



UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA PRESS
JOURNALS + DIGITAL PUBLISHING



Town Arrest Orders in Israel and the Occupied Territories (Excerpt)

Author(s): Amnesty International

Source: *Journal of Palestine Studies*, Vol. 14, No. 2, Special Issue: The Palestinians in Israel and the Occupied Territories (Winter, 1985), pp. 186-196

Published by: [University of California Press](#) on behalf of the [Institute for Palestine Studies](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2537179>

Accessed: 09-03-2015 20:45 UTC

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



University of California Press and Institute for Palestine Studies are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Journal of Palestine Studies*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

Town Arrest Orders in Israel and the Occupied Territories (Excerpt)

Amnesty International¹

Since February 1979, Amnesty International has been working on behalf of people in Israel and the Occupied Territories whose physical movement has been restricted by administrative order. These people, though not imprisoned, are ordered to stay within the confines of their town or village for a specified period, usually for an initial period of six months, although this is frequently renewed. During this period, they are neither formally charged nor brought before a court of law. Most are also required to report daily to their local police station, and most are not permitted to leave their homes between sunset and sunrise. The police may check their whereabouts at any time, which includes entering their homes at night.

Up until 1979, town arrest orders² had rarely been used. Since the beginning of 1980, according to Amnesty International's information, at least 148 people have

been issued with town arrest orders: 93 from the West Bank, 24 from Israel proper, 13 from the Gaza Strip, 9 from Jerusalem and 9 from the Golan Heights. An average of 66 people are under town arrest every year (see Appendix D).

Those affected by town arrest orders have been Palestinians and Druze from Israel and the Occupied Territories. Most are political activists opposed to the Israeli occupation, who are outspoken in their criticism of Israeli policies and in their support for the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO). They have included mayors (who were dismissed from office in 1981/2), journalists, doctors, lawyers, trade unionists, teachers, writers and students (many of them members of university student councils). In Israel they have included members of the Israeli Communist Party,³ the National Progressive Movement,⁴ and Abna' al-Balad (Sons of

the Village);⁵ in the Occupied Territories most are alleged by the authorities to be members of, or activists for, various factions of the Palestine Liberation Organization, such as Al Fatah, the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine (PFLP) or the Democratic Front for the Liberation of Palestine (DFLP).

Written permission from the military commander is needed before a person can leave the designated area. This can be difficult to get and has frequently been refused. As a result, people under town arrest have faced difficulties in carrying out their work or study effectively, if their place of restriction is other than their place of work or study; in some cases people have simply been unable to carry on their work or study at all; they may be unable to continue their non-violent political activities, or at least be unable to attend political or professional meetings or conferences elsewhere in Israel, or the Occupied Territories, or abroad; they may face difficulties or long delays in getting adequate medical treatment if this is not available in their home town; and they may find their family and social life severely disrupted.

Although town arrest orders may only be issued when they are deemed by the military authorities to be essential for reasons of security, Amnesty International believes that the curtailment of these people's freedom of movement is in many cases a punishment for their non-violent political activity. Amnesty International is also concerned that they are physically restricted without being formally charged or brought before a court of law.

Legal Background

Town arrest orders are imposed by the Regional Military Commander (and on occasion by the Defence Minister) 'for the protection of public security, defending

the region and public order.' They are issued, in Israel proper, (i.e., pre-1967 borders) in accordance with Articles 108-110 of the Defence (Emergency) Regulations (DER) of 1945 (see Appendix A) which were introduced during the British Mandate and incorporated into the Israeli legal system. In the Occupied Territories, the Defence (Emergency) Regulations were 'revalidated'⁶ by a series of military orders, called Security Provision Orders. Articles 84-86 of Security Provision Order 378 of 1970 deals with restriction orders and orders of surveillance (see Appendix B). This legislation enables the military authorities to restrict individuals to a particular village, town or district, place them under house arrest, impose limitations on their travel, and require them to fulfill official formalities such as periodic registering.

