publication in the Arabic-language press will pass the censor's editing.

Articles that are censored from the Arabic-language press may be challenged by appealing to the Chief Censor. In a few rare instances, the Chief Censor has allowed the articles in question to be published.

An internal appeals system has, however, been established to challenge any censoring of materials in the Hebrew-language press or in the Jerusalem Post. Under the appeal system, the article in question is discussed among the censors and the editors of the Israeli press, with the Chief of Staff of the

Israeli Defense Forces having the final say.

Article 100 empowers the Censor to prohibit the operation of a newspaper's printing press for any length of time. Unlike their Israeli counterparts, Arabic-language newspapers have been prohibited from printing their newspapers a number of times throughout the years as punishment for allegedly breaching the Chief Censor's directives.

## II. CENSORSHIP UNDER WEST BANK MILITARY RULE

Following the 1967 War, the Commander of the Israeli Defense Forces adopted many of the Regulations in formulating the military orders instituting censorship in the West Bank. One group of orders affecting printed media restrict the import and distribution of publications originating outside the "enclosed area"(3) of the West Bank. Newspapers, books, and magazines published in occupied East Jerusalem as well as in Israel fall under these restrictions. Another group of orders restrict publishing within the "closed area" of the West Bank. Through one of the same military orders, the Commander granted himself, or anyone appointed by him, the powers of "Inspector" under the Regulations, effectively making Articles 86-101 of the Regulations applicable to the West Bank as well.

Typical of the whole corpus of Israel military legislation, the military orders concerning censorship incorporate preambles declaring the purpose of such orders to be the preservation of "public order and security." Despite this limited stated purpose, Israeli military censorship practices have aimed at suppressing unapproved comments, interpretations of events, and expressions of Palestinian national identity.

A. Importing Into and Distributing Within the West Bank

The most striking feature of the orders restricting the import and distribution of printed matter is the extreme breadth of the prohibition. No printed matter of any sort may legally be brought into the West Bank, whether as single copies for personal use or in bulk for public distribution, without the military government having first issued a permit for the specific printed matter in question.

Military Order No. 50, as originally enacted in 1967, forbids the import and distribution of newspapers into the West Bank without a permit from the "person responsible" who is appointed by the military commander of the area. To obtain a permit, the publication is first subjected to strict censorship through a special department of the military government. This permit must be renewed every three months. Palestinians importing and/or distributing any publication in the West Bank without a permit are deemed criminal offenders and risk prosecution in an Israeli military court.

The order defines "newspaper" to include "any pamphlet containing news, information, events, occurrences, or explanations relating to news or news-items, tales, or any other item of public interest, which may be printed in any language or any country, whether for sale or free distribution at specific periods or unspecified times."

Military Order No. 379, issued on April 3, 1970, expanded Order No. 50 to include a provision granting the "person responsible" the power to confiscate any publication, whether a single copy in the possession of a single individual or copies of a publication under distribution, in the West Bank without a permit. The order authorizes the "person responsible" to take all necessary measures to confiscate the material and dispose of it.

Arab newspapers published in East Jerusalem and cleared by Israeli censors are sent to distribution outlets in the West Bank. The military government in the West Bank need not

see the newspaper before distribution. However, the newspapers on the stands remain subject to seizure by the military authorities should they consider materials in the newspapers threatening to "security" or "public order" in the area.

Importing and distributing other publications such as books is subject to restriction as well. Under the Regulations, Article 88(1), the military authorities issue orders prohibiting the importation or distribution of certain books deemed a risk to "public order and security." The Israeli military censorship authorities maintain a listing of prohibited books and distribute listings periodically to the legal profession. A master list was last issued in September, 1982. The list contains over 1,000 titles including books on Muslim and Arab histories, geography, economics, and poetry. It also included a book about the Israeli Defense Forces by Ha'aretz correspondent Ze'ev Schiff and a similar book by former Deputy Prime Minister Yigal Allon, Of Blessed Memory, as well as, The Jew of Malta by Christopher Marlow, George Antonius' The Arab Awakening, a biography of Theodor Herzl by Desmond Stewart, and many literary works by individuals identified with the Palestinian national movement.(4)

Many lawyers in the West Bank have complained to the authorities that they have not received nor have they been able to obtain a copy of the list upon request. Consequently, West Bank Palestinians usually have no way of knowing what books are permitted until they are arrested and charged with possessing a prohibited book under Article 88(2) of the Regulations. Palestinians caught possessing books not on the list, but nonetheless considered a risk to the "public order and security" in the area are prosecuted under Military Order No. 50, as amended by Military Order No. 862 issued on August 6, 1980. Order No. 862 changed Order No. 50 in several important ways.

It redefined the word "newspaper" to include "any publication," making it illegal to import and distribute any publication in the West Bank without a permit.

It also added a new paragraph effectively making it illegal to possess any publication in the West Bank without a permit regardless of whether or not the publication is contained in the prohibited publications list. The new paragraph states:

2(B) For purposes of clarification, any publication which has NOT been entered in the list of prohibited publications issued in the appendix of the order regarding prohibited publications, by virtue of Article 87(1) or 88(1) of the British Emergency Regulations of 1945, shall NOT be considered a publication PERMITTED to be brought into or published in the Area unless a permit has been issued for it. (Emphasis added).

