Canadian Perspective", in *Conflict Quarterly*, vol. 1, no. 3 (1981).

16. *Holloway Report*, pp. 38-40.
17. See "Vance is reportedly resigning", in Boston *Globe*, 28 Apr. 1980; US Department of State, "Muskie Named Secretary; Rescue Attempt Reviewed", *Current Policy* no. 172; "Vance: Rescue Attempt 'Self-indulgent Nonsense' ", in *Ottawa Citizen*, 6 June 1980.
18. President Reagan's decision to appoint the Vice-President, Mr. Bush, as head of a special crisis-management team may perhaps be seen as an effort to overcome the endemic problems of interdepartmental co-ordination in US crisis management. It appears that the Secretary of State is unhappy with this arrangement, and this does not bode well.
19. Jenkins, *op cit*.
20. For discussion of possible practical steps on diplomatic protection see Paul Wilkinson, "Diplomatic Relations?", *Police Review*, vol. 88, pp. 1921-3.

THE ARAB-ISRAELI CONFLICT: A NEW STAGE?

by

Mordechai Abir

The Arab-Israeli conflict is an extension of the conflict between the Arab national movement and the Jewish national movement over the territory of Palestine. As the political/strategic importance of the Arabs increased in the 1950's and to a much greater extent in the 1970's — owing to the west's dependence on Middle East oil supplies — the Arab-Israeli conflict and the Palestinian problem which lies at its heart assumed an importance in the international arena out of all proportion to its true dimensions. It is doubtful that any other issue achieved the prominence of the Arab cause in world affairs in the 1960's and 1970's.

Modern Arab nationalism claims that its roots can be found in the second part of the 19th century, although most scholars consider the first decades of the 20th century to be the true beginning of this movement.[1] From the start Arab nationalism transcended political borders in the Middle East and by the 1950's the Pan-Arabist movement was struggling to unify an Arab nation whose territory stretched from the Atlantic Ocean to the Persian Gulf. Early Arab nationalists and Western scholars describe Arab nationalism to be that of people whose language is Arabic, whose culture is the Arab culture, who consider themselves Arabs and who live, or wish to live, in the Arab homeland.[2] In recent years Islam has become a major criteria of Arab nationalism. This point has been hotly contested in the past by the Arab intelligentsia who felt that a modern national movement should be secular. Moreover, many in the movement were Christian Arabs, some of whom acted as ideologists. Nonetheless, in spite of divisions owing to administrative considerations and the ambitions and rivalries of local leaders, the Muslim *Umma* (community) had for centuries served as the politi-

cal superstructure of the Arab nation.[3] It is hardly surprising, then, that a revival of Arab nationalism should be accompanied by a resurgence of the Islamic influence. The coincidence of these factors clarifies the intense Arab opposition to any non-Muslim entity in what is considered the Arab homeland. The creation in the region of a Jewish state — which could be seen as an offshoot of European colonialism, was an even greater anathema to Muslim/Arab nationalists because previously Jews had been despised or, at best, tolerated in Arab lands.

Jewish presence in Palestine[4] was uninterrupted throughout the centuries following the destruction of the Jewish kingdom. But even in the *Diaspora*,[5] where most Jews lived, the return to Zion and the resurrection of the Jewish state was part of the Jewish daily prayer. In the 19th century the sporadic waves of Jewish migration back to homeland, motivated mainly by religious fervour, assumed the character of a modern nationalist ideology: Zionism. Migration and settlement in "Eretz Israel" were institutionalized through the establishment of the Zionist movement in 1897.[6]

