

وزارة التعليم العالي والبحث العلمي  
MINISTRY OF HIGHER EDUCATION & SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH  
ⵎⵓⵏⵓⵔ ⵎⵓⵎⵎⵉⵔ ⵓⵏⵓⵣⵓⵣ  
Xⵉⵎⵓⵏⵓⵣⵓⵣ ⵎⵓⵎⵎⵉⵔ ⵓⵏⵓⵣⵓⵣ  
Xⵉⵎⵓⵏⵓⵣⵓⵣ ⵎⵓⵎⵎⵉⵔ ⵓⵏⵓⵣⵓⵣ

MOULOUDE MAMMERI UNIVERSITY OF TIZI-OUZOU  
FACULTY OF ARTS & LANGUAGES  
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSLATION & INTERPRETING



جامعة مولود معمري - تيزي وزو  
كلية الآداب واللغات  
قسم الترجمة

Item Number : .....  
Serial Number : .....

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements  
for the degree of Master in Translation

**DOMAIN : Foreign Languages**  
**SUBJECT : Translation**  
**SPECIALITY : Translation Arabic/English/Arabic**

## Title

**A hermeneutic approach to meaning restitution from  
Arabic into English in 1974 Yasser Arafat's address to the  
United Nations**

**Presented by :**  
**- TARMANT El Hadi**

**Supervised by:**  
**- Dr. KHALEF El Djouher**

### **Board of Examiners :**

Chairwoman: NINE Halima, MAA, UMMTO  
Supervisor : KHALEF El Djouher, MCB, UMMTO  
1<sup>st</sup> Examiner : BENHIDJEB Taous Asmah, MAB, UMMTO

**Class : June 2017**

Domiciliation laboratory of the Master: Laboratory of Intellectual & Cultural Representations

# *Dedication*

For my parents, brothers and sisters

# **Acknowledgements**

I am grateful to Mrs El Djouher KHALEF for the efforts she made to supervise this project and thus ensured a good frame of work. I am also very grateful to every person who helped to ignite in me the flame of curiosity without which this work would not have been envisioned. I express my deepest respect for all my friends for their encouragements and patience with me throughout this busy journey.

## **Table of contents**

<b>Dedication.....</b>	<b>i</b>
<b>Acknowledgements.....</b>	<b>ii</b>
<b>Table of contents.....</b>	<b>iii</b>
<b>Introduction.....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Chapter I: Diplomacy and hermeneutic.....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>I.1 Diplomacy as text practices and texts as practices of diplomacy.....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>I. 1. 1 Discourse or text as dialogue.....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>I. 1. 2 Discourse as multi-modal .....</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>I. 1. 3 Discourse and power.....</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>I. 1. 4 Diplomacy and discourse correlation.....</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>I.2. Characteristics of diplomatic texts .....</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>I.2.1 Characteristics of form.....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>I.2.2 Characteristics of diplomacy’s language .....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>I.3 Hermes: patron over diplomats and interpreters .....</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>I.3.1 Hermes the protector of interpreters .....</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>I.3.2 Diplomats under the shadow of Hermes.....</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>I.4 From hermeticism to hermeneutics .....</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>I.5 Translation, exegesis and interpretation: a case for hermeneutics .....</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>Chapter II: A hermeneutic paradigm in diplomatic translation.....</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>II.1 The place of translation in hermeneutics.....</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>II. 2 Diplomacy and translation: A long tradition of coexistence.....</b>	<b>29</b>
<b>II.2.1 History of languages used in diplomacy.....</b>	<b>29</b>
<b>II.2.2 Diplomatic translation .....</b>	<b>31</b>
<b>II.2.2.a) Advantages and disadvantages of diplomatic translation .....</b>	<b>33</b>
<b>II.2.2.b) The competence of diplomatic translators and interpreters .....</b>	<b>33</b>
<b>II.2.2.c) Difficulties of diplomatic translation.....</b>	<b>34</b>
<b>II. 3 Translation at the United Nations .....</b>	<b>35</b>
<b>II. 4 Steiner’s fourth motion and Gadamer’s hermeneutics of understanding ....</b>	<b>36</b>
<b>II.3.1 Of self-understanding and ideology in diplomatic translation .....</b>	<b>38</b>
<b>II.3.2 Of reflective understanding and power in diplomatic translation .....</b>	<b>40</b>

<b>II.3.3 Of mutual understanding and culture in diplomatic translation .....</b>	<b>41</b>
<b>II. 5 A hermeneutic paradigm to meaning restitution in diplomatic discourse....</b>	<b>43</b>
<b>Chapter III: A hermeneutic analysis of Yasser ARAFAT’s speech at the UN (1974)...</b>	<b>44</b>
<b>III.1 Presentation of the corpus .....</b>	<b>45</b>
<b>III.2 About the translator.....</b>	<b>46</b>
<b>III.3 Contextual background .....</b>	<b>47</b>
<b>III.4 A hermeneutic analysis and critique of the corpus.....</b>	<b>48</b>
<b>III.4.1 Section one: .....</b>	<b>49</b>
<b>Example 1: .....</b>	<b>49</b>
<b>Example 2: .....</b>	<b>56</b>
<b>III.5.2 Section two: .....</b>	<b>60</b>
<b>Example 1: .....</b>	<b>60</b>
<b>Example 2: .....</b>	<b>65</b>
<b>III.5.3 Section three: .....</b>	<b>69</b>
<b>Example 1: .....</b>	<b>69</b>
<b>Example 2: .....</b>	<b>73</b>
<b>Conclusion .....</b>	<b>81</b>
<b>Bibliography .....</b>	<b>84</b>
<b>Appendix A.....</b>	<b>I</b>
<b>Glossary A : English-Arabic .....</b>	<b>I</b>
<b>Glossary B : Arabic-English .....</b>	<b>XII</b>
<b>Appendix B .....</b>	<b>XXIII</b>
<b>The corpus.....</b>	<b>XXIII</b>
<b>B-1 : The Arabic Source text .....</b>	<b>XXIII</b>
<b>B-2 : The English target text.....</b>	<b>XLIV</b>
<b>Appendix C .....</b>	<b>LXIX</b>
<b>System Arabica.....</b>	<b>LXIX</b>

# **Introduction**

## Introduction

In this study we will be dealing with diplomatic translation in international organisations and as a case in point the United Nations (UN). Diplomatic translation is a type of political translation that epitomises one of the oldest political and linguistic practices in history. In fact, both diplomacy and translation stemmed from the same tradition. It is the new trend, however, different from the old period of *Drogoman* (Dragoman), which presented new challenges to the translator as peculiarities with regard to the setting, the language used and moral responsibilities. Diplomatic translation concerns translating verbal or written exchanges between representatives of political entities of the international community. It is governed by almost the same rules as those of diplomacy in order to vigorously restore the meaning.

By restitution of meaning is meant the *compensation* move in the hermeneutic motion. The compensatory stage is, in technical terms, simply restitution (placing back in one's place). In reality, the translator faces ideological, political and cultural challenges when translating into another language a material that may have unfavourable effect on the readership of the target language. In this case, the question of understanding is raised and becomes a real issue when culture is at odds with ideology and power. Understanding is a hermeneutic process, involving self-understanding, reflective understanding and mutual understanding, in which the translator should move from the whole to the part and vice versa in a circular move, the hermeneutic circle, in order to understand the subject matter. This move ends up with *compensation*. The task of the translator is to bring back the meaning, yet remain faithful to the original.