#### B. Publishing in the West Bank

Printing or publishing in the West Bank is restricted by Military Order No. 101 (1967), as amended by Order No. 718 (1977) and No. 938 (1981), "concerning the prohibition of incitement and adverse propaganda." Article 6 of this order provides:

It is forbidden to print or publish in the area any publication, advertisement, proclamation, picture, or any other document which contains any article with political significance except after obtaining beforehand a licence from the military commander in the area where the printing or publishing is to be carried out. (Emphasis added).

Definitions of key words in the paragraph above are contained in the preamble of the order. They appear purposefully open-ended to facilitate the broadest judicial interpretation of the order, making it possible to bring the maximum number of people within the order's scope.

"Printing" is defined in the order to include "lithography, typing on a typewriter, copying, photographing or any other manner of representation or of communicating expressions, numbers, symbols, pictures, maps, painting, decorations, or any other similar material."

"Publishing" is defined to include "broadcasting, distributing, handing over, announcing, supplying or submitting to any person whatsoever."

In accordance with the above definition, "publishing" has been interpreted broadly by the military courts. In a 1978 Military Court case in Ramallah, a librarian was convicted of "publishing" when he purchased what he thought was a permitted publication for the Ramallah public library and made it available for the public to check out. He was convicted of "publishing" the work on the basis that he was "supplying" others with an illegal publication. Retail book salespeople have been convicted of "publishing" by selling unpermitted publications to customers.

A "publication" is defined to include a "newspaper, scroll, series or book, or any other document which has been published or is prepared for publication even if only once, and the document shall be presumed prepared for publication unless the contrary is proven."

Notably absent from the text of definitions contained in Military Order No. 101 is any description or demarcation of what in fact the military authorities consider "political significance" to mean. Without such definitive legal guidelines, military court judges responsible for applying the military orders are placed in an extraordinary quasi-legislative role of deciding on an ad hoc basis the criteria for "political significance," and only then determining whether the particular publication in question fits those criteria. Under the terms of Order No. 101, "political significance" need not be further evaluated as "hostile" or "inciting" to enable conviction. However, if the court ultimately finds that the "political significance" is of a

nature that incites the reader to actions violating the "security and public order" of the area, the accused may also be convicted of incitement. Military court judges have differed in their interpretation of these questions, and have issued an inconsistent body of decisions. The grounds for prosecution and conviction are so ill-defined as to make almost any publishing activity undertaken without a permit vulnerable to prosecution.

Although "political significance" has yet to be officially defined, there are many military court decisions that reveal what in fact the military censors consider it to be: any suggestion that West Bank inhabitants are suffering under occupation, any talk of love and loyalty to the homeland, or any representation of national aspirations. Common examples of illicit "political content" have included pictorial representations of Israeli soldiers assaulting Palestinian civilians, schools surrounded by barbed wire, calendars depicting the Palestinian massacres in Sabra and Shatila, the use of Palestinian colors of red, green, black and white, or pictures of Palestinian political figures. Leaflets produced by Israelis protesting Israel's invasion of Lebanon, maps of Palestine, or the words "Palestine," "homeland," "return," or the "PLO" have also been declared illicit, as have Christmas cards that contain the message, "Greetings from the Occupied Holy Land."

Works by West Bank literary writers, most notably poets, are closely scrutinized by the censorship authorities for "political content." Publication of poetry alluding to steadfastness, national pride, endurance, the right of refugees to return to their land, opposition to occupation, and torture in prison frequently result in prosecution. For example, the Israeli military authorities have brought a case of incitement against Palestinian poet Sami Kilani. Kilani, now under town arrest in his village of Ya'abad, was taken to the military court in Nablus on May 15, 1983 for publishing a collection of poetry entitled, "A New Promise to Iz al-Din al-Qassam." The military prosecutor called the book "inciting", basing his charge on a report by the Israeli army. The report

considered the symbols of the collection and its meanings "inciting" because they refer to the first leader of the Palestinian revolution in 1935, Iz al-Din al-Qassam who was killed in a clash with British troops in Ya'abad. Kilani refers to al-Qassam in only one of 14 poems and mentions al-Qassam only to criticize Arab regimes for backstabbing the Palestinian people. A decision of the case is still pending.

### C. Powers of Search, Seizure, and Arrest

While the military prosecutor may bring criminal proceedings against alleged violators of the Regulations and/or Military Order No. 50 and No. 101, the Israeli soldier posted in the West Bank is given broad warrantless search and arrest powers on the possibility that any resident, household, or institution may be in possession of an illicit publication. Soldiers have the authority to search and arrest any Palestinian in the West Bank at anytime.

Under Order No. 101, every soldier has the power to use all necessary force to implement any of the censorship orders. The soldier is also at liberty to utilize, at his individual discretion, the powers granted him in Section 4 of Security Provisions Order No. 378 (1970), namely warrantly arrest, search, and seizure of materials. Section 4 allows any soldier to search any person or premise at any time in the West Bank, without warrant, on the suspicion that an individual, organization, or business may be in possession of an unpermitted publication. It also allows any soldier to arrest, without warrant, anyone suspected of possessing, publishing, or distributing unpermitted publications. Victims of such arrests have often alleged that during the ensuing interrogation, information on friends, associates, family members, and organizational affiliations was pursued, and the publications themselves were ignored.

Military Order No. 378 offers a readily available legal pretext for random searches of persons, homes, and offices and selective and arbitrary arrest and prosecution. A highly



irregular situation of indeterminate criminal liability irreconcilable with accepted norms of civilian or military justice is created in which local residents possessing libraries in their homes are vulnerable to arrest and prosecution for possessing illegal publications if any book found in their collections happens not to have been expressly permitted, regardless of the nature of the book or the date of its acquisition. Consequent to this military order, virtually every individual possessing a private library is technically in violation of the orders, whereby enforcement and prosecution becomes a matter entirely of the military authorities' choosing. Enforcement need not entail any criminal prosecution, but may be punishing in its own right.