Most frequently used is town arrest, whereby individuals are confined during the day to their town or village of residence, which they are forbidden to leave without written permission from the military authorities, and to their homes by night, usually between sunset and sunrise. In some cases, people are forbidden to change their place of residence while under town arrest; or they may be restricted to their town or village of birth, and not the town in which they are currently living and working. Restricted persons are almost always required to report once, twice or three times a day (rarely weekly) to a local police station.

There is no upper limit on the duration of town arrest orders. Town arrest orders are issued for an initial period of three months, more commonly six months, and in a few cases have been issued for a one year period. The majority of orders are renewed, some repeatedly, and Amnesty International knows of at least 24 persons who have been under town arrest for more

than 2 years consecutively, and 6 of them for 4 years.

The Regional Commander issuing the order is under no obligation to specify the nature of an alleged offence. In practice neither the restricted person nor his/her lawyer is given the full details of the reason for the order.

The legislation concerning town arrest orders provides for a system of appeal. Until June 1981, in the Occupied Territories, an Appeals Committee appointed by the Regional Commander and 'presided over by a senior officer, who must be a legally qualified judge of long experience'⁷ reviewed cases once every six months regardless of whether the restricted person had appealed against the order. It then made its recommendations to the Regional Commander on whether to uphold the Regional Commander's decision. Under an amendment to Article 86 (Military Order 918, dated June 1981) cases are no longer reviewed in the same way: the Appeals Committee reviews cases at least once every six months, but only after a restricted person has made an application for an appeal to the committee. In addition, "a second body known as the Recommendations Committee also checks informally at six month intervals whether each supervision order is justified."⁸

For those restricted in Israel proper and Jerusalem, such appeals are made to the district court. Both those restricted in Israel as well as those in the Occupied Territories have recourse to the Israeli High Court of Justice if unsatisfied with the decision of the Appeals Committee or Court.

Amnesty International's Concerns and the Israeli Authorities' Response

(a) *Amnesty International* is concerned that the law gives power of restriction which is

very broadly defined and makes no distinction between violent and non-violent political behaviour. Any behaviour that was hostile to the Israeli authorities or their policy could, in the circumstances of Israel and the Occupied Territories, be qualified as a threat to 'public security' or 'public order.' Amnesty International is concerned therefore that people may have been restricted on account of the non-violent exercise of their right to freedom of opinion and expression, and as such may be prisoners of conscience under Article 1(a) of Amnesty International's statute which states that its aim is to work:

"irrespective of political considerations . . . towards the release of and providing assistance to persons who are imprisoned, detained or otherwise physically restricted by reason of their political, religious or other conscientiously held beliefs or by reason of their ethnic origin, sex, colour or language, provided that they have not used or advocated violence."

The Israeli authorities argue that no one is subjected to town arrest orders because of the non-violent exercise of their right to freedom of opinion and expression. Such orders, they say, are issued in order to *prevent* acts of violence or breaches of the peace taking place, and *not* to punish acts that have been committed. The authorities have explained the purpose of town arrest orders to Amnesty International as follows:

"Special or police supervision orders are imposed infrequently and only when required to preserve public safety or order. They are *preventative* rather than punitive in nature and involve a delicate balance between the need to protect public security on the one hand and the freedom of the individual on the other. No one is subjected to these orders for mere expression

of opinion, however hostile. *Such orders are invoked only when there are solid grounds to fear that constant incitement is likely to lead to actual violence and breach of the peace.*"⁹ (Emphasis added)

The Israeli authorities also argue that such people cannot be considered as prisoners of conscience, as Amnesty International says, because they have advocated violence by virtue of their association with 'terrorist' or hostile organizations. In reply to Amnesty International concerning individual restricted persons, the authorities have asserted that the person concerned had instigated hostile and subversive activities against the State of Israel; and/or that that person was or had been a member of, or associated with, one of the factions of the PLO such as the DFLP—'a terrorist organization . . . responsible for numerous acts of murder and sabotage . . .'; or an organization associated with the PLO such as the National Guidance Committee¹⁰ which 'has not satisfied itself with the peaceful expression of its position but has resorted to initiating actions including unlicensed, violent demonstrations and a campaign to single out as traitors Arabs who deviate from the positions of the PLO'; or the National Progressive Movement which 'identifies itself with the rejectionist terrorist groups which have repeatedly declared as their goal the elimination of the State of Israel, and which pursue this goal by means of violent armed struggle'; or Abna' al-Balad which 'has as its goal the elimination of the State of Israel by the use of violence and terrorist organizations.'¹¹