One of the main objective motives that guided our choice to this subject is the fact that political practices on the international level are more demanding in terms of competent translators who would be able to raise the challenge of *rapprochement* between peoples of the world. In this regard, professional translators at the UN would be able to go beyond their ideologies and political (power) affiliations to reach the *other* in order to further

understanding between different peoples and nations of the world. The second motive consists in attempting to verify how the hermeneutic approach could be helpful in addressing ideology and power relations, i.e. prejudice, in diplomatic translation. For this, an attempt to observe cultural contribution in an objective view of *otherness* would be a counterbalance to re-establishing order or at least minimise chaos by understanding international (peoples) relations. In addition to this, the corpus is representative of the studied phenomena, manifestations of understanding, in the three areas of ideology, politics (power) and culture. Moreover, the *language world* in which it was translated fits well the hermeneutic approach which might be used to conciliate the opposites: East vs. West, Muslim vs. Judeo-Christian, Liberal vs. Arab (Baas, Communist)...As for the subjective incentive that determined the choice, it was simply a curiosity to confirm a haunting and recurring questioning about the common treatment reserved to some official representatives with regard to understating translations of their declarations: why was that so? The second subjugating motive is a project to write a thesis on the same subject, explore *alterity* in translation with a hermeneutic view point as far as political discourse is concerned.

The corpus, being a diplomatic communication of a revolutionary leader to the world at the UN, may have presented some particular difficulties to the translator. However, the difficulties that we are concerned about are those pertaining to ideology, power, and culture. The question one may ask is: how to conciliate the two antithetical hypothetical postures of the translator, his subjectivity (ideology) and his objectified world view (rationalisation) or power in discourse? What are the possible instruments that, consciously or not, in a hermeneutic perspective, might absolve the translator from his responsibility and reach mutual understanding and by the way complete the process of understanding through self-understanding and reflective understanding? Does the hermeneutic approach have any consistency in a globalised pragmatic world?

Diplomatic translation is an activity which involves a very huge responsibility. Being so, subtleties in meaning would lead either to worsening relations between political entities, or improving them. We therefore put forth the following hypotheses in an attempt to solve the problem: firstly, a diplomatic translator would be able to conciliate the opposing subjective prejudice and objective rationalisation through a process of fusion of horizons which is rendered possible by a shared cultural background on which depends mutual understanding. Secondly, this latter may be reached through *compensation*. Compensation is a principle that would allow mutual understanding to happen by preventing either incarnation (sacramental intake) or infection. Finally, the hermeneutic approach to translation might be said to have sufficient consistency in analysing diplomatic translation at the UN.

The Hermeneutic approach to translation might be approached as a method which would help laying a basis, and by the way not remain as a set of useless principles in a prevailing pragmatic world. In this perspective we will be attempting to set an example about the possibility of applying Steiner's fourth move, *compensation*, in translating a political speech. The method used is a combination of two theoretical principles; STEINER's compensation (restitution) as expounded in *After Babel*, and GADAMER's concept of understanding with its derivatives as explained in *Truth and Method*. Restitution is not the process of translating; it is, at least in this study, the **act of rewording** the original text in the target language. Compensation happens by rebalancing the original and the target text. It happens by hanging together (for this is what it means – Latin *pendere*) the two plates of the balance by a mediating device in order to allow the tilting of the receiving containers (languages). The whole architecture is reproduced by the concept of understanding. True understanding happens when horizons (source and target text languages) fuse in the process by self-understanding, reflective understanding and mutual understanding. Mutual understanding is the empathic function of understanding by which equilibrium is restored between prejudiced self-understanding and rational reflective understanding.

## Introduction

In the first chapter of this research titled “Diplomacy and hermeneutics” an attempt is made to establish a link between the main subjects treated in the study which are diplomacy and hermeneutics. This undertaking aims at establishing correlations and correspondences between the main concepts involved in this study. Starting with the correlation between discourse and diplomacy, there are junction points which are dialogicality, power and multi-modality. Then, the main characteristics of diplomatic texts which are namely ambiguity, formalisation (ritualisation) and correctness (non culture-bound) are distinguished. In the third place, a discussion about the connection linking diplomats and interpreters to Hermes is factually established. Then, important enough is the historical account given in what concerns hermeneutics; an argument was advanced that modern hermeneutics stemmed from the hermetic tradition. Last but not least, the comprehensive nature of hermeneutics is singled out by correlating translation, interpretation and exegesis.

In the second chapter, a hermeneutic paradigm in diplomatic translation, the consistency of the hermeneutic paradigm in translating diplomatic texts is made into evidence by discussing first and foremost the preponderance of translation in hermeneutics. After that, translation and diplomacy were dealt with as a pair of historical and practical correlates. In fact both have coexisted since the dawn of history. Advantages and disadvantages as well as competences and difficulties of diplomatic translation are discussed in this chapter. A short section about diplomatic translation at the UN is also included. The fourth section contains the most important part of this study: the hermeneutic paradigm to diplomatic translation. It was centred on Steiner’s fourth move, *compensation/restitution/fidelity*; and, on Gadamer’s *understanding* theory. Finally, the consistency of the hermeneutic paradigm in diplomatic translation is argued about.

The third chapter is dedicated to the analysis of the corpus. After having presented the corpus, important contextual information were provided to facilitate and guide the reading of the study as the analysis advances. Finally, we proceeded to the analysis by setting six

examples with two for each one category of the three: ideology/self-understanding, power/reflective understanding and culture/mutual understanding.

There are two main objectives aimed at in this study. The first one is about the approach; the second is about the area of study. The first one is set to verify a hypothesis according to which the hermeneutic approach could be applied, like in literature, to diplomatic texts in translation analysis assessment. As for the second, it was about the area of study: the use of hermeneutics in both translation and diplomacy may be a continuation of a certain tradition.

This study was very demanding in specialised and authority books. So we were especially referring a lot to Steiner's *After Babel* and GADAMER's *Truth and Method*. In addition to this, other resources are exploited such as EBELING's *The Secret History of Hermes Trismegistus*. Dictionaries are also used in this study in order to define the meaning of important terms used in the present study. The *Origins*, an etymological dictionary, is particularly and persistently cited. JAMES and BERRIDGE's *Dictionary of Diplomacy* is often referred to namely in the first chapter. At the end, this study is augmented with three appendices containing two bilingual glossaries of relevant terms, the corpus in Arabic and English as well as the Arabic transcription system (system Arabica).

In the course of this study we had had to face many difficulties of different kinds. The first difficulty was that the hermeneutic approach, though very seriously thought and well-articulated, still lacks a clear practical framework. So, as explained earlier, we resorted to espouse two different endeavours in order to manage a practical pathway to fit the size of our subject. The second setback was the subject itself, as there is scarcity in bibliographical material dealing with "political hermeneutics" mainly when translation is involved. So, an extra effort had been deployed so that we could adapt affordable material to our task. There were many other hindrances, but the weightiest of them all is time or the *dead-line*.

# **Chapter I:**

## **Diplomacy and hermeneutics**

In this chapter it will be dealt with diplomacy and hermeneutics as two parent activities. In fact, the task that is undertaken here is an effort in perspective to cover a large swathe of concepts and terms pertaining to our subject matter, in addition to establishing possible relations between them.

### **I.1 Diplomacy as text practices and texts as practices of diplomacy**

Texts and diplomacy are as important and determining factors as any other factors in the development of human relations. They are important in the way they shape and impact historical processes; they are very useful and reliable, though not exclusively, to understand historical *processes*. It is worthwhile to shed light on the relationships that may exist between the two phenomena that are Texts and Diplomacy.

Firstly, the word diplomacy is at first glance a very familiar one. It is very commonly used today as relations grow very complex due to conflicting interests. What the word diplomacy entails would be less clear without reference to its etymon. Diplomacy originates from Latin ‘*diploma* [which] is simply the Gr [Greek] *diploma*, a paper folded double, from *diploin*, to double, from *diploos*, twofold, var [variant] *diplosios* [...] whence E [English] diplomacy [...]’<sup>1</sup> This etymology reveals, at first glance, that diplomacy is not like any ordinary activity.