For example, in late 1982, several months after the death of her husband, an UNRWA medical assistant with a history of resistance-related activities, Khadija Yusef, answered the doorbell of her home located in the Dheisheh refugee camp outside of Bethlehem. She was confronted with Israeli soldiers and their commander who proceeded to search her house without a warrant or any explanation. After a thorough search of the house, they removed the entire collection of the family library containing medical, religious and literary books. Along with these 800 books, they removed family records including her husband's birth certificate, identity cards, passports, family pictures, school graduation certificates, and family property titles. The soldiers took the entire lot outside, dumped them into a 44-gallon drum, drenched them in gasoline, and set them on fire. Mrs. Yusef was never charged with any violation of the orders and to this date has yet to receive an official explanation as to why the family library was destroyed.

Should an arrest be carried out, the Israeli authorities may hold the accused at a police station or other place of detention for up to 96 hours before obtaining an arrest warrant. Any Israeli police officer is competent to issue an arrest warrant in writing for a period not exceeding 7 days. Military courts are authorized to issue an extension of the arrest warrant for a period of up to 6 months. Should formal

charges be filed with the military court, the court may order the detention of the accused until the trial is completed.

#### CONCLUSION

Despite the system of censorship outlined above, newspapers, books, magazines, and other forms of expression do find their way to the West Bank. The stated purpose of the orders restricting importation and distribution is open to serious question in light of the fact that movement of local residents between the West Bank, East Jerusalem, and Israel is normally unrestricted and materials legally published in Israel but banned in the West Bank are accessible to West Bank residents. Furthermore, radio and television news of events in the West Bank and programming that most certainly would be considered "hostile propaganda" are broadcast daily on Jordanian, Syrian, and Egyptian networks, all of which are received in the majority of West Bank homes. The ease with which the same materials can be obtained or received removes any functional justification for the orders prohibiting importation and distribution.

Restrictions placed on printing and publishing materials of an undefined "political nature" have not eliminated the publishing of these materials. However, they have caused the vast majority of independent printers and publishers in the "closed area" to relocate their operations in East Jerusalem where the censorship practices and threat of prosecution are more relaxed. Attempts to impede the availability of publications of an unfavorable political nature through warrantless search and seizure practices and to deter or punish Palestinians for possession of these publications through arrest and prosecution has not prevented similar political messages from being received. Apart from these attempts at suppressing "political" publications, Israeli military censorship orders and enforcement practices place West Bank Palestinians, who choose to read publications on

economics, history, and the humanities, or novels, poetry, and the like, in jeopardy of selective and arbitrary prosecution and punishment for practices - i.e., the exercise of literacy - which pose no real challenge to "security and public order."

FOOTNOTES

1. Meir Shamgar, Editor, Military Government in the Territories Administered by Israel, 1967 - 1980: The Legal Aspects. (Jerusalem: Alpha Press, 1982), p.295.
2. "Makhoul vs. District Commissioner of Jerusalem, H.C. 322/81 (1982)". An unofficial translation from the Hebrew text. (Jerusalem: the Association for Civil Rights in Israel, 1983).
3. See Military Order No.5 (1967).
4. For a detailed analysis see Meron Benvenisti, Israeli Censorship of Arab Publications (New York: The Fund for Free Expression, 1983); and The Jerusalem Post, 9 December 1983, p.6.

APPENDIX

PUBLISHED AND UNPUBLISHED CORRESPONDENCE  
CONCERNING VIRGIL FALLOON'S ARTICLE  
FOLLOWING ITS PUBLICATION IN  
"INDEX ON CENSORSHIP"

I. Article by columnist Philip Kleinman in the "Jewish Chronicle" (London) of 27 July 1984.

TRUTH - BUT NOT ALL THE TRUTH

Index on Censorship is a respected publication which numbers among its directors Dan Jacobson and Stephen Spender. When the magazine devotes, as in its current [August 1984] issue, six pages to Israeli censorship in the occupied territories, it deserves to be taken seriously.

Or, at least, that is what you might think. Having read it, I am not so sure. Nor am I sure that George Theiner, the editor, has done his job properly.

That is not because any of the material printed is completely untrue. I believe most of it to be factually correct. But there are at least three flagrant examples of suggestio falsi, an overall offence of suppressio veri and an atrocity story which should have been checked out and apparently was not.

Israel is not Russia or Iran. Reporters do not have to smuggle information out, relying on one-sided accounts because it is impossible to get two sides. If, in a relatively open society, they are free to ask questions and compare evidence, they are under some obligation to do so.

One of Theiner's correspondents is not in the conventional sense a reporter at all, but that does not change

the moral situation. The longest of three linked pieces is by Virgil Falloon, described as a legal research volunteer on the West Bank. He details the censorship rules, which are both strict and criticisable, especially in regard to military powers to enforce them.

According to Falloon, the military seized 800 books from one Arab widow's home and burned them on the spot together with family records. That is the atrocity story. The official version of this alleged incident is not supplied;

Because permission is required for the distribution of any publication, Falloon says West Bankers who read economics, history or literature are "in jeopardy of selective and arbitrary prosecution." This suggests that Israel has blocked educational development. The opposite is true. The four West Bank universities have all been created since the occupation.