Amnesty International's concerns have not been dispelled by these arguments put forward by the Israeli authorities. Amnesty International still believes that many people may have been restricted for the non-

violent exercise of their right to freedom of opinion and expression.

First, Amnesty International holds that mere membership in, or association with the PLO does not necessarily mean that that person has used or advocated violence. While Amnesty International accepts that military wings of the various PLO factions carry out acts of violence, many individuals in or associated with the PLO are engaged in exclusively political and/or diplomatic activity and do not themselves use or advocate violent acts.

Secondly, Amnesty International considers accusations that a person has been 'engaged in instigation and incitement against the Israeli authorities' do not necessarily entail an accusation that the person used or advocated violence. Amnesty International has on a number of occasions asked the authorities for details of the specific use or advocacy of violence by a restricted person but no such details have been given. In some cases the authorities have referred to past convictions and sentences already served for alleged violent offences, but in other cases the authorities' reply simply gives no details of the person's alleged involvement with violence. In many restriction order cases, Amnesty International receives no information that the person concerned has carried out acts of violence, or has publicly advocated acts of violence; in some cases restricted persons have told Amnesty International that as members or supporters of the PLO, or other illegal organizations, they had engaged only in political or cultural activities.

Thirdly, the Israeli authorities are making certain assertions of fact regarding a person having used, or incited to, violence. Although Israeli law makes terrorist activity and incitement to violence criminal offences, the Israeli authorities have chosen, in these circumstances, not to

submit to normal judicial process. However satisfied the authorities may be that the allegations are well founded, they cannot expect the outside world to accept their assertions without question.

(b) *Amnesty International* is concerned that restricted persons are neither formally charged nor brought before a court of law, and that without details of the charges against them, they have no effective right to refute the evidence against them.

As such, restricted persons also fall under Article 1(b) of *Amnesty International's* statute which states that its aim is to oppose:

“by all appropriate means the detention of any prisoners of conscience or any political prisoners without trial within a reasonable time or any trial procedures relating to such prisoners that do not conform to internationally recognized norms.”

The Israeli authorities have said to Amnesty International:

(i) that special supervision orders comply fully with Article 78 of the Fourth Geneva Convention (1949).¹² Article 78 states in part:

“If the Occupying Power considers it necessary, for imperative reasons of security, to take safety measures concerning protected persons, it may, at the most, subject them to assigned residence or to internment.

Decisions regarding such assigned residence or internment shall be made according to a regular procedure to be prescribed by the Occupying Power in accordance with the provisions of the present Convention. This procedure shall include the right of appeal for the parties concerned. Appeals shall be decided with the least possible delay. In the event of the decision being upheld it shall be subject to periodical review, if possible every six months, by

a competent body set up by the said Power.”

The authorities have also referred to the official commentary on the Convention by the International Committee of the Red Cross which states:

“Unlike the Articles which come before it, Article 78 relates to people who have not been guilty of any infringement of the penal provisions enacted by the Occupying Power, but that Power may, for reasons of its own, consider them dangerous to its own security and is consequently entitled to restrict their freedom of action” (Jean S. Pictet, *Commentary: IV Geneva Convention Relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War*, Geneva, 1958, p. 368).