In fact, its ambiguous practices, often characterised with blatant duplicity, equivocal ambivalence, suspicious concealments and even clandestineness, are logical consequences of the very nature of an institution whose sole *raison d’être* is to protect the state’s integrity and interests. ‘*Diplomacy is therefore the principal means by which states communicate with each other, enabling them to have regular and complex relations. It is the communications*

---

<sup>1</sup> Eric, PARTRIDGE, *Origins: A Short Etymological Dictionary of Modern English*, London & New York, Routledge, 4<sup>th</sup> Edition, 1966, p. 816

*system of the international society.*<sup>2</sup> Diplomacy is the way by which *complexity* is managed that otherwise the *balance of power* would be tilting to chaos.

The notion of diplomacy we construe, based on everyday life news reports, is only one aspect or function of diplomacy. Indeed there is much to what diplomacy is than meets the eye. Here follows in a nutshell the three main functions amongst the five numbered in the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations (1961) (combination being made):

**1- Representation (message delivery):** it is done through the staff of mission acting as a *'permanent channel of communication between the sending state and the receiving state'*;<sup>3</sup>

**2- Negotiation:** sometimes diplomatic communications take the form of negotiation to *'promote friendly relations between the sending State and the receiving State, and developing their economic, cultural and scientific relations'*;<sup>4</sup>

**3- Information gathering and dissemination (expression of power):** *'a diplomatic mission has the task of reporting to its state on conditions and developments in the receiving state'*.<sup>5</sup>

Hence the perception of diplomats as being legal spies in the state they are accredited in, whose justification may be found in *'diplomacy's role as a form of information gathering and dissemination [manipulation, sub-version?]*.<sup>6</sup> What are the implications of these functions on the discursive level? To give an answer to this requires that a definition of discourse is first reached. For that, it is useful to know: What is a text?

The meaning of the word text may sound seemingly very obvious and taken for granted. In fact, it is not. Text is from Latin *"texere, to weave [...]* Its pp [past participle] *textus* has the derivative n [noun] *textus* (gen-ūs), *something woven, hence the 'woven' structure of a narrative, hence tenor, narrative, whence the modern sense 'text'*.<sup>7</sup> It is from Latin *'textus [meaning] (sic) 'piece of plaited work; fabric' [...]* is a theoretical term of

<sup>2</sup> G.R., GERRIDGE, Alan, JAMES, *A Dictionary of Diplomacy*, New York, Palgrave, 2001, p.62

<sup>3</sup> *Idem*, p. 66

<sup>4</sup> United Nations, *Treaty Series; treaties and international agreements registered or filed and recorded with the Secretariat of the United Nations*, New York, vol. 500, 1965, p. 98.

<sup>5</sup> GERRIDGE, JAMES, *op. cit.*, p. 66

<sup>6</sup> Jeremy, BLACK, *A history of diplomacy*, London, Reaktion Books, 2010, p. 8

<sup>7</sup> PARTRIDGE, *op. cit.*, p. 3387

*formally limited, mainly written expressions that include more than one sentence.*<sup>8</sup> The word text is a ‘*term [that] originally denoted any coherent sequence of written sentences with a structure typically marked by cohesive devices.*’<sup>9</sup>

### **I. 1. 1 Discourse or text as dialogue**

The rigorous formalism obviously shown in the above definition reduces the notion of text to a linear succession of words, forming consequently another succession of sentences in an incremental relational order justified by (discourse) grammar rules, mainly cohesion and coherence. The idea of a written material or the object itself like a book or newspaper, as referring to a text, has become prevailing in formal traditional text theory studies for many generations. This shows a conspicuous limitedness of this approach, which is predominantly *monologic*.

Yet, another approach has been suggesting another view of the text. Discourse analysis suggests that discourse, i.e. a generic term for different types of texts ‘*is more than a random set of “utterances”: it shows connectedness.*’<sup>10</sup> So text is the same whether it is written or spoken with regard to utterance which is a verbal written or spoken language performance.

This approach put equal emphasis on the monologic and dialogic aspects of discourse, because ‘*monologic and dialogic forms of text or talk are valuable – at the level of the individual, the social group, and society at large.*’<sup>11</sup> According to Van DIJK, ‘*language use manifests itself in utterances that, as object types, we interpret as discourses or texts of a certain natural language. If more than one speaker is involved in the production of such utterances, we speak of a dialogue or conversation.*’<sup>12</sup>

---

<sup>8</sup> Hadumod, BUSSMANN, *Routledge dictionary of language and linguistics*, London, Routledge, 1996, p.1187

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>10</sup> *Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics*, Elsevier Science, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition, 2005, p.598

<sup>11</sup> Catherine, O’CONNOR, Sarah, MICHAELS, “When is dialogue ‘dialogic’?”, *Human development*, 2007, N° 50, pp. 275–285

<sup>12</sup> Teun, Van DIJK, *Macrostructures: An Interdisciplinary Study of Global Structures in Discourse, Interaction, and Cognition*, New Jersey, New Jersey, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1980, p. 5

### **I. 1. 2 Discourse as multi-modal**

Besides the fact that a text includes both linguistic forms, written and spoken, it is also not only ‘*text or talk, verbal, but it is also images, sounds, figures, gestures, colours [...] it is not limited to verbal*’<sup>13</sup> practice but it also involves semiotic signs and references. So discourse does involve linguistic and semiotic elements that intersect to form a coherent and meaningful multi-model. Discourse is a *multi-model* structure where meaning is generated by the interaction of its verbal and nonverbal components.

### **I. 1. 3 Discourse and power**

In addition to the dialogic and multi-modal functions of discourse there is a third function that is useful in order to understand the relationships that determine discourse and *vice versa*. ‘*If Monologic discourse is less open to challenge, less open to change more authoritative,*’ then of course, the power and social status of the speaker will contribute to its overall perceived value on the ‘*continuum of ideological stance*’.<sup>14</sup>

The *ideological stance* is determined by power relations, social and political belonging of individuals to ideological groups. Discourse is a ‘*place where relations of power are actually exercised and enacted*’<sup>15</sup> in face-to-face individual or cross-cultural instances. In his seminal *Discourse and Power* FAIRCLOUGH concluded that ‘*in terms of 'power in discourse', discourse is the site of power struggles, and, in terms of 'power behind discourse', it is the stake in power struggles - for control over orders of discourse is a powerful mechanism for sustaining power.*’<sup>16</sup> The production of discourse is submitted to rules in relation to what, when, where, how and whom to address in what way, all of which determined by power relations.

---

<sup>13</sup> Teun, Van DIJK, *Discourse and Knowledge*, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=sxsf-WJRKEM> (visited on 24/06/2016)

<sup>14</sup> O’CONNOR, MICHAELS, *op. cit.*, p. 277

<sup>15</sup> Norman, FAIRCLOUGH, *Discourse and power*, New York: Longman Inc., 1989, p. 43

<sup>16</sup> *Idem.*, p. 74

### **I. 1. 4 Diplomacy and discourse correlation**

It is noteworthy that a link is established and parallels drawn between texts and diplomacy. As argued earlier in this chapter, diplomacy and texts, i.e. discourses, share a common ground in mainly three areas as far as their dialogic, multi-modal nature and power are concerned.

As rightly stated by ambassador Stanko NICK, ‘*every verbal discourse, be it a simple chat, conversation, exchange of views, formal diplomatic demarche [our highlight], official negotiation or any other form, basically is a dialogue [our highlight], and therefore consists of speaking and listening to the other person.*’<sup>17</sup> This relation, as can be noticed, is the direct outcome of diplomacy’s role as negotiation platform in international relations.