Falloon mentions the banning of a book by former deputy Premier Yigal Allon. He does not reveal that the Arabic translation contained a violently anti-Israel preface.

Similarly, when Roger Hardy, in a shorter, accompanying article, refers to a New York Times report that Orwell's "1984" was banned, he does not explain that the report was based on a clerical error of December, 1976, confusing books banned and permitted, and that the error was rectified the following month.

A third piece is about the banning of books, by the talented Palestinian poet, Mahmoud Darwish, but does not mention that some contain direct incitement to hatred of Israelis. Nothing in Theiner's magazine indicates that the occupation and the censorship are the direct results of a war of survival.

Nor is the reader told that, whereas before June 1967 there was only one Arabic daily in the West Bank and East Jerusalem, there are now four, plus seven periodicals. According to a study reported in the Jerusalem Post, the pro-

PLO journals--yes, they exist, even under the occupation--write about Israel and Israelis with regular and total hostility.

II. Letter from the Editor of "Index On Censorship", George Thainer, in the "Jewish Chronicle" of 10 August 1984.

A PARADOX OF FREEDOM

Sir,

In his "Media" piece (July 27) Philip Kleinman takes us to task for our recent coverage of military censorship on the West Bank. The article was called "Truth--but not all the truth."

If one wanted to play this game, one could likewise accuse Mr. Kleinman of giving only some of the truth when, for instance, he describes Virgil Falloon, the author of the report we printed, as "a legal research volunteer on the West Bank," omitting the rest of the description given in "Index"--namely, that he works for the organisation Law in the Service of Man, the West Bank affiliate of the International Commission of Jurists in Geneva (surely not an unimportant detail when the author's credibility is being questioned); or again when he fails to make it clear that Roger Hardy's "accompanying article" was, in fact, a review of an authoritative report on "Israeli Censorship of Arab Publications" commissioned by the New York Fund for Free Expression and compiled by the former deputy mayor of Jerusalem, Meron Benvenisti.

I readily agree with Philip Kleinman when he tells us that "Israel is not Russia or Iran"--that is why, when writing about Israel, we deal, not with writers and others languishing in prisons and labour camps or being tortured and executed, but with subjects like the censorship of Arab publications.

We did not explain, as Mr. Kleinman would have us do, that "the occupation and the censorship are the direct results of a war of survival," having sufficient faith in the intelligence and general knowledge of our readers to believe that they are aware of the background.

Maybe we have shown too much faith; we have certainly not perpetrated a suppressio veri. Mr. Kleinman has chosen not to notice the box with a quote from the "Guardian" which started with the words "It is a fact of Israel's life that notwithstanding the incessant attacks on its own people and property, it is expected, and its own people generally expect it, to show a high standard of justice and law enforcement when Israelis are the offenders."

We see our job as presenting the facts on censorship anywhere in the world. In doing so we appreciate that the relative freedom and the ease with which information can be obtained and transmitted in free societies sometimes leads to paradoxical situations, so that Israel gets far more column inches in our chronicle section than, say, East Germany, while Albania will appear rarely, if at all. We have on several occasions gone out of our way to point out the paradox--most recently in the issue in which the article on Israel appeared: "Countries which have considerable margins of freedom, such as Egypt and Israel," wrote our Middle East specialist, "figured constantly in our reports last year, even though the very fact of such reports means more freedom in those countries than among most of their neighbours."

George Theiner  
Editor, Index on Censorship



III. Article by Philip Kleinman in the "Jewish Chronicle" of  
17 August 1934.

FAITH IS FINE, BUT IGNORANCE RULES

George Theiner, editor of Index on Censorship, should pull his socks up. Three weeks ago I pointed out several specific distortions of fact in his August issue, largely devoted to censorship on the West Bank. His letter to this paper last week failed to mention, still less justify, any of them. Since then the Observer has quoted Index without comment.

Theiner replied only to my general criticism that his magazine contained no indication that "the occupation and the censorship are the direct results of a war of survival." Index, he wrote, had "sufficient faith in the intelligence and general knowledge of our readers to believe that they are aware of the background."

His faith is touching, but I cannot share it. A feature of recent media coverage of the Middle East is the ignorance revealed even by some specialist journalists of the history of the Arab-Israeli conflict. The point is brought out in an excellent new research report on "The Lebanon War and Western News Media" written by Dr. Yoel Cohen and Dr. Jacob Reuveny of Bar-Ilan University and published by the Institute of Jewish Affairs.

Theiner also reproached me for having failed to spell out the precise credentials of his contributors, as if that made their mistakes more forgivable. He overlooked the fact that, while they had 8,000 words to make their case, I had only 500 words to comment on it. Lack of space accounted for another omission of mine.

Because I used all of my July 27 column to talk about Index's propaganda barrage, masquerading as objective reporting, I had no space to refer to the publication of a

long article by Lynn Reid-Banks in the Sunday Telegraph of July 22 which I would categorise as objective reporting. In it she summarised conversations with both Jews and Arabs on the West Bank.

If I go back to her article now it is because it stood in interesting contrast to the spate of recent "Israeli rotters, Arab victims" pieces to which I have previously drawn attention. (David Hirst was back playing that game in a series of three Guardian articles this week.)

While not hiding her distaste for Gush Emunim, Lynn Reid-Banks made clear what is so often concealed, namely that "not all Arabs on the West Bank are poor and downtrodden" and that quite a few of them despise the PLO, holding it responsible for their troubles.