(ii) that special supervision orders are issued to prevent acts of violence or breaches of the peace taking place, not to punish acts that have been committed. A person's past actions are taken into account in so far as they are indicative of possible future behaviour. By way of further clarification, the authorities have referred to an Israeli High Court ruling which states:

“. . . the power defined in Regulation 110 cannot be used to punish a person for past acts or serve as a substitute for criminal proceedings. The power is preventative, that is to say it is directed towards the future and may only be used if such is necessary in order to avert an anticipated danger. It is of course possible that the evaluation of a situation with regard to the future is based on acts done in the past; it could hardly be otherwise, for a logical conclusion drawn by the holder of power must be based on facts, and no facts are as indicative of possible future occurrences as past facts, whether they concern acts that were brought to completion or whether they point to preparation for the commission of

acts endangering public safety or the defence of the state" (*Sallah Baranseh v O C Central Command*, Sup. Ct. Cases 36 IV, pp 249–250 (1981)—emphasis supplied).

(iii) that restricted persons in the Occupied Territories have the right to appeal to the Appeals Committee to "demand a clarification of the reasons for it and/or challenge its legality. The Appeals Committee will then hold a hearing in which the applicant is informed in greater detail regarding the reasons for the order and given an opportunity to challenge their validity. If for security reasons (i.e., to protect the life of an informant) it is impossible to reveal all the evidence to the appellant at the hearing then this information is considered and evaluated *in camera* by the Appeals Committee."¹³

All restricted persons can also petition the High Court of Israel to appeal against the decisions of the Appeals Committee. The authorities have pointed out that it is an unusual (in international law terms) and positive provision for residents of occupied territories to have the right to petition the High Court of the occupying government.

They have also challenged Amnesty International's assertion that the High Court takes a rather limited view of its ability to challenge decisions taken by the military on security grounds.

Amnesty International's reply to these arguments put forward by the Israeli authorities is as follows:

(i) Amnesty International is concerned that Article 78 of the Fourth Geneva Convention should not be abused to justify the restriction of people for the non-violent exercise of their right to freedom of opinion and expression. The abuse Israel makes of Article 78 is also illustrated by the fact that it is invoked to justify restrictions not only in the Occupied Territories but also in Israel proper.

(ii) Amnesty International considers that no one should be deprived of their liberty without being informed of the reasons for it at the time of the imposition of the restriction order.

(iii) Amnesty International believes that the appeals machinery does not adequately provide restricted persons with the opportunity to challenge the legality of the order or refute the evidence against them. In general restricted persons are not given the full and precise reasons for the order even after appealing to the Appeals Committee or the High Court, reasons of security always being given for not revealing such information to the individual concerned. In the few cases where reasons have been provided, the evidence upon which the allegations were based was not produced, reasons of security again being given. Without such information it is impossible for a person effectively to challenge the claims of the military that the order is justified for reasons of security.

Very few restricted people have succeeded in getting their order lifted as a result of going to the Appeals Committee or High Court. Amnesty International knows of a very few cases where this has happened following a recommendation from the Appeals Committee or a compromise reached at the High Court; but Amnesty International also knows of cases where such recommendations have been ignored by the military authorities. In some cases restriction orders have been lifted just before a High Court appeals hearing.

In general the High court will not interfere in matters concerning the military authorities, except where it can be proved that the order was not issued 'with due caution and with specific attention to the observance of the precondition of justifying its exercise'¹⁴ and this is very difficult to do.

Appeals to the Appeals Committee or the High Court for an improvement in the conditions of an order—such as for permission to travel for work, medical or social reasons, or to register once rather than twice a day, etc—are more often successful.

(iv) The authorities have not satisfactorily explained why full details of the reasons for the restriction cannot be made known to the individual concerned, or the lawyer, even if the sources of such information cannot be disclosed for security reasons.

Four Town Arrest Cases

These four cases are representative of the cases of town arrest that Amnesty International is investigating.

(a) *Radwan Abu Ayyash*

Radwan Abu Ayyash, aged 34, lives in Ramallah in the West Bank, but works as a journalist in East Jerusalem. He is the managing editor of *Al Awdah* (The Return), a weekly political magazine, editor of the Palestine Press Service and Vice President of the Association of Arab (i.e. Palestinian) Journalists. He is married with 3 children.