It follows, then, that both texts, i.e. discourse, and diplomacy are multi-modal, since discourse itself is multi-modal. This is assumed by the fact that in diplomacy, gestures (body language), silence, flags...etc are also patterns that are designed to carry messages (signalling).

Finally, NICK argued that the ‘*dominant role of one [verbal and non-verbal] language or another in diplomacy has resulted from the political, strategic, economic, cultural or other domination of one power or another in international relations.*’<sup>18</sup>

### **I.2. Characteristics of diplomatic texts**

Whatever its nature (verbal spoken/written or semiotic) and material (stone, papyrus, paper, electronic, Internet...etc), texts are called documents in diplomacy. Diplomatic documents include ‘*full powers, letters of accreditation, diplomatic notes and treaties*’.<sup>19</sup>

---

<sup>17</sup> Stanko, NICK, “Use of Language in Diplomacy”, *Language and diplomacy*, Malta, Mediterranean Academy of Diplomatic Studies, 2001, p. 44  
[http://www.diplomacy.edu/sites/default/files/Language\\_Diplomacy\\_Chapter2.PDF](http://www.diplomacy.edu/sites/default/files/Language_Diplomacy_Chapter2.PDF) (visited on 15/06/2016)

<sup>18</sup> *Ibid.* p. 41

<sup>19</sup> Dietrich, KAPPELER, “Texts in diplomacy”, *Language and diplomacy*, Malta, Mediterranean Academy of Diplomatic Studies, 2001, p. 201 (<http://www.diplomacy.edu/resources/general/texts-diplomacy> (visited on 26/06/2016))

### **I.2.1 Characteristics of form**

The elements of this category are not easy to define because there are diverse and different documents, with each one form characterized by the nature of the document; for example, a treaty is obviously different in form, say, from diplomatic notes.

For this reason focus is only made on speech characteristics. It is, however, not difficult to approximately reveal the characteristics pertaining to form, as far as speeches are concerned. In fact, there are mainly three characteristics, which are the *‘introduction (protocol), the main text (context), and the concluding formulas or final protocol.’*<sup>20</sup>

The introduction (protocol) comprises all protocol elements having to do with introducing the main topic of discourse. This includes invocations, greetings and naming whom the document is directed to, the interlocutor.

The main text represents the body of the document and contains the topic of discourse. This part of the document is divided into many different units; the organisation of which all depends on the subjects and issues treated and involved in it.

Finally, a speech delivered by a state representative or a diplomat is concluded by what is called the final protocol or the concluding (protocol) formulae.

Other characteristics of diplomatic texts are those pertaining to originality. There are drafts, copies and original documents. *‘If made before an “original,” they were in fact rough drafts of it; if made afterward, they were copies.’*<sup>21</sup> Copies of originals are usually made and accepted as such. However, this often led to fabrication of forged documents.

### **I.2.2 Characteristics of diplomacy’s language**

Diplomatic documents qualify as tangible and formal practice of language. Diplomatic language is, so to speak, a form of political language; however BAYLEY affirms that *‘there is no such thing as political language, but a wide and diverse set of discourses, or genres, or*

---

<sup>20</sup> Peter, HERDER, Diplomats, *Britannica Online Encyclopedia*, <http://www.britannica.com/print/article/164633> (visited on 26/06/2016)

<sup>21</sup> *Ibid.*

*registers that can be classified as forms of political language.*<sup>22</sup> Anyway, political language is a generic term for facets of language in diplomatic communications. As any other forms of language, diplomatic language characterises as:

**1-Ambiguous language:** at certain points, language does reflect power relations in the way it manifests itself. But this is not always the case as long as we know that sometimes language use leaves room, advertently, for ambiguous statements. For this reason, BERRIDGE says that *'diplomacy is an essentially political activity.'*<sup>23</sup> The main characteristic of language of diplomacy is as NICK remarks: *'One of the typical characteristics of diplomatic language is a certain "subdued tone", some kind of "understatement". It is correct to say that the real weight of words and terms in diplomatic professional jargon is much stronger than those same words in "normal" everyday speech.'*<sup>24</sup> This presupposes that in diplomatic communication utterances and statements are subject to open interpretations;

**2-Formalised (ritualised) language:** though paradoxical that may seem, diplomatic language is also formalised in patterns that allow professional diplomats to reach common ground. In fact, this *'formalisation into special patterns, with a chosen cadence and sometimes repetitive pattern is, and has been designed to oil the joints of relationships between people and nations.'*<sup>25</sup> As a matter of fact, formalisation is a very useful way to contain, direct and control the evolution of diplomatic processes;

**3- Correct and non-culture-bound language:** last but not least, language of diplomacy should not be culture-bound but an *'attempt at transcending such boundaries to create a quasi-neutral vehicle of exchange; a vehicle of exchange that conveys the message while*

---

<sup>22</sup> P., BAYLEY, "Analysing Language and Politics" in *mediAzioni* 12

[http://www.mediazionionline.it/articoli/bayley\\_print.htm](http://www.mediazionionline.it/articoli/bayley_print.htm) (visited on 09/06/2010)

<sup>23</sup> BERRIDGE, G.R., *Diplomacy: Theory and Practice*, Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2002 "cited in" The Language of Diplomacy: A Linguistic Analysis of Jerzy Buzek's Address on "Eu-China: Strategic Partnership in Light of the Challenges for Global Governance", Held at the University of Nanjing, 28 May 2010", *mediAzioni* 12, <http://mediazioni.sitlec.unibo.it>, (visited on 30/06/2016)

<sup>24</sup> NICK, *op. cit.*, p. 45

<sup>25</sup> Kamel, S., ABU JABER, "Language and diplomacy", *Language and diplomacy*, Malta, Mediterranean Academy of Diplomatic Studies, 2001 <http://www.diplomacy.edu/resources/general/language-and-diplomacy> visited 26/06/2016)

*appearing least ego damaging.*<sup>26</sup> In diplomatic contexts, language must be (politically) correct. This correctness is about respect of the other's culture, identity and interests in order to further advance mutual understanding, by conciliating conflicting views and avoiding violent clashes. For this, requirements for polite formulation are to be fulfilled in order to a diplomat protect himself and his state's interests.

### **I.3 Hermes: patron over diplomats and interpreters**

Hermes is known by many other names. As we go back into the recesses of history we discover the self-same personage in different cultures and countries in ancient lore. In this narrative focus is made on the Greek Hermes.

Legend had it, in the account that follows,<sup>27</sup> that Hermes is the son of Zeus and Maia; he was born in a cave in Arcadia. When still new born, he escaped from his cradle to Pieria and had stolen the oxen of Apollo. In order not to be discovered by his footsteps he put on sandals. Back to Arcadia, Hermes found a tortoise at his cave's entrance. He killed the tortoise and took its shell. He invented the lyre by stringing it with animal guts.

Apollo went to charge him before Maia. Hermes denied the charges. But as he saw his pleading was not credible, he led Apollo to Pylos and gave him back the oxen. Enchanted by the sound of the lyre, Apollo exchanged the oxen for the instrument. Presenting his other many inventions, Hermes was offered the shepherd's staff (symbol of authority). Zeus made him his own herald.

#### **I.3.1 Hermes the protector of interpreters**

Hermes was also the god of skill in the use of speech and eloquence; he was offered tongues of sacrificial animals, conferring him by the way the power of masterly command of language and, *in extenso*, the gift of polyglotism, which gives him the power of interpretation.