Finally let me recommend a Jerusalem Post article by Hirsh Goodman which should be required reading for anyone like George Theiner whose awareness of the Middle East background seems incomplete. Meir Kahane's election to the Knesset, wrote Goodman, was "a result not only of blind hatred of Arabs in Israel, but also of blind Arab hatred of Israelis." The youngsters who had voted for him had grown up in an environment of "constant opposition by all except Sadat and a few moderate Palestinians, most of whom have paid with their lives for their moderation."

On Wednesday The Times printed a long-winded retraction of a story alleging Israeli soldiers killed a Lebanese child. More about this next week.

IV. Letter from George Theiner in the "Jewish Chronicle" of 24 August 1984.

"INDEX" AND CENSORSHIP

Sir,

I really don't want to take up your space by exchanging fire with Philip Kleinman ad infinitum, but I cannot allow his attack last week to go unanswered.

Briefly then, it just won't do to dismiss as "Index's propaganda barrage" two serious reports on censorship on the West Bank--one commissioned by an organisation in Israel which works with the International Commission of Jurists in Geneva, the other published by the Fund for Free Expression in New York and written by the former Deputy Mayor of Jerusalem, Meron Benvenisti. Philip Kleinman may have had only 500 words at his disposal, but that is no excuse for making it appear as if "Index" got all this information from some unidentified "correspondents" and was out to malign Israel.

And a final point: just because, as Kleinman rightly says, Israel is not Russia or Iran, when we write about it--just as when we write about Britain, the USA, or any other democratic country--we tend to set our sights somewhat higher and expect such countries to behave that much more correctly where censorship (and human and civic rights in general) is concerned.

George Theiner  
Editor, Index on Censorship

V. Letter from R. R. Goldstone in the "Jewish Chronicle" of 24 August 1984.

Sir,

Perhaps George Theiner, editor of Index on Censorship, would like to explain why my own private protest three months ago, based on two free copies of "Index," dated August 1983 and February 1984, were ignored. I made the point that a disproportionate number of column inches were devoted to Israeli censorship--far more than for any other country.

Since the August 1983 copy gave sources of its world-wide reports, which were no longer given in the February 1984 issue, I wondered if the appointing of an Arab researcher Haifaa Khalaffah had anything to do with the change. The "Middle East International," no doubt Arab-inspired, was quoted as the source of three items on Egypt, a half-column, and four items on Israel and the Occupied Territories, a column and a half.

The Director's report, page 45 in this same issue, welcomes the researcher and in the February 1984 issue her name appears on the permanent staff list for the Middle East, a new appointment.

Sources were not given in this issue and there was no report on Egypt. But once again Israel and the Occupied Territories received pride of place with a column and a half. The Arts Council help to fund this publication, which means that we are funding an anti-Israel publication through our taxes.

Early this year I wrote to Sir Angus Wilson, the writer, a patron of "Index," asking him to deal with the matter and he passed on my complaint. Since then, in spite of a direct letter and further reminder, the silence has been deafening.

Therefore, I have concluded that "Index" is biased, anti-

Israel, pro-Arab, and I do not choose to support it financially as I had originally intended.

R. R. Goldstone  
102 Claremont Road, E7

VI. Article by Philip Kleinman in the "Jewish Chronicle" of 31 August 1984.

#### TIPPING SCALES AGAINST ISRAEL

Index on Censorship may have a small circulation, but the letter from its editor, George Theiner, published in this paper last week, illustrated much of what is wrong with present-day media coverage of Israel.

Five weeks ago, I pointed out several specific distortions in an 8,000-word anti-Israel propoganda barrage (yes, I persist in calling it that) carried in his magazine. He has now written twice to the Jewish Chronicle, but has still made no attempt to prove the truth of those allegations I challenged.

I could, of course, be wrong, but at least I took the trouble to do some checking. Theiner does not appear to have bothered to do any checking of his own. Worse still, he does not acknowledge that he ought to have done so.

Conclusion one: these days you can believe anything, and print it, if it is defamatory of Israel. Never mind if it turns out to be inaccurate; only the Zionist minority will object, and who cares about them?

Theiner declared last week that when Index wrote about Israel, "just as when we write about Britain, the USA or any other democratic country, we tend to set our sights somewhat

higher and expect such countries to behave that much more correctly" (than Russia or Iran).

Conclusion two: Israel may be engaged in a long-term struggle with implacable enemies who routinely go in for repression of the worst kind, but it's perfectly OK to concentrate on the sins of the former while ignoring those of the latter. If the balance of Western public opinion thereby swings against the Jewish State and in favour of a collection of undemocratic thugs and tyrants, you can't blame respectable people like editors or TV producers.

As has often been pointed out, the relative openness of Israeli society makes it easy and safe for Western journalists to study its failings--while blithely disregarding its virtues, which don't make such exciting copy.

Poking your nose into the affairs of Israel's neighbours is neither easy nor safe. Which may be why we had another nice colour piece from The Times' Robert Fisk last week based on conversations with young Israeli soldiers in Lebanon, but not one about young Syrian soldiers. Strangely--or perhaps not so strangely--the Israeli boys all, it was implied, knew English. Here's a suggestion for Charles Douglas-Home, editor of The Times. Give Fisk a few months off to learn Hebrew--he's a clever fellow, he can do it--and then move him to, say, Tel Aviv or, better still, Ashdod with a brief to find out what really makes Israelis tick and write about it.