The League of Nations granted Britain in 1920 a Mandate over the territory known as Palestine,[7] consisting at that time of more than 113,000 sq. kms. on both sides of the Jordan River. Long considered part of southern Syria, Palestine had never been a separate political or administrative entity through the centuries of Muslim rule; its inhabitants considered themselved Syrian Arabs.[8] But as early as 1922 the British partitioned Palestine: all of the territory east of the Jordan River — more than 75 percent of the Mandate — was granted the status of a semi-independent amirate, called Trans-Jordan, under the rule of Abdullah, the pro-British son of the Sherif of Mecca. Abdullah's new subjects were mainly "Palestinians" whose kinfolk, in many cases, remained on the "West Bank" of the Jordan. Lacking the trained educated elites to run his administration and to develop Trans-Jordan's economy Amir Abdullah encouraged many thousands of Palestinians to immigrate from the West Bank to the East Bank of the Jordan. Thus, the every day affairs of the amirate were conducted by "Palestinians", ruled by an imported dynasty which was supported by a British-led Bedouin Arab army.[9]

In the remaining portion of the Mandate the British government was trying to reconcile the contradictions in its dual obligation to resident Arabs and Jews: under the terms of the Mandate the British Government was to facilitate the creation of a "national home" for the Jews without prejudicing the "civil and religious rights of existing non-Jewish communities."[10] It proved an impossible task. Jewish immigration and Zionist demands for a fully independent state generated immediate and violent Arab opposition. From the outset opposition to Jewish national aspirations in Palestine became an integral part of inter-Arab relations because it was the only subject on which all Arabs could agree. It was constantly exploited by Arab rulers and factions to further their interests and to gain power.[11]

The bitter struggle between Arabs and Jews in mandatory Palestine and the impact of the holocaust in Europe, led to a United Nations decision in 1947 to partition Palestine into separate Jewish and Arab states. This decision was rejected totally by the Arabs. In their battle against the Jewish community, which numbered 650,000 people, the 1.2 million "Palestinian Arabs" were rein-

forced immediately by many "volunteers" from Arab countries, but by May 1948, when the British mandate terminated, very few Palestinian Arabs still participated in the war and the "volunteers" were joined by the armies of five Arab countries who invaded Palestine. The failure of the Arab armies to win the war was to some extent the outcome of internal rivalries and their inability to coordinate their operations against the Jews. Inter-Arab rivalry and their emotionally influenced refusal to recognise the Jewish state's legitimacy prevented the signing of permanent peace agreements between the combatants at the end of the 1948 war. Israel's international "borders" were determined, therefore, by the cease-fire agreements and were never recognised by the Arabs who frequently reiterated their intention to annihilate Israel.[12]

The Palestinians, who did not participate in the war, were generally ignored by all in the coming years. Of the 1.2 million Arabs who lived in Palestine at the beginning of 1948 about 160,000 became Israeli citizens. The 450,000 inhabitants of the West Bank, along with nearly 300,000 refugees, became Jordanian citizens when the West Bank was united with Trans-Jordan by decree in 1949. The 150,000 inhabitants of the Gaza Strip, plus about 100,000 refugees lived under Egyptian rule, while about 550,000 Palestinian Arabs who escaped Israeli conquest became refugees. Many of the latter found their way eventually to the Persian Gulf states and to Iraq. A similar number of Jews, however, left the Arab countries and became citizens of Israel. Indeed, Resolution 242 of the U.N. Security Council, which although first rejected by them became the Arab cause célèbre in the 1960's and 1970's, speaks about "the rights of the Palestinian refugees" but does not mention Palestinian self-determination.[13]

Israel's territory following the cease-fire agreements, which consisted of about 60 percent of Palestine west of the Jordan (or 15 percent of the original mandatory territory), resembled a piece of a jigsaw puzzle. At its most vital point along the coastal plains, where 60 percent of Israel's population live and about 80 percent of Israel's economic infrastructure is located, Israel's border with the West Bank runs only 14-32 kms away from the sea. A narrow corridor connected the coast with Jerusalem, Israel's second largest, town and the Gaza Strip projected into Israel to a distance of only about 48 kms from Tel-Aviv. The Jordan River, the lifeline of arid Israel, moreover, draws its waters from sources on Israel's borders with Syria and Lebanon and most of the water in the fertile coastal plains come from subterranean streams whose source is the mountains of the West Bank. How vital is the geo-political factor was demonstrated by the Syrians in the early 1960's: there was no conceivable way for Syria to use the Jordan water, yet it led the struggle against the American-sponsored plan to divide the Jordan River waters between Israel and Jordan. The Syrian campaign, clearly aimed at depriving Israel of essential water and a means to develop its economy, won the support of the Arab countries because extremism in relation to Israel always paid off in the inter-Arab struggle. The Jordan water problem eventually led to the June 1967 "Six Day War".[14]