---

<sup>26</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>27</sup> William, SMITH, *A New Classical Dictionary of Greek and Roman Biography, Mythology and Geography*, New York, Harper & Brothers, 1884, p.361

Hermes' supreme command over speech faculty is reflected in his capacity to not only speak on behalf of the gods, but to be able to interpret their word; and, he easily do so with the word of man, which is the direct consequence of the former given office. His name is verbally related to interpretation. In the *Origins*, PARTRIDGE thinks that '*herma* [original italics] or pillar-shaped image with a head of the Gr [Greek] god *Hermēs* [...] the bearer of secrets [...] suggested Gr [Greek] *hermēneus* [original italics], an interpreter'<sup>28</sup>

GROSS observed: '*Examples of verbal evidence are fairly abundant. Perhaps the most persuasive is the ancient Greek word hermēneus, which the Liddell-Scott lexicon renders as both "interpreter" and "translator."*'<sup>29</sup> That is to say that Hermes has influence on interpreters and translators because this skill was derived from him. Furthermore, the verbal form *hermēneuo*, GROSS added, '*provides the following possible choices [...]: interpret foreign tongues, translate, explain, expound, put into words, express, describe, [and] write about.*'<sup>30</sup>

Evidence abounds so much so that the same argument is also provided by PLATO, who makes a direct link to interpretation in *Cratylus*, one of his principal dialogues on language, or '*about the correctness of names*' (*π ἐπὶ ὀνομάτων ὀρθότητος*). *It is precisely about the question whether the correctness of names is a natural or a conventional matter.*'<sup>31</sup> Accordingly, now that a relationship is established between Hermes and interpretation, what are the implications of Hermes's involvement with the latter?

### **I.3.2 Diplomats under the shadow of Hermes**

Diplomacy, as seen earlier, is the cunning adaptation of hard power to soft means and *vice versa*. It is a canal or a process that comprises a profusion of opposite powers. As

---

<sup>28</sup> PARTRIDGE, *op. cit.*, p. 1416

<sup>29</sup> Alexander, GROSS, "Hermes—God of Translators and Interpreter The Antiquity of Interpreting Distinguishing Fact from Speculation", *Published Papers, Articles, & Translations by Alexander Gross* <http://language2.home.sprynet.com/f/hermes2.htm#top> (visited on 20/02/2015)

<sup>30</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>31</sup> Francesco, ADEMOLLO, *The Cratylus of Plato: A Commentary*, New York, Cambridge University Press, 2011, p. 1

diplomats are often men of prudence doubled with finesse and guile, they can duly aspire to Hermes's favours. In addition to Hermes being an *'interpreter (hermêneus), [he is also] a messenger, a thief and a deceiver in words, a wheeler-dealer—and all these activities involve the power of speech.'*<sup>32</sup> This perfectly fits into the frame of diplomats being representatives, i.e. messengers. They can interpret messages, so they can handle them.

Secondly, and as a consequence of the latter fact, diplomats are deceivers in words and often do not mean what they say (deliberate ambiguity). This does not expose them to danger whatsoever because they not only enjoy immunity, but they skilfully and even gracefully fulfil their mission under the shadow of Hermes:

*'As heralds and messengers [diplomats] are usually men of prudence and circumspection, Hermes (Mercury) was also the god of prudence and skill in all the relations of social intercourse. These qualities were combined with similar ones, such as cunning, both in words and actions, and even fraud, perjury, and the inclination to steal; but acts of this kind were committed by Hermes (Mercury) always with a certain skill, dexterity, and even gracefulness'*<sup>33</sup>

From their hefty position, diplomats are empowered to promote social intercourse (*in extenso* inter-state or international relations). This idea is well-rooted in myth depicting Hermes moving *'from place to place and "concluding treaties", necessarily implying he was the "promoter of social intercourse" and of "commerce among men.'*<sup>34</sup>

Wielding both hard power by being patron of the art of fighting, and soft power by being "interpreter" of the oracles and cultivator of the olive tree (symbol of peace), Hermes is the self-accomplished diplomat, per excellence. This point is supported by historical evidence as reported in *A History of Diplomacy*:

*'This Greek inheritance [diplomacy] included concepts such as neutrality, methods such as arbitration, and practices such as diplomatic immunity for heralds and providing envoys with credentials. The Greek god Hermes (the Roman Mercury) was for a long time to be linked with diplomacy as symbol and protector. He was frequently depicted as a messenger bearing a herald's staff.'*<sup>35</sup>

---

<sup>32</sup> GROSS, *op. cit.*, <http://languag2.home.sprynet.com/f/hermes2.htm#top> (visited on 20/02/2015)

<sup>33</sup> SMITH, *op. cit.*, pp.361-362

<sup>34</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>35</sup> BLACK, *op. cit.*, p. 20

Legend had it that the powers that Hermes had himself he conferred them upon those mortals and heroes who enjoyed his favour and all who had them are under his special protection. *‘In Ancient Greece Hermes, the divine messenger, was the deity of language and diplomacy, and the most prominent diplomatic emissaries, heralds (kerykes), were regarded as the offspring of Hermes.’*<sup>36</sup>

### **I.4 From hermeticism to hermeneutics**

It would be now possible to deal with the relationship between, what learned men of yore were attributing to Hermes, say, hermetic (Hermes) teachings, and nowadays hermeneutic thrust. This does open in fact a new venue as to whether there might exist a solid basis for the argument that, apparently so, there might be a continuum from hermeticism to hermeneutics. Attempting to give a coherent and serious answer to this question is to delve into yet another more complex question: what is hermeticism?

Hermeticism is the whole teachings contained in the writings attributed to Hermes Trismegistus. These writings are called Hermetica. They include the hieratic writings which some of them date back to the second millennium B.C., the *Corpus Hermeticum*, the *Tabula Smaragdina* (Smaragdine Table also known as the Emerald Tablet), the *Asclepius*, *Poemander* [Pymander or Poimander...], etc.

Hermes Trismegistus (Hermes Trice Great, greatest of philosophers, prophets and kings) *‘is identified with Thot or Theut as early as the time of Plato.’*<sup>37</sup> But how would this shift, from Greece to Egypt, be explained? Well, *‘Thot was one of the most important and ancient gods of Egypt. From the old kingdom (3700-2150 B.C.E.) on, this god, [...] was*

---

<sup>36</sup> Christer, JÖNSON, Martin, HALL, *Essence of Diplomacy*, New York, Palgrave Macmillan, 2005, p. 68

<sup>37</sup> SMITH, *op. cit.*, p.362

*represented anthropomorphically.*<sup>38</sup> The epithet “thrice great” is attached to Thot as early as the third millennium B.C.

What is more important is the fact that, with reasonable effect in antiquity, this ‘*lord of reason and rational speech*’(sic) is viewed as the forefather of all wisdom, philosophy and theology, and ancient Egyptian priests supposedly instructed Democritus, Plato, Pythagoras, and Eudoxus in the knowledge of Hermes.’<sup>39</sup>

This doctrine held in view that knowledge of truth is gained through three stages: the first is mystical vision (intuitive perception) of truth, which only select (initiated) few are able to see; ‘*the second is through explanatory words (logos), the rational speech that makes the vision comprehensible to man,*’<sup>40</sup> and is meant to express knowledge in form of ideas (ideation); and the last stage is (Hermes) preaching or teaching the knowledge thus attained.