I would suggest the same experiment for The Guardian's David Hirst, except that, on the evidence of his recent series of features on South Lebanon, I suspect Hirst's dislike of Israel is so ingrained as to be immovable.

In the New Statesman, Claudia Wright wrote indignantly (natch!) about "extortion" by the pro-Israel lobby in the US, which "has been asked to drop all customs' duties" on Israeli goods and to do so before the Presidential election. She saw no way such an agreement could possibly benefit the US itself.

VII. Letter from George Theiner in the "Jewish Chronicle" of  
21 September 1984.

Sir,

Mr. Kleinman's charges against "Index on Censorship" have grown into a wide-ranging attack on its accuracy and political impartiality. "Index" has been thoroughly misrepresented and this forces me to reply at length.

Mr. Kleinman began his criticism of "Index on Censorship's" recent article on Israeli censorship by saying he was not sure that I had done my job properly. He went on: "That is not because any of the material printed is completely untrue. I believe most of it to be factually correct. But there are at least three flagrant examples of suggestio falsi, an overall offence of suppressio veri and an atrocity story which should have been checked out and apparently was not" (July 27).

His latest charges (about the same material) are more general and more serious: "an 8,000-word anti-Israel propaganda barrage." He accuses "Index" of distortions, concentrating on the sins of Israel, disregarding its virtues, ignoring the sins of Israel's enemies (August 31).

Mr. Kleinman also rebukes me for not answering each of his points. I shall now do so.

1. The "atrocity" story which "should have been checked out and apparently was not". It is not an atrocity story; it concerns the burning of 800 books and was given as an example of the extremely wide-ranging and arbitrary powers of the military authorities. "The official version of this alleged incident is not supplied," adds Mr. Kleinman. If he believes the incident to be a fabrication, he should say so and state his reason. What makes him think the story was not "checked out" by the writer? (I imagine the editor of the "Jewish Chronicle", like most editors, does not "check out" all the

facts asserted in his reporters' stories. The writer is competent or not.)

2. Mr. Kleinman's second complaint concerns the concluding sentence of Falloon's "Index" article, which went as follows: "Apart from these attempts at suppressing 'political' publications, Israeli military censorship orders and enforcement practices place West Bank Palestinians who choose to read publications on economics, history, and the humanities, or novels, poetry and the like, in jeopardy of selective and arbitrary prosecution and punishment for practices -- i.e., the exercise of literacy -- which pose no real challenge to 'security and public order'."

Mr. Kleinman paraphrases this and comments: "This suggests that Israel has blocked educational development. The opposite is true."

The suggestion is Mr. Kleinman's. The exercise of literacy is not the same thing as education; the article is clearly about censorship and not about education. Mr. Kleinman is setting up an Aunt Sally in order to dispose of it.

3. Among over 1,000 titles banned by the military authorities, one is the Arabic translation of a book by former Deputy Premier Yigal Allon. Mr. Kleinman says: "He (Falloon) does not reveal that the Arabic translation contained a violently anti-Israel preface."

I don't yet have a copy of this edition to hand. Had Mr. Kleinman himself read the full Arabic introduction before writing his article? We will see what was actually written when the text is found. And what of the other banned titles?

4. Mr. Kleinman complains: "When Roger Hardy, in a shorter accompanying article, refers to a 'New York Times' report that Orwell's '1984' was banned, he does not explain that the report was based on a clerical error of December 1976, confusing books banned and permitted, and that the error



was rectified the following month."

Roger Hardy, towards the end of his review of a survey directed by Meron Benvenisti, former Deputy Mayor of Jerusalem, entitled "Israeli Censorship of Arab Publications," wrote: "After Anthony Lewis, of the 'New York Times', pointed out that even Orwell's '1984' was prohibited on the West Bank, the censor cancelled the lists issued before 1977, and in 1982 issued a master list comprising Arabic titles only."

It took Anthony Lewis's column to galvanise the Israeli authorities to revise the confused lists of banned books. The appearance of Orwell's "1984" on the banned list exposed the Israeli authorities to ridicule; and incidentally indicated the degree of confusion. Perhaps the mistake was subsequently corrected in the way Mr. Kleinman says it was, but what a mistake!

5. Mr. Kleinman writes: "A third piece (i.e., article) is about the banning of books by Mahmoud Darwish, but does not mention that some contain direct incitement to hatred of Israelis."

Mahmoud Darwish's books are banned in the West Bank because they give encouragement to the Palestinian cause. As Meron Benvenisti's survey states (page 128) -- and Roger Hardy quoted this -- "Poetry and fiction connected even indirectly and symbolically with Palestine is banned." The survey goes on to say: "Practically the entire range of human emotions connected with the Israeli-Palestinian struggle is perceived (by the Israeli military censor) as a 'call for action'." The survey emphasizes -- and Rogery Hardy quoted this, too -- "It may be that only 3-4 per cent of imported titles (of books) are censored, but the titles represent 100 per cent of all works that express, instill or foster Palestinian-Arab national feelings and national heritage."

6. Mr. Kleinman charges that "Index" did not tell its readers that "whereas before June '67 there was only one Arabic daily in the West Bank and East Jerusalem, there are

now four, plus seven periodicals."

I refer Mr. Kleinman to Mr. Benvenisti, page 35. "Jerusalem was the press capital of Jordan until the early 1960s. Of six dailies published in the Hashemite Kingdom, only one ('al-Urdan') was published in the capital, Amman, and five papers were published in Jerusalem... The number of regular publications (now) is three dailies, five weeklies, four bi-weeklies and monthlies, as well as numerous irregular publications."

