

- b) As a condition of its withdrawal from such territory, that state may require the institution of security measures reasonably designed to ensure that territory shall not again be used to mount a threat or use of force against it of such a nature as to justify exercise of self-defence.
- c) Where the prior holder of territory had seized that territory unlawfully, the state which subsequently takes that territory in the lawful exercise of self-defence has, against that prior holder, better title.

THE LEGALITY OF THE SETTLEMENTS, AND ISRAEL'S OCCUPATION OF JERUSALEM

Professor Stone (the author of the treatise "*Legal Controls of International Conflict*", which included an extensive commentary on the Geneva Conventions) has shown that with regard to the issue of Jewish settlements in the occupied territories Israel is by no means in breach of the Geneva Convention by her settlement activity. Moreover, her occupation of Jerusalem is entirely in accord with international law, and that she has better and prior claim to Jerusalem than any other party.

It would appear that, especially since the oil weapon was drawn from its scabbard in 1973, a concerted effort has been made both by the Arabs and by the United Nations to engage in a wide-reaching and illicit re-writing or re-interpretation of history. Since truth is the only weapon against lies, these matters should be widely made known.

Derek White

CFI Communications, PO Box 2687, Eastbourne, BN22 7LZ
Tel: 0845 230 3067 (local rate) or 01323 410810 • Fax: 01323 410211
Prayerline: 0845 230 3068 (local rate) or 01323 439840
email. info@cfi.org.uk • website. www.cfi.org.uk
Registered Charity no. 1101899

THE WAR ON HISTORY

In the midst of the peace talks and endeavours to bring a solution to the "Palestinian problem" certain distortions of history are being purveyed by those who would see Israel abandon territory, including Jerusalem, given to her by God, and ultimately her final destruction. Some of these distortions of history are so frequently portrayed in the front line of the world media that by constant repetition they become received truth in the minds of journalists, politicians, and the man in the street. It is common (at least in BBC news parlance) to refer to east Jerusalem as 'Arab east Jerusalem', thus implying that it belongs not to Israel but to the Arabs.

Reference is regularly made to certain U.N. Resolutions and to International Law as it relates to Israel and the occupied territories, and some clarification is needed in these matters.

WHO ARE THE PALESTINIANS?

The claim that the Palestinians are the original occupants and owners of the land of "Palestine" has been made not only by politically motivated Palestinian leaders, but also by Arab Church leaders in the official churches of the Middle East.

Arieh Avneri in his impeccably researched book "*Claim of Dispossession*" has shown quite conclusively that a large proportion of present day Palestinians are in fact quite recent immigrants, and are descended from Egyptian, Algerian, Circassian, Yemeni, Bedouin and other refugees and immigrants - both legal and illegal - who entered the country during the past 100 years. Indeed, he says:

"The few Arabs who lived in Palestine a hundred years ago, when Jewish settlement began, were a tiny remnant of unending conflicts between local tribes and local despots." "Social paroxysms, wars and destruction prevented the Arab population in Palestine from taking root and from handing down a tradition of permanent settlement from generation to generation." (pp 11,12)

The ancestry ploy is the most common Palestinian prevarication. Yasser Arafat is reported as having once claimed "that Palestinians Arabs are descendants of the Jebusites who inhabited the city even before King David".

Zuhair Muhsin, head of the PLO Military Operations Department said on March 3 1977:

"We are one people. Only for political reasons do we carefully underline our Palestinian identity. For it is of national interest for the Arabs to encourage the existence of the Palestinians against Zionism. Yes, the existence of a separate Palestinian identity is there only for tactical reasons."

Such claims might be merely facetious, apart from the fact that they are proclaimed by those who seek to gain the sympathy of the Church in the West and are probably believed by those who do not know the elements of the history of this region.

INTERNATIONAL LAW

International Law, as it relates to Israel's position in the administered (or occupied) territories, is of a much more serious nature. Professor Julius Stone, one of the world's best known authorities in both jurisprudence and international law, has examined this whole question. So important is this matter that his findings are briefly summarised as follows:

The principle *ex injuria non oritur* operates in international law to the effect that no legal claim to territory can arise out of an illegal aggression. Professor Stone examines the application of this rule to the competing claims of Israel and Jordan in the administered territories.

THE SELF-DEFENCE PRINCIPLE

The basic precept of international law concerning the rights of a state victim of aggression, which has lawfully occupied the attacking state's territory in the course of self-defence, is clear.

This precept is that a lawful occupant such as Israel is entitled to remain in control of the territory involved pending negotiation of a treaty of peace. Both Resolution 242 (1967) and Resolution 338 (1973), adopted by the Security Council after the respective wars of those years, expressed this requirement for settlement by "negotiations between the parties", the latter in those very words. Conversely both the Security Council and the General Assembly in 1967 resisted heavy Soviet and Arab pressures demanding automatic Israel withdrawal to the pre-1967 frontiers. Through the decade 1967-77, Egypt and her Arab allies compounded the illegality of their continued hostilities by proclaiming the slogan "No recognition! No peace! No negotiation!" thus blocking the regular processes of international law for post-war pacification and settlement.

Israel's territorial rights after 1967 are best seen by contrasting them with Jordan's lack of such rights in Jerusalem and the West Bank after the Arab invasion of Palestine in 1948. The presence of Jordan in Jerusalem and elsewhere in cis-Jordan (the "West Bank") from 1948 to 1967 was only by virtue of her illegal entry in 1948. Under the international law principle *ex injuria non oritur* she acquired no legal title there. Egypt itself denied Jordanian sovereignty; and Egypt never tried to claim Gaza as Egyptian territory.

By contrast, Israel's presence in all these areas pending negotiation on new borders is entirely lawful, since Israel entered them lawfully in self-defence. International law forbids acquisition by unlawful force, but not where, as in the case of Israel's self-defence in 1967, the entry on the territory was lawful. It does not so forbid it, in particular, when the force is used to stop an aggressor, for the effect of such prohibition would be to guarantee to all potential aggressors that, even if their aggression failed, all territory lost in the attempt would be automatically returned to them. Such a rule would be absurd to the point of lunacy. There is no such rule.

International law, therefore, gives a triple underpinning to Israel's claim that she is under no obligation to hand "back" automatically the West Bank and Gaza to Jordan or anyone else. In the first place, these lands never legally belonged to Jordan. Second, even if they had, Israel's own present control is lawful, and she is entitled to negotiate the extent and the terms of her withdrawal. Third, international law would not in such circumstances require the automatic handing back of territory even to an aggressor who was the former sovereign. It requires the extent and conditions of the handing back to be negotiated between the parties.

The most succinct statement of this position is in Professor Stephen Schwebel's "What Weight to Conquest?" published in 1970, before he entered U.S. Government service, and became an eminent judge of the International Court of Justice. He points out that the answer to that question in terms of international law, after the Charter's prohibitions of the use of force, makes necessary a vital distinction "between aggressive conquest and defensive conquest, between the taking of territory legally held and the taking of territory illegally held". He writes:

Those distinctions may be summarised as follows:

- a) A state acting in lawful exercise of its right of self-defence may seize and occupy foreign territory as long as such seizure and occupation are necessary to its self-defence.