It is in this final stage that the hermetic doctrine is actuated and there is a principle that postulates that cultural and religious elements are to be understood only allegorically:

*‘According to this opinion, one was not to understand any cultural manifestation, any text, any divine image, according to appearances, but was to inquire after the meaning behind the appearances. The distinction between surface and depth, between exoteric and esoteric was viewed as the decisive hermeneutic key to hermeticism.’*<sup>41</sup>

The hermeneutic effort toward a genuine and complete understanding of natural phenomena requires analysis of language related manifestations according to the principle of Word (speech) creativity or performativity. During the middle ages which, in this respect, started with the closing up of the Academy of Athens by emperor Justinian in 529 A.D., hermeticism witnessed a recession. Yet, it survived by changing its centre to the north of the Alps after the conversion of Clovis to Christianity. Hermeticism survived because ‘*Church Fathers held it in high esteem, and also because Arabic scholars cultivated the image of*

---

<sup>38</sup> Florian, EBELING, *The Secret History of Hermes Trismegistus: Hermeticism from Ancient to Modern Times*, Ithaca and London, Cornell University Press, 2007, p.3

<sup>39</sup> *Idem* p.7

<sup>40</sup> *Idem* p.12

<sup>41</sup> *Idem* p. 40

*Hermes Trismegistus*.<sup>42</sup>The tradition was adopted and cultivated in ‘*the splendid courts of Almansor and Haroun al Raschid, [where] the professors of the hermetic art found patronage, disciples, and emolument.*’<sup>43</sup>

Despite the favour he enjoyed in second and third centuries from theologians such as Clement of Alexandria, the personage of Hermes is harshly criticised by St. Augustine. He is not disqualified as sage and even prophet, however. The Jews take him to be Enoch, and still enjoys a high position in Jewish mysticism (Kabala). The prophet Enoch is identified by Muslim sources to be the prophet Idris (إدريس) who received revelation after Seth. Idris was born presumably in Babylon. He moved to Egypt where he established his kingdom before the cataclysmic Flood. Before his death he is believed to be ascended to heaven. He was mostly viewed as the in-ventor of writing. He supposedly preserved antediluvian knowledge.

This same Idris is said to have left some 30 books (*Sohuf*) which contained all ancient sciences like astrology, theology, alchemy...etc. He is a Prophet (theologian), a sage (philosopher) and a king (hegemon, leader). It becomes clearer and clearer that the idea of hermeticism was ‘*handed down from the Egyptians to the Greeks, and from these to the Arabs, and from the Arabs to the Germans.*’<sup>44</sup>

In this regard, Arabic hermeticism was the centre of gravity in the way it was received in Europe: ‘*It is certain, however, that the European Hermetic movement that began in the late fifteenth century is only one part of something much greater, at the center (sic) of which, geographically and chronologically, is the Arabic tradition.*’<sup>45</sup>

The adoption of Arabic Hermes by German paracelsist alchemists (named after Theophrastus von Hohenheim also known as Paracelsus (1493/4-1554)) in the sixteenth century, in *Aurora Philosophorum* (dawn of philosophy), was a landmark in the hermetic

---

<sup>42</sup> *Idem* p. 32

<sup>43</sup> Charles William, HECKETHORN, *Secret Societies of all Ages and Countries*, London, Richard Bentley and Son, 1875, p. 199

<sup>44</sup> EBELING, *op. cit.*, p.45

<sup>45</sup> Kevin, Van BLADEL, *The Arabic Hermes: from a Pagan Sage to a Prophet of Science*, New York, Oxford University Press, 2009, p. 4

history. It is more than likely that the hermetic teachings had a strong influence on the hermeneutic philosophy and literature of later centuries in Germany where hermetic orders have made their appearance as late as the seventeenth century.

Hermeneutic philosophy and literature thrived in romantic Germany as a response to the Enlightenment movement. It is worth noting that Romanticism was, and still is, a reservoir for hermetic thinking. Herder, Goethe, Schiller, Novalis...and Holderlin<sup>46</sup> were very influenced by the Eastern tradition of hermeticism. They found in it remedy for and refuge from Enlightenment trends that caused havoc by starting bloody wars and revolutions throughout Europe. This idealist counter revolution against Enlightenment ideas was a continuation of the hermetic tradition in new garments.

*'In this tradition, Schleiermacher's position was interpreted as the prototype of Romantic hermeneutics and the 'Romantic revolution' in hermeneutics. The more recent literature on this subject contends that the formation of a hermeneutic philosophy or theory took place according to a scheme of several successive phases, in which Romantic hermeneutics was assigned its firmly determined position. These phases consist in the sequence of Schleiermacher (Romantic hermeneutics), Dilthey (foundation of the human sciences), Heidegger (ontological turn), and Gadamer (universal hermeneutics).'*<sup>47</sup>

The hermetic connection to modern (universal) hermeneutics is an established fact and needs more scrutiny from scholars to determine the peculiarity of each one of its phases. Last but not least, the gist of the matter is that universal hermeneutics had its root in the romantic hermeneutics which is in fact embedded in *Hermetica*.

### **I.5 Translation, exegesis and interpretation: a case for hermeneutics**

In this short section we will be discussing the main concepts correlating with hermeneutics. The objective aims at harnessing the points of junction and show complementarily between hermeneutics, translation, interpretation and exegesis.

---

<sup>46</sup> Gary, LACHMAN, *The quest for Hermes Trismegistus: from Ancient Egypt to the Modern World*, Edinburgh, Floris Books, 2011

<sup>47</sup> Ernst, BEHLER, "Theory of language, hermeneutics, and encyclopaedistics", *German Romantic Literary Theory*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1993, p. 277

From the outset, it would be uneven to talk about hermeneutics without considering translation as one of its uttermost manifestations. Translation is from remote Latin etymon *Toll*, meaning a tax or a paid due. The Latin verb ‘*tollere*, to raise, to remove, has pp [past participle] *lātus*, used as the pp [past participle] of *ferre*, to carry or bear’. This would give ‘*translātus*, serving as past participle of *transferre*, to carry across, to transfer, [...] with derivatives [...] *translātor*, copyist, [and] translator.’<sup>48</sup>

Oddly enough, both *transferre* and *translātus* display a strange redundancy; for, as it seems obvious, the particles *trans*, *ferre*, and *lātus* reflect a common idea which is that of mediation and carrying across something of value. In fact, translation is not any activity of carrying across, and mediation. Translation is ‘*the replacement of textual material in one language (SL) by equivalent textual material in another language (TL)*.’<sup>49</sup> This equivalence suggests that the translator should at any cost value the source text at its just value so that the translation equals and emulates the original in value. What does give any text its value or meaning?

This question brings about another concept in the discussion which is interpretation. Interpretation is from Latin ‘*interpres* (o/s [oblique stem] interpret-), negotiator, agent, hence interpreter, has derivative *interpretāri*, to explain, to interpret,’ PARTRIDGE continued arguing that the Latin ‘derivative *interpretātiō* (o/s *-ātiōn-*) becomes OF-MF [old French-middle French] *interpretation* (later interpretation), adopted by E [English]...’<sup>50</sup> In this definition, interpretation is assimilated to a commercial activity, in which the commercial agent resorts to negotiation and bargaining. This idea is not astounding. One can easily observe and understand the reason why the entry to the word interpretation in the *Origins* is “price,” *pretium*, which has derivatives such as appreciation, to appreciate, etc. Whereas translation is a matter of equivalence, interpretation is about appreciation. The interpreter

---

<sup>48</sup> PARTRIDGE, *op. cit.*, p. 3494

<sup>49</sup> J., C., CATFORD, *A linguistic Theory of Translation: an Essay in Applied Linguistics*, London, Oxford University Press, 1965, p. 20

<sup>50</sup> PARTRIDGE, *op. cit.*, p. 2557

applies a certain value (price) to the text. Morris, to distinguish between interpreting and interpretation, defines the latter as *'the act of conveying one's understanding of meanings and intentions within the same language in order to avoid misunderstanding [...].'*<sup>51</sup> Interpretation is the act and process of explaining the meaning of communication. It is about gauging, assessing and appreciating the meaning of discourse.