To summarise 1-6: the first charge does not stand up to examination; the second, about education, is a red herring; the third remains open; the fourth adds a fact which, if true, doesn't invalidate or weaken Hardy's statement; the fifth gives a misleading alternative explanation which, even if true, would still fail to explain the banning of all Darwish's books; the sixth point is misleading.

The most serious charge against "Index" comes in Mr. Kleinman's column of August 31, where he writes: "Israel may be engaged in a long-term struggle with implacable enemies who routinely go in for repression of the worst kind, but it's perfectly OK to concentrate on the sins of the former while ignoring those of the latter. If the balance of Western public opinion thereby swings against the Jewish State and in favour of a collection of undemocratic thugs and tyrants, you can't blame respectable people like editors or television producers. As has often been pointed out, the relative openness of Israeli society makes it easy and safe for Western journalists to study its failings, while blithely disregarding its virtues, which don't make such good copy."

Considering that as recently as April of this year we carried an article with the title "Repression in Iraq and Syria" and sub-titled "Recent reports...point to torture, special courts and hundreds of executions" and accompanied by boxes such as "Iraq: torture and death" and "Iraq: writers arrested," while a sub-title on Syria read "Mass slaughter," I fail to understand how Mr. Kleinman can justify his repeated

accusation that "Index" criticises Israel but ignores the misdeeds of its enemies.

(He also complains that we disregard Israel's virtues. While "Index", by its very nature, is in the business of berating governments rather than praising them, there has been praise for Israel in the articles by Tom Segev and Professor Gershon Weiler -- to the extent that we have been accused of being pro-Zionist because we printed them!)

If Mr. Kleinman had taken the trouble of looking at "Index's" publishing record, he would have seen that the "sins of Israel's enemies" have certainly not been ignored: there have been 17 articles about Israel and 75 about the rest of the Middle East; General, 7; Algeria, 2; Bahrain, 1; Egypt, 14; Iran, 20; Iraq, 5; Kuwait, 1; Lebanon, 2; Libya, 4; Morocco, 6; Saudi Arabia, 4; Syria, 3; and Tunisia, 6.

"Index" is neither anti-Israel nor pro-Arab. It reports on the work of censors in such diverse countries as Poland, Turkey, the USSR, Argentina, South Africa, Britain and the USA, and publishes examples of banned writing. At different times it has been described as pro-Zionist, pro-Marxist and pro-capitalist. It is none of these. By misconstruing as hostile propaganda criticism which is made in good faith, Mr. Kleinman deludes himself and his readers -- and comfortingly removes the need to consider unpalatable facts.

VIII. Letter from Philip Kleinman in the "Jewish Chronicle" of 21 September 1984.

So, after nearly two months, Mr. Theimer has finally tried to answer my detailed charges. I thank him for summarising accurately some of what I said. I see no reason to recant.

Now to the six points:

1. It is not a question of the writer's competence, but of whether his source told the truth. Neither Mr. Falloon nor Mr. Theiner has supplied a whit of evidence for what may have been a fabrication. The onus of proof is on them, not me.

2. The suggestion that Israel has blocked educational development arises unmistakably from Falloon's text. I repeat that he deliberately ignored the educational development under Israeli rule.

3. No, I have not read the Arabic text of Allon's book. I rely on informants, but I hope less uncritically than Mr. Theiner.

4. I reported the official Israeli explanation of how Orwell's "1984" came to be put by a clerical error on the list of banned books. Their explanation, not mine, but I see Mr. Theiner does not deny it. He purports, however, to know it was only Anthony Lewis's article which caused the list to be revised. How does he know this?

5. Mr. Theiner does not attempt to answer the specific point I made about Darwish's books, but again takes refuge in generalities.

6. Again Mr. Theiner ignores the point that, whatever the exact numbers (for which my source was a "Jerusalem Post" article), there is a thriving anti-Israel press under Israeli occupation.

I admit I am not well acquainted with "Index's" publishing record, but I note that in a previous issue the monthly world round-up of alleged infringements of freedom included one from Syria, one from Egypt, none from Iran, Iraq, Jordan or Saudi Arabia and 13 from Israel!

IX. Letter from Raja Shehadeh addressed to the Editor of the "Jewish Chronicle", but sent to George Theiner to be forwarded at his discretion.

1st October 1984

The Editor  
The Jewish Chronicle

DOUBLE STANDARDS

Sir,

Law in the Service of Man has followed with interest the debate in your journal following the article which Mr. Virgil Falloon, a legal researcher working with LSM, contributed to Index on Censorship.

LSM stands behind all that was said in Mr. Falloon's article. The purpose of this letter is not to defend what appeared there, which has been adequately confirmed by Israeli writers and others in no sense hostile to Israel. Despite the criticism, censorship continues to be excessive in the areas occupied by Israel.

One internal contradiction seems to recur and is worth pointing out here. Supporters of Israel who believe they must defend it against any criticism, begin as a rule by pointing out how bad the situation is in Israel's neighbouring countries. For example, Mr. Philip Kleinman in his article "Truth - but not all the truth", objects to the fact that Mr. Falloon does not inform his readers that only one Arabic daily was published in the West Bank and East Jerusalem before June 1967. This is in fact thoroughly misleading, since it is only true of the period immediately preceding the occupation of the area by Israel, prior to which there were no less than five Arabic language daily newspapers published in Jerusalem. Nevertheless, apart from the fact that violations of human

rights in one country can never justify similar violations in another, why make comparisons with other countries over which Israel repeatedly boasts of its superior standard of freedom and democracy.