The Six Day War provided Israel with the strategic depth essential for its defense and, indirectly, with the time required to mobilize its militia army. But after the war Israel was faced with the problem of governing more than a million Arabs in the West Bank and the Gaza Strip in addition to its own 500,000 Israeli

Arabs. Because of its democratic character and wish to preserve its Jewish identity, Israel did not annex the occupied territories, an act which could have solved its most pressing security problem, with the exception of the emotional issue of the unification of Jerusalem, but which would have changed the demographic balance in the Jewish state. Israel, therefore, maintained the special status of the occupied territories pending a peace agreement. But the occupation brought with it a new security problem: Palestinian terrorism. When they began to emerge in the late 1950's the Palestinian organizations were Pan-Arab oriented and on the whole supported Egypt's President Nasser. But with the decline of Nasserism in the 1960's they began to support the idea of a separate Palestinian entity. In the meantime, the "Palestinian question" was exploited repeatedly by Arab leaders in their struggles for power. Even the Arab League's decision to establish the Palestinian Liberation Organization (PLO) in 1964 was the outcome of Egypt's attempt to counter Syrian tactics and to maintain its patronage of the Palestinian cause. The Arab-defeat in 1967 immediately bolstered the value of the PLO. The organization was not inhibited from fighting the Israelis and its struggle won the support first, of the "New Left" for the idea of a "secular democratic Palestinian state" and secondly, of the international community, because it claimed the right of self-determination for the Palestinians.[15]

The Yom Kippur War of 1973 proved Israel's claim that strategic depth is essential for its defense. The war represented the first serious, coordinated Arab effort to counter Israel's qualitative manpower advantage by combining the traditional Arab quantitative superiority with numerous sophisticated weapons systems, especially air defense and anti-armour weapons. The initial successes of the Egyptian and Syrian forces before Israeli reserve forces mobilized demonstrated that the numerically superior Arab forces with their sophisticated weapons could easily have overrun Israel in its pre-1967 borders.[16]

By 1974 the Arab world could be divided into three main camps. The first, led by Egypt, was becoming increasingly anti-Soviet, pro-Western and pragmatic. Unlike his predecessor Anwar Sadat was not a supporter of the Pan-Arab cause, nor could he hope to gain President Nasser's stature in the Arab camp. This was particularly the case as Egypt's special position in the Arab leadership had been eroded in the 1960's and by the 1970's was being supplanted by the more pluralistic Arab community. Nonetheless, he was a shrewd strategist. Having salvaged Arab pride by the achievements of the Yom Kippur War, President Sadat was convinced that the best way to force Israel to relinquish the occupied territories was to improve Arab relations with America and exploit its influence over the Jewish state rather than jeopardize Arab achievements by another war. Such a policy, Mr. Sadat believed, would also help to rehabilitate Egypt's economy and military power and at the same time would be a safeguard against Soviet aspirations in the Middle East, which he considers more dangerous than Israel.[17]