Another term comes into perspective which is exegesis, from Greek *exēgeisthai* connoting 'to guide or lead (someone) out of a complexity', denoting 'to explain or interpret' a text, has derivative *exēgēsis*, whence E [English] exegesis [...]'<sup>52</sup> Exegesis is an interpretation based on pre-established rules and methods. It is the analysis and explanation of texts to determine the meaning intended by the author. Confusion arises when exegesis and hermeneutics are used interchangeably, but whereas the latter *'investigates principles and methods used in interpretation,'* the former is the *'actual use and application of those principles and methods.'*<sup>53</sup> This distinction will allow the application not of hermeneutic principles and methods, but instead it will make possible exploration of (some of) these principles and methods. Moreover, in this study it is not a matter of attempting to lead *out of complexity*; it is about setting and testing a method of interpretation.

In this chapter it has been attempted to give a general framework by establishing relations and bridging gaps of ambiguity and fuzziness to settle the argument on firm ground. It has been argued that diplomacy and texts, in the strictest meaning of the word, are very intrinsically related by the fact that any text, say a fabric or canvas, can display and hide at the same time; so, what matters is what one makes of its building blocks that can be words, colours... to shape meaning. Diplomacy is built on texts and with texts. Hermeneutics helps making sense of possible combinations of signs as indices.

---

<sup>51</sup> Ruth, MORRIS, "The Moral Dilemmas of Court Interpreting", *The Translator*, Manchester, St. Jerome Publishing, 1995, Vol.1, N° 1, p. 25

<sup>52</sup> PARTRIDGE, *op. cit.*, p. 2950

<sup>53</sup> James D., HERNANDO, *Dictionary of hermeneutics : a concise guide to terms, names, methods and expressions*, Missouri, Gospel Publishing House, 2012 revised edition, sample at <https://www.overdrive.com/media/1204530/dictionary-of-hermeneutics> (visited on 08/06/2016)

**Chapter II:**  
**A hermeneutic paradigm in  
diplomatic translation**

## A hermeneutic paradigm in diplomatic translation

In this chapter we will be talking about different matters relating to hermeneutics and diplomatic translation in addition to the formulation of a hermeneutic paradigm in order to be used as an analysis instrument of the corpus under study.

### **II.1 The place of translation in hermeneutics**

Hermeneutics, as we have seen earlier, is the investigation of principles and methods of interpretation or the *'investigation of what it means to 'understand' a piece of oral or written speech, and the attempt to diagnose this process in terms of a general model of meaning. It was initiated by Schleiermacher and taken up by A. W. Schlegel and Humboldt.*<sup>54</sup>

It does include names of great fame such as Goethe, Schopenhauer, Matthew Arnold, Paul Valery, Ezra Pound, I. A. Richards, Benedetto Croce, Walter Benjamin, and Ortega y Gasset. This investigation aims fundamentally at understanding the subject matter of discourse. Since any understanding depends on interpretation so, admittedly, as soon as there is language there is interpretation, that is, translation.

From the outset, the possibility for a hermeneutic analysis to be relevant presupposes the existence of a reality, i.e. an experience that needs to be understood (discourse). This understanding is made possible through translation since *'this whole process is verbal'*<sup>55</sup> (original italics). However, whatever its subject matter, translation declines itself in two types: intra-lingual and inter-lingual.

Firstly, intra-lingual translation is a natural activity in which human (dialogical) mind thinks and speaks. According to HEIDEGGER, language is the *'house of Being'*,<sup>56</sup> i.e. man dwells in a *'language world'*<sup>57</sup> and as consequence of his being a resident therein, he interprets the World according to a particular mindset that it entails. Moreover, being a *host-*

---

<sup>54</sup> George, STEINER, *After Babel: Aspects of Language and Translation*, London, Oxford University Press, 1975, p. 296

<sup>55</sup> Hans-George GADAMER, *Truth and Method*, London, New York, Continuum, 2<sup>nd</sup> revised edition, 2004, p. 385

<sup>56</sup> Martin, HEIDEGGER, *On the Way to Language*, Harper & Row publishers, 1982, pp. 5

<sup>57</sup> GADAMER, *op. cit.*, p. 386

## A hermeneutic paradigm in diplomatic translation

age of language is necessary, for, as GADAMER put it, ‘*you understand a language by living in it.*’<sup>58</sup> So there is a linguistic hospitality.<sup>59</sup> Language ‘*is not merely linguistic signs employed in daily communication but “the house of Being”—an ontological construct that claims the being of its residents as they speak its tongue.*’<sup>60</sup> In this regard HEIDEGGER thinks that hermeneutics is not merely a methodology of interpretation. It provides a frame for being, a *modus vivendi* by which humans act, react and interact, say live, spontaneously in the world. Spontaneity, one of the main concepts in Schleiermacher’s hermeneutics, is the activity of the mind which renders the world intelligible by linking together, by dint of language, different phenomena. In addition to this, receptivity, the way the world is given to the subject, coalescing with spontaneity allows the ability to say the same thing differently, by questioning, and it is instantiated in the fact that we are often compelled to translate our own utterances in order to make them ‘*truly our own again*’<sup>61</sup> and ‘*thus every translation is at the same time an interpretation.*’<sup>62</sup>

Translation is inherently linked to language practice. Another point which epitomises intra-lingual translation is the fact that same linguistic communities translate into their different dialects and social classes to understand each other. This view was expounded by Schleiermacher and many later theorists such as RICOEUR and N. FAIRCLOUGH.

In addition to this, Schleiermacher postulated in *On the different methods of translating* that ‘*every human being, on one hand, is under the power of the language he speaks; he and all his thoughts are its product*’<sup>63</sup>. This obviously was one of the Greek influences on him, namely Plato who held that language is a reflexion of the Form or Idea (Aristotle called it Substance...and ultimately became the heideggerian *Dasein*), this is why

---

<sup>58</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>59</sup> Richard, KEARNEY, *Paul Ricoeur and the Hermeneutics of Translation*, Research in Phenomenology, Brill, N° 37, 2007, p. 151

<sup>60</sup> Wei, ZHANG, *Heidegger, Rorty, and the Eastern Thinkers: A Hermeneutics of Cross-Cultural Understanding*, State University of New York Press, p. 48

<sup>61</sup> Friedrich, SCLEIERMACHER, “*On the different methods of translating*”, in Lawrence, VENUTI, *The translation studies reader*, London, Routledge, 2012, p. 43

<sup>62</sup> GADAMER, *op. cit.*, p. 386

<sup>63</sup> SCLEIERMACHER, *op. cit.*, p.46

## A hermeneutic paradigm in diplomatic translation

*'hermeneutics is as an "announcing and making known" of what had previously existed but was perceived as obscured or concealed at the time of investigation. Thus, hermeneutics in the Greek understanding was not intended to discover or find something new, but to uncover or reveal what had been already there.'*<sup>64</sup>

Taking into account the hold language has on the masses, SCHLEIERMACHER thought it right to contribute in shaping language by translating into it sciences and arts (other fields such as legal texts are not translated but interpreted) from foreign tongues, which undertaking constitutes a pivotal axis in his ethical and political hermeneutic project.

Inter-lingual translation is another type where the message to translate is not understood in the original language and needs a mediation through translation. GADAMER thinks that only in such contexts is this mediation considered as translation because 'where there is understanding, there is not translation but speech. To understand a foreign language means that we do not need to translate it into our own.

So, if there be need, translation is teleologically conditioned by its correlative pair, understanding. Mastery of language does not justify the translator's undertaking; it is a precondition for conversation, however. It results from this that *'the hermeneutical problem concerns not the correct mastery of language but coming to a proper understanding about the subject matter, which takes place with the medium of language.'*<sup>65</sup> According to this view translation does not aim at understanding the individual, but the subject matter of his discourse.