Either we accept Israel's claim that it attempts to uphold Western democratic values, and use these as the standard in our assessment of its policies, or we recognise that Israel has abandoned this tradition and judge accordingly. It must be one or the other.

Raja Shehadeh  
Director

X. Abstracts of a letter sent by Law in the Service of Man to Philip Spender of "Index on Censorship" to reply to specific charges leveled by Philip Kleinman of the "Jewish Chronicle" against points raised in Virgil Falloon's article.

1 October 1986

1. Virgil Falloon's article states clearly that no official explanation was given for the burning of the widow's books and papers, and none has been given to this day. If Philip Kleinman is himself able to obtain an explanation of any kind from the authorities, this would be much appreciated. Neither the widow nor the Israeli lawyer she consulted have been able to do so.

2. We do not have, and cannot easily obtain a copy of Yigal Allon's book, but should it not be pointed out that this illustrates exactly the point under discussion - the book is banned in the West Bank?

The following extract from the Arabic preface to the book is quoted in an article by the Israeli journalist Amos Elon in the Hebrew-language daily Ha'Aretz of 7 May 1982 - the article reported an interview with the Israeli censor during which Elon was shown the book:

"...[the book] insults Arab intelligence with an attitude imbued with a deep-rooted arrogance and boundless aggression. The book is better than anything else [which we] could write on the schemes of oppression and the expansion of Israel and its plots to force a surrender on the Arab nation." Elon goes on to query whether the reader cannot be allowed to choose for himself between Allon's books and the introduction. Alternatively, if the introduction is offensive, why cannot this alone be censored, leaving the main body of the book? It is widely considered, by both Israelis and Palestinians, that the book was in fact censored because the views expressed in it by Allon, in particular the advisability of returning part of the Occupied Territories and not settling areas heavily populated by Palestinians, conflicted with the views of the Israeli government.

3. Kleinman's assertion that before June 1967 there was only one Arabic daily newspaper in the West Bank and East Jerusalem is misleading. In Meron Benvenisti's study of Israeli censorship, also reviewed in the August edition of Index On Censorship, he describes the state of the press in the early 1960s in Jordan, including Jerusalem, as follows: "Of the six dailies published in the Hashemite Kingdom, only one (al-Urdun) was published in the capital, Amman, and five papers were published in Jerusalem ... In March 1967 a new press law reduced the number of newspapers to three ... however, the 1967 war intervened before the changes took place. The Jerusalem papers ceased publication two days before the occupation of East Jerusalem by Israel." Thus, although Mr. Kleinman's statement may be correct in relation to the days immediately preceding the occupation, only weeks before there had been a flourishing Arabic press. The five newspapers published were: Falastin, al-Difa'a, al-Jihad, al-Manar, and al-Bilad.

More important, however, is that the comparison with the situation under Jordanian rule is itself invidious, since Jordan did not hold itself out as a prime example of an open and democratic society as Israel does. Furthermore, before 1967 residents of the West Bank and Jerusalem had access to newspapers from all over the Arab world, whereas now they are necessarily reliant on local newspapers (and Egyptian papers since the Israeli treaty with Egypt).

4. Despite censorship, Mahmoud Darwish's poems are very well-known here. Far from inciting hatred of Israelis, many of the poems are addressed to Israeli friends, for which he has even been criticised in some Palestinian circles. The recurrent themes of many of his poems are the sorrow of exile, the love of his country and attachment to the land, which is not synonymous with hatred of Israelis as Mr. Kleinman may assume.

The following are the books of poetry by Mahmoud Darwish which are censored:

- (i) To Love You Or Not
- (ii) Attempt No. 7
- (iii) Oh Peace
- (iv) A Diary of Ordinary Sorrow
- (v) Diwan of Mahmoud Darwish
- (vi) Weddings
- (vii) This Is Her Portrait, This Is the Suicide of Her  
    Lover
- (viii) A Lover From Palestine
- (ix) The Birds Die in Galilee
- (x) A Soldier Dreams of White Lilies

5. As to education, Mr. Kleinman's statement that the four West Bank universities have all been created since the occupation is incorrect, and may be misleading if taken to suggest that Israel has promoted the growth of these universities.



Dir Zeit University was founded in 1924 as a school; in 1962 it developed into a college, holding two-year degree courses, and in 1972 its status was changed to that of a university when it started to hold four-year courses. Al-Najah National University has existed since 1918 as a school, before becoming a teachers' training college in 1965 and a university in 1977. The Islamic College in Hebron was founded in 1971, and Bethlehem University in 1973 by the Catholic Freres.

The West Bank universities are all private institutions and receive no funding from Israel. Prior to the occupation, Palestinians had easy access to the universities of Egypt, Lebanon and elsewhere. After 1967, such access was difficult and costly for those from the Occupied Territories, and even where possible those leaving ran the risk of not being allowed to return to their homes. It was to fill this need for higher education that the universities grew. That these universities have flourished is due solely to the efforts of West Bank educators and their supporters, most notably other Arab universities. Israel allowed, rather than encouraged, their development initially, but in 1980 it assumed extensive powers of control over the universities by means of Military Order 854, followed by other supplemental orders. In addition, all the universities suffer considerable harassment, including total closure (al-Najah is at present closed by order of the military authorities for four months), arrests and imposition of restriction orders on students, expulsion of teachers and of two presidents, and, of course, censorship of books.