The "radical-progressive" camp, now known as the "Rejection Front" and consisting of Syria, Iraq, South Yemen, Libya, Algeria and the PLO, maintained close relations with the Soviet Union, was inimical to Western interests and opposed Sadat's pragmatic policy. It continued to consider Israel an offshoot of American "neo-colonialism" and was determined not to accept its

existence. Their strategy called for maintaining a continuous pressure on Israel and was based on the assumption that time favoured the Arabs because of their increasing political and economic power on the one hand and the limitations of Israel's manpower and financial resources on the other. The West, it was argued, could be coerced to force Israel to accept a secular democratic Palestinian state in the original borders of the British mandate or at least to relinquish the occupied territories without receiving any concessions from the Arabs. Part of the strategy of this camp was to gain international recognition for the PLO and support for its plans for a Palestinian state.[18] But, in addition to internal problems which threatened the stability of their own countries the leaders of the Rejection Front could not overcome personal rivalries and sectarian differences, nor could they hope to defeat Israel in the battlefield without Egypt's and, to some extent, Jordan's cooperation. Moreover, the success of their strategy depended on the support of the conservative oil-producing countries, whose increasing economic power made them a major factor in Arab and international affairs.

Led by Saudi Arabia these regimes represented the third camp, the middle ground. They welcomed Sadat's pro-Western policy and covertly supported Egypt yet, fearing the radicals, chose to walk the tight rope between the two camps and by inclination rejected any settlement with Israel which would mean the recognition of its legitimacy. Jordan preferred to sit on the fence between the conservatives and Egypt. With its vast oil resources and increasing financial power Saudi Arabia gained a key position in Arab leadership by the late 1960's. After the 1974 energy crisis its importance in the world's economy and politics was largely responsible for America's Mid-Eastern policy reassessment whereby Saudi Arabia became a focal point of American policy. The success of the oil weapon removed Saudi Arabia's previous inhibitions concerning the use of "oil power" in world politics to achieve Arab political and economic goals. But in addition to utilizing political leverage against Israel and granting subsidies to the "confrontation states" and the PLO, the Saudis have been developing a strategic military infrastructure in northwestern Arabia not far from Israel's border. Indeed, aside from its Islamic-Arab motivation the Saudis are aware of the fact that their immense contribution to the struggle against Israel has made Saudi Arabia an object of Israeli strategic planning, if not a target for an Israeli pre-emptive strike.[19]

All the above notwithstanding the conservative camp, led by the Saudis, cognizant of its internal instability and vulnerability, was apprehensive of the outcome of a new round of Arab-Israeli war. Thus the Saudis, despite their vociferous demands for the return of the "occupied territories" and for a Palestinian state, were unwilling to opt for war against Israel or to support other extremist plans that would push Israel into a corner. With much more to lose now than in the past, it even looked as if Saudi Arabia might be prepared to tolerate a settlement of the conflict with Israel, which would satisfy the Arab demands, but would not necessitate their recognition of Israel's legitimacy.

As things stood in late 1977, then, Mr. Sadat could be justified in his assumption that his pragmatic policy concerning Israel would eventually gain the support of his conservative friends. He underestimated, however, their aversion to

an open recognition of Israel and their fear of the radical camp. Consequently, his visit to Jerusalem in November 1977 surprised and frustrated his conservative allies in Arabia. But, after the immediate shock and anger died down it still looked as if Sadat's policy would win the support of his allies and eventually, Sadat believed, that of the conservatives and Jordan.[20] Clearly, neither he nor anyone else could have foretold the impact of the Iranian revolution and the consequent increased influence of Militant Islam on the Arab world. The fall of the Shah and the collapse of American credibility changed completely the situation in the Middle East. Following the Camp David Summit the frightened conservative regimes joined the radicals in condemning Sadat's initiative. Indeed, the Arab OPEC states, led by Saudi Arabia, were instrumental in coercing Egypt's Arab allies to sever relations with the Sadat regime and in turning Western Europe against the agreement as well.[21]