On 24 June 1984 he was served with a 6 month restriction order confining him to his home town of Ramallah. He has to report every day at 11 a.m. to the police station.

He was served with the restriction order following his attempts to travel to the United States as a guest of the United States Information Service, along with 40 other journalists from around the world, to cover the Democratic National Convention in San Francisco. [On 14 June he had tried to go to Amman (in Jordan) but had been turned back at the Allenby Bridge. He had then tried to obtain a *laissez passer* in order to leave from Lod airport in Israel

but had been unable to get one because of a strike by the officials responsible.]

As a result of the restriction order Radwan Abu Ayyash's work as managing editor of *Al Awdah* has been severely hampered since he cannot travel to his office in East Jerusalem. He also says that 'the order has effectively severed my ties to family relations and friends, most of whom live in the Nablus area.'

The restriction order states that it was issued because it was 'necessary for security reasons and because he is a prominent PLO activist in this area, to the extent that he is working to achieve the aims of this organization and has secret activities against the State.'

Radwan Abu Ayyash, however, says "These charges are completely false and untrue. I am a Palestinian journalist who tries to express the mood and real feelings of his people, the Palestinians, no more and no less than this . . . I am a Palestinian journalist who advocates negotiations and peace. I have worked hard towards the realisation of these ideals . . . it is clear to me that the motive behind the town arrest has little to do with 'security' considerations, but is instead part of a general policy by the Israeli government aimed at isolating Palestinian journalists from American and other journalists."

In July 1982 Radwan Abu Ayyash was arrested while travelling from Ramallah to Jerusalem and questioned about a booklet in his possession entitled *The Palestinian Journalist*, which describes the activities of the Union of Arab Journalists and their problems in the Occupied Territories. While it was legal to possess the book in Jerusalem, it was illegal in the Occupied Territories since no permit had been obtained for its distribution there. Radwan Abu Ayyash was interrogated at Ramallah police station and asked to sign a confession that he supported the PLO, had pub-

lished and distributed illegal material, and had attacked military censorship. He refused to do so, denying these accusations. In December 1982 he was tried and fined IS 10,000 and given a three month prison sentence suspended for 3 years.

(b) *Sami Muhammad Salim al-Kilani*

Sami Kilani, aged 31, is a lecturer in physics at Al Najah University in Nablus (on the West Bank) and a writer of poetry and short stories. In January 1983 he was issued with a restriction order confining him to his family's home in Ya'bad, a village in the district of Jenin. The order was renewed for the third time in June 1984. At first he had to sign in at Jenin police station every day at noon. Between December 1983 and June 1984 he was obliged to report once a week at Tubas, a village 30 or 40 kilometers from Ya'bad (this village is difficult to get to because there is no direct transportation). Since he received his last restriction order, in June 1984, he has again to report daily to Jenin police station.

Being under town arrest has affected Sami Kilani's working and family life—he is unable to carry on his university work, and his wife and child live apart from him during the week because of his wife's work as a teacher in Nablus.

An appeal to the Appeal Committee in April 1984 for the order to be cancelled or at least transferred to Nablus was rejected. At the hearing Sami Kilani was told that the reason for his restriction was that he was dangerous to the security of the public due to his activity of incitement, but the evidence could not be revealed because it was secret. The lawyer is planning to appeal again.

His political activity and writing has led to frequent arrests and restrictions. In December 1977 he was sentenced to 3 years imprisonment for membership in the Dem-

ocratic Front for the Liberation of Palestine (a faction of the PLO), in setting up a local branch of the organisation, of recruiting others, of attempting to influence public opinion by distributing leaflets calling for people to demonstrate against President Sadat's visit to Jerusalem. He was interrogated twice about a collection of short stories he published in June 1981; he was refused permission in August 1981 'for security reasons' to carry out post-graduate studies in Turkey; he was detained for 18 days in April 1982 for incitement but was not charged or tried; his family home in Ya'bad was raided by the police and banned books were confiscated. On 24 February 1983, while under town arrest, he was charged with incitement against the Israeli authorities on account of a book of his published poetry. This contains a poem about a Palestinian hero called Izz Addin Al-Qassim who fought against the British during the Mandate period. According to the charges, the poem was allegorical and incited against the state of Israel. Sami Kilani was finally acquitted of this charge on 11 January 1984.