But nothing in the Middle East remains fixed in place for long. The attack on the Grand Mosque in Mecca — following as it did the ascent of the radical Khomeini regime and the seizure of the American hostages in Iran — was a turning point in Saudi politics. The Royal house became determined to protect the regime and covertly began to support American defence and security initiatives in the region. The Carter doctrine of January 1980, articulated in response to the crises in Iran and Afghanistan, also helped the Saudis to regain their confidence. They exploited the glut in the oil market and the fact that they were producing about 35 percent of OPEC's oil exports to consolidate their position in OPEC and in the Arab camp. The short lived Iraqi-Syrian axis collapsed in mid-1979, at least in part because of Saudi initiatives which contributed indirectly to widening the rift between the two countries. Through proxies (mainly Jordan) Saudi Arabia escalated in 1980 the subversion of the Damascus regime. Furthermore, the exhaustion of Iraq's military and financial resources through war with Iran made Baghdad more dependent on Saudi financial and economic aid and enabled the Saudis to accept a limited American presence on its territory and the establishment of American bases in nearby areas. Moreover, having concluded that isolating Egypt was not compatible with its interests, the Saudi government indicated to Cairo that it was willing to improve relations if President Sadat would uphold the principles of the return by Israel of all the occupied territories and the establishment of a Palestinian state in the West Bank. To the observer of Middle East affairs the Saudi position in OPEC and the Arab camp had never been stronger.[22]

The developments in the Arab camp further contributed to the decline of the military threat to Israel which was an important outcome of the Camp David Agreement. On the other hand, "oil power" has become far more effective in isolating Israel politically. The Western European initiative, intended to coerce Israel into accepting a PLO-ruled Palestinian state on the West Bank and the Gaza Strip, is — the Israelis believe — motivated by cynical *real politik* — prompted by Arab oil power. This solution Israelis reject categorically. The vast majority of Israelis refuse to deal with an organization whose Covenant commits the organization to the annihilation of the Israeli state. The PLO leadership have made it clear that they do not regard a Palestinian state on the West Bank as an end in itself. Rather, they have indicated that it "will serve as a base

19

for the liberation of the whole of Palestine."[23]

The oil weapon affects Israel in other ways as well. Israel's endemic economic problems, partly the outcome of defence expenditures amounting to 30 percent of its GNP, were aggravated by the high cost of oil (especially after the return of the Suez oil fields) and the need to match, to some extent, the immense Arab arms purchases. But, while oil money enables the Arabs to step up the arms race, Israel has been forced to slash its defence budget by 25 percent. Fully aware of the Saudi role in undermining its political and military power, Israel now considers Saudi Arabia a confrontation country. If another Arab-Israeli war was to break out it is only to be expected, therefore, that the oil countries will be drawn into it.

Israel, however, is tired of wars which have claimed the life of many of its children, and is seeking a peace solution that would not jeopardise its existence. Mr. Begin's autonomy plans represent one option. The "Jordanian solution", which envisages the unification of the West Bank with Jordan under certain conditions, is another. But most Arab countries have rejected Israeli initiatives not based on full acceptance of Arab demands and they remain opposed to recognition of Israel.[24] Recently there have been signs of increasing pragmatism in the conservative camp and in Jordan. Obviously Saudi Arabia's stance concerning a settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict is the key to any solution. Much will depend, however, on future developments in the Arab camp and on whether the Reagan administration will be able to rise to the challenge and exercise its influence in the region. Another round of Arab-Israeli war could prove not only disastrous for Jews and Arabs, but for the well being of the world.

FOOTNOTES

1. For contrasting views, see George Antonius, *The Arab Awakening* (London, 1938), pp. 35-60, 79-100; and Yehoshua Porath, *The Emergence of the Palestinian-Arab National Movement, Vol. 1, 1918-1929* (London, 1974), pp. 20-69.

2. Antonius, pp. 13-19.

3. Michael Curtis et al, ed., *The Palestinians: People, History, Politics* (New Brunswick, N.J., 1975), pp. 97-120; G.H. Jansen, *Militant Islam* (London, 1979), pp. 17-48; and John O. Voll, "The Islamic Past and the Present Resurgence", *Current History*, vol. 78, no. 456 (1980) pp. 145-48, 180-81.

4. The name given by the Romans to the area known as Judea after they had subdued the last Jewish revolt. AD 132-135

5. The dispersal of the Jewish community into exile, principally into what is now central and Eastern Europe, after the Roman victory.

6. Walter Laqueur, *A History of Zionism* (New York, 1972), *passim*.

7. J.C. Hurewitz, *The Struggle for Palestine* (New York, 1950; repr. 1976), pp. 17-18.

8. *ibid.*, p. 17; John Marlowe, *The Seat of Pilate* (London, 1959), p. 48; Porath, pp. 4-8.

9. Hurewitz, pp. 20, 51; Marlowe, pp. 160-64.

10. Hurewitz, p. 18.

11. Porath, *The Palestinian Arab National Movement: From Riots to Rebellion, Vol. 2, 1929-1939*

(London, 1977), pp. 8-13, 49-79, 110-18.

12. Nicholas Bethell, *The Palestine Triangle: The Struggle Between the British, the Jews and the Arabs, 1935-1948* (London, 1979), *passim*; Hurewitz, pp. 295-329.

13. Curtis et al, pp. 52-62, 70, 131.

14. Nadav Safran, *Israel: the Embattled Ally* (Cambridge, Mass., 1978), pp. 67-82, 385.

15. *ibid.*, pp. 258-61, 266-71; Bard E. O'Neill, *Armed Struggle in Palestine: a Political-Military Analysis* (Boulder, Colo., 1978), pp. 43-50, 107-23; Curtis et al, pp. 114-16, 139.

16. The war stirred considerable controversy within Israel, especially in the Israeli Defence Forces. For a useful account and analysis see Chaim Herzog, *The War of Atonement: October 1973* (Boston, 1975).

17. George Lenczowski, *The Middle East in World Affairs,* 4th ed. (Ithaca, N.Y., 1980), pp. 568-71.

18. O'Neill, PP. 215-17.

19. Lenczowski, pp. 606-10; Safran, p. 567.

20. Colin Legum, ed., *Middle East Contemporary Survey, Vol. 2, 1977-78* (New York, 1979), pp. 213-15, 227-30, 232-33.

21. See "A Sudden Vision of Peace", *Time*, 25 Sept. 1978, and "A Glimpse of Peace", *Newsweek*, 26 Mar. 1979; *New York Times*, 5 June 1980; *Economist*, 23 Aug. 1980; *Washington Post*, 5 Mar. 1981.

22. Adeed Dawisha, "Saudi Arabia's Search for Security", *Adelphi Papers*, no. 158 (1980); *Washington Post, 6 Feb. 1980; Newsweek*, 3 Mar., 4 Aug. 1980; *Time*, 16 Mar. 1981.

23. Interviews with Yasser Arafat, *Time, 9 Apr. 1979, International Herald Tribune*, 31 July, 6 Aug. 1980; see also, *Time*, 14 Apr. 1980; *Newsweek*, 8 Sept. 1980; *Guardian Weekly*, 16 Mar. 1980; *Economist*, 21 June, 9 Aug. 1980.

24. *New York Times*, 1 June 1980, 5 Feb. 1981; *Newsweek*, 11 Aug. 1980, 23 Mar. 1981; *Economist*, 28 Feb. 1981; *Time*, 16 Mar. 1981.

SECURITY OR CENSORSHIP?
THE CRYPTOGRAPHY CONTROVERSY

by

Rodney H. Cooper

Cryptography, the study of secret codes and cyphers,[1] has long been the preserve of governments. In 1952 the United States Government created and designated the National Security Agency (NSA) to be the sole agency responsible for developing and employing cryptographic techniques on the government's behalf. It was also richly endowed with funds to encourage research in this field which was carried out, often with joint sponsorship of the National Science Foundation (NSF), at a limited number of universities.[2] Until recently the knowledge gained from this research was distributed on a highly restricted "need to know" basis — the only keyword on research papers was MOST