(c) *Walid Zaqut*

Walid Zaqut, aged 23, from Beach camp in Gaza, is a first year student at the college of Business Administration at Bir Zeit University (BZU) on the West Bank.

On 23 February 1984 Walid Zaqut was issued with a six month restriction order confining him to the town of Gaza during the day and to his home at night, and requiring him to report to the local police every day. No reason was given for the restriction order at the time it was issued.

Walid Zaqut went to the Appeals Committee to request the reasons for the order, a change of location to Bir Zeit so that he could continue his studies, and continue medical treatment for a stomach complaint

he had been receiving from a specialist in Ramallah (near Bir Zeit).

The Appeals Committee, which met in March and May 1984, suggested that Walid Zaqt continue his studies at Gaza Islamic University (GIU), and recommended, without consulting his medical records, that his medical treatment could be transferred to Gaza. Walid Zaqt, however, did not accept the Committee's suggestion about his studies on the grounds that his year's credit at BZU would not be recognised at GIU, that the standard of his course at BZU was higher and this was important for admission to a higher degree programme after graduation.

Walid Zaqt's lawyer filed a writ for a hearing at the High Court. Two days before the date scheduled for the court hearing, 12 July 1984, the lawyer received a list of reasons for the town arrest order. These included the allegations that Walid Zaqt had joined the Democratic Front for the Liberation of Palestine (DFLP) while abroad in August 1980, that he had painted slogans against the 1979 Camp David agreement in August 1982, and distributed an illegal magazine; that in January 1983 he had represented the DFLP in negotiations between students at BZU, that in December 1983 he had stood for election to BZU Student Council, and that he was the leader of the DFLP students at BZU.

A postponement of the High Court hearing was granted so that Walid Zaqt's lawyer could prepare an affidavit refuting the allegations against him and stating that in August 1980 Walid Zaqt was in Gaza and not abroad; that he was not a member of the DFLP (Walid Zaqt had been arrested on 14 October 1982 accused of membership of the DFLP but had been released without charge on 5 March 1983); that he had not taken part in any discussions at BZU in January 1983 because he

was in prison, and that he had never stood for election to the Student Council. Walid Zaqt's case at the High Court is continuing.

Walid Zaqt's restriction order expired on 22 August 1984 and a new order was issued on 1 September 1984.

(d) *'Umar Radwan Sa'id*

'Umar Sa'id, aged 24, lives in Kafr Kana near the town of Nazareth in the Galilee. As a student of biochemistry at Beersheba University he was an active member of the National Progressive Front. As a result of his political activities at University he was placed under town arrest from July to December 1980. (He was restricted to his village of Kafr Kana but was given permission to take his exams at the university.) He graduated in October 1982 and in December 1982 he was again put under town arrest, and the order has been renewed every 6 months since then, the last time in June 1984. He has to report to the police station twice a day at 8 a.m. and 5 p.m. (although earlier it had been once a day). He has been arrested on several occasions for having violated the order, or for not having reported to the police station on time, and fined or given a suspended prison sentence.

'Umar Sa'id appealed both in 1983 and 1984 for a change in location of the order to enable him to do post-graduate studies in Haifa or Jerusalem, so far unsuccessfully. In 1984 his lawyer submitted a petition to the High Court for the reasons for the order. The authorities have given as reasons for the order 'Umar Sa'id's political activities while a student and his declared political views which, they claim, amount to incitement to violence. 'Umar Sa'id in turn has submitted an affidavit refuting such allegations. No date has yet been set for the High Court hearing of the petition.



1. This document (AI Index: MDE 15/16/84), dated October 1, 1984, is correct as of August 31, 1984 according to information available to Amnesty International. Appendices to the original document include excerpts from the Defence (Emergency) Regulations (1945), (Israeli) Security Provisions Order 378 of 1970, Text of Restriction Order (issued to a West Bank Resident) and a list of 148 cases of individuals under town arrest. These cases are divided by region: Israel, and the occupied territories of Jerusalem, West Bank, Gaza Strip and Golan Heights. The entire document is obtainable from Amnesty International, International Secretariat, 1 Easton Street, London WC1X 8DJ, UK and from Amnesty International U.S.A., 705 G Street SE, Washington, DC 20003—*Ed.*
2. Amnesty International uses the term 'town arrest' to distinguish this form of restriction from others, such as restriction from travelling into the Occupied Territories, or from travelling abroad.
3. Also known as *Rakah* (in Hebrew)—*Ed.*
4. The National Progressive Movement is a legal organization set up in 1978 by Israeli Arabs studying at Israeli universities. The main reason behind the formation of this movement was the students' dissatisfaction with the results of elections for the Arab Students Committee of the Hebrew University of Jerusalem. The majority of the representatives elected to the leadership of the Committee were members of *Rakah* (the Israeli Communist Party), and these students were reluctant to work within a *Rakah*-dominated organization. Its members are mainly students and graduates. The organization is particularly active in some of the villages in the Galilee. It is a political organization which states that the PLO is the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people, and the Israeli Arabs are Palestinians. It calls for one democratic state for all religions, though as a first step there would be a Palestinian state on the West Bank. The organization is also active for Palestinian rights such as land rights and better conditions for prisoners.
5. *Abna' al-Balad* is a legal organization in Israel. Its declared aim is the achievement of equal rights and self-determination for the Arab citizens of Israel. It is opposed to the Israeli Government's occupation policies and stresses the Palestinian identity of Arabs living under Israeli rule since 1948.
6. The Israeli authorities say that the DER were a part of existing law in the territories before the occupation. This view is challenged by West Bank jurists who say that 'after the merger of the West Bank with the East Bank in 1950, these defense regulations were considered repealed and were never in fact used in the West Bank' (*The West Bank and the Rule of Law* by the International Commission of Jurists and Law in the Service of Man, 1980, p. 24).
7. International Commission of Jurists (Israel National Section), *The Rule of Law in the Areas Administered by Israel*, 1981, p. 87.
8. Letter from Israeli Attorney General to Amnesty International, 14/6/83.
9. Letter from the Israeli Attorney General's Assistant to Amnesty International groups, 25/10/82.
10. The National Guidance Committee (NGC) was set up in 1978 by Palestinians in the West Bank, soon after the 1977 Camp David agreement. Its aim was to provide a framework within which Palestinians in the West Bank would be able to coordinate their opposition and resistance to Israeli occupation. Later the NGC sought to counter attempts by the Israeli authorities to create an alternative Palestinian leadership in the West Bank

- (i.e., the Village Leagues) with whom discussion, as perceived under the Camp David agreement, could take place. The Israeli authorities have stated that the NGC 'engaged in initiating unlicensed and violent demonstrations. It also started a campaign to single out as traitors those Arabs who deviated from the PLO position which resulted in violent actions'. Many members of the NGC, who included journalists, politicians and trade unionists, had their political activity and freedom of movement restricted; many were placed under town arrest. The Israeli authorities banned the Committee in April 1982.
11. For a description of the National Guidance Committee, the National Progressive Movement and Abna' al-Balad, see Appendix D, p. 34.
 12. In accordance with international law, the provisions of the Fourth Geneva Convention apply to occupied territories. Israel, however, considers that she administers, not occupies, the territories in question, and has therefore decided to *voluntarily* adopt the provisions of the Convention without being *obliged* to do so.
 13. Letter from the Israeli Attorney General to Amnesty International, dated 14/6/83.
 14. From the High Court ruling Sallah Baranseh vs. O. C. Central Command Supreme Court Cases 36 IV, p. 242 (1981).