Understanding of discourse is done through interpretation which is an analysis based on meaning units that can be arrived at by a process of contextualization. It is the author's thought that ought to be translated not his subjectivity. To do that one is invited first of all to understand the medium of his thought, language. This latter, as it manifests itself in the speaking individual, crucial for any act of understanding and translating, concerns knowing of its historicity and its actualisation in individual speech. So understanding is oriented not to

---

<sup>64</sup> ZHANG, *op. cit.*, p. 95

<sup>65</sup> GADAMER, *op. cit.*, p. 387

## A hermeneutic paradigm in diplomatic translation

reconstruct the language in general but to know the meanings intended by the discoursing individual and the way he combines them. In this regard, hermeneutical analysis takes into account three parameters which are the author, the text and the reader.

This hermeneutics was, during the patristic age (age of the Church Fathers), namely with St. Augustine of Hippo, a doctrine of interpretation to guide man's approach to the ambiguous passages in Scripture (exegesis proper). In the nineteenth century this term was appropriated by Schleiermacher and Dilthey to refer to an art or technique of understanding of historical consciousness and formulation of rule for interpretation of texts.

In order for translation to be effective it should fulfil its teleological task which Steiner believes is an '*imperative, a stubborn searching out of all the apertures, translucencies, sluice-gates through which the divided streams of human speech pursue their destined return to a single sea.*'<sup>66</sup>

This said translation has become one of the most important tools in reshaping social as well as political order namely in Germany, for it was common belief among the elite that in order for a polity to gain a honourable place has to integrate in its culture the creations of the spirit from other nations. In many countries of Europe there were produced critical translations.

*'Schleiermacher and some of his contemporaries produced their translations not for the between two language games monolingual reader who has no access whatsoever to the original, but rather for the educated reader who was able to read original and translation side by side and, in doing so, to appreciate the difference in linguistic expression as expressing the difference.'*<sup>67</sup>

The power of language in shaping man's thoughts is, however, not inflexible and absolute, because '*on the other hand, every free-thinking, intellectually independent individual shapes the language in his turn.*'<sup>68</sup>

---

<sup>66</sup> STEINER, *op. cit.*, p. 244

<sup>67</sup> André, LEFEVERE, *Translation, History, Culture: a Sourcebook*, London and New York, Routledge, 1992, p. 5

<sup>68</sup> SCLEIERMACHER, *op. cit.*, p. 46

## II. 2 Diplomacy and translation: A long tradition of coexistence

### II.2.1 History of languages used in diplomacy

Sumerian was the first known linguistic medium of culture and civilization in the Tigris–Euphrates valley. It may be considered the ‘*earliest language of diplomatic intercourse and expression.*’<sup>69</sup>

However, ‘*the first peace treaty that is known from history had been concluded back in the 12th century B.C. between Ramses II, pharaoh of Egypt and Hattusili III, king of the Hittites.*’<sup>70</sup> Scientists proved that the original was written in Acadian, while the Egyptian is just a translation. Other texts confirm that Acadian was the first known dominant language of diplomatic interactions in the ancient world. JÖRGSON and HALL remarked that

*‘it is puzzling that Akkadian [Acadian] was adopted as the diplomatic language by kings as powerful and different as the Egyptian, the Babylonian, the Hurrian, the Hittite or the Elamite. Even though Akkadian was not such a dominant language as Egyptian, Hebrew or Phoenician, it had certain advantages that allowed it to remain the diplomatic lingua franca until the time of Alexander the Great.’*<sup>71</sup>

One advantage of this language was the cuneiform system that was very widespread and the use of stylus and clay tablets was very practical than its contemporary hieroglyphic writing system. Both Sumerian and Acadian used the cuneiform script.

Another technical revolution in writing gave ascendance to another language this time around the tenth century B.C. The adoption of the alphabet system favoured the Aramaic language to thrive and become, after being adopted by neighbouring powers, the *lingua franca* of international diplomatic intercourse.

*‘When Akkadian ceased to exist as a living language, it was superseded by Aramaic as the leading diplomatic language. The native tongue of the Arameans in Syria, Aramaic made its way into the polyglot society of Persia and became a lingua franca along the caravan routes of the desert.’*<sup>72</sup>

---

<sup>69</sup> A. OSTROWER, *Language, Law, and Diplomacy*, Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press, 1965, p. 164

<sup>70</sup> Tamas, BARANYAI, “The role of translation and interpretation in the diplomatic communication,” *Skase Journal of Translation and Interpretation*, Vol. 5, N° 2, 2011, p. 2  
[http://www.skase.sk/Volumes/JTI06/pdf\\_doc/01.pdf](http://www.skase.sk/Volumes/JTI06/pdf_doc/01.pdf) (visited on 23/03/2016)

<sup>71</sup> JÖNSSON, HALL, *op. cit.*, p 69

<sup>72</sup> *Idem*, p. 70

## A hermeneutic paradigm in diplomatic translation

From the 3<sup>rd</sup> century B.C. and the conquests of Alexander the Great, Greek became along with Aramean the language of diplomatic communication. The descendants of Alexander imposed Greek as an exclusive language by force and forbade other languages. Later, the Roman emperors knew Greek and used it, but the spread and dominance of Latin was unavoidable. Yet, by the end of the sixth century, Constantinople abandoned Latin and used only Greek as the language of diplomacy, whereas Latin dominated in Rome.

*'In the Middle Age, the diplomatic envoys usually come from the educated layer of the clergy, and also the language of the Church was Latin. Also, being a dead language, the 'official' use of this language in diplomatic interaction didn't hurt the pride of any nation, as it didn't indicate a difference in rank.'*<sup>73</sup>

With the Renaissance and Humanism coming into the stage, Latin gradually lost its position face to other European vernacular languages due to the invention of printing. Indeed, less and less books were published in Latin, *'more and more diplomats had no ties with the Church, and these people couldn't speak Latin well, or even couldn't speak Latin at all.'*<sup>74</sup>

In the early eighteenth century French has made its entrance and gradually became the undisputed language of diplomacy. In 1714 a treaty was concluded in Rastadt between France and the Holy Roman Empire. The treaty was paradoxically formulated in French and the reason was that *'the French general, Villars couldn't speak Latin, while the commander of the Habsburg Empire's army, Prince Eugene of Savoy – who was born in Paris – could speak French very well.'*<sup>75</sup> But a *mention spéciale* was added to mark the fact that French was not accepted as an official language of negotiation yet. In the Treaty of Paris in 1763 the special clause was not added which gave French its prominence as a diplomatic language *par préférence*.

The position of French stayed intact, though challenged by young powers like Prussia and Italy, until the late 19<sup>th</sup> century when not only England but the United States started to intervene in mainland affairs. In 1895, a tribunal was set in Paris to settle the question of

---

<sup>73</sup> BARANYAI, *op. cit.*, p. 3

<sup>74</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>75</sup> *Ibid.*

## A hermeneutic paradigm in diplomatic translation

Behring Sea and the protection of sea lions. It was agreed that the problems will be discussed in English. In the aftermath of WWI French suffered a “collateral damage,” for the treaties putting an end to war were prepared by four states. However,

*‘George Clémenceau and Vittorio Emanuele Orlando [who] had a good command of English; however, the representatives of the Anglo-Saxon countries were not as talented regarding the languages. The British David Lloyd George could speak some French, but not really well, while the American Woodrow Wilson couldn’t speak French at all. Thus, the conditions of the peace have been formulated both in English and in French, both versions being considered as of equal authority’<sup>76</sup>*

This situation of bilingualism lasted until the end of WWII, when English bereaved French its position. The widespread use of the English language in diplomatic context continued crescendo so much so to inspire George Bush, then President of the United States, to question the necessity of his speech’s interpretation into German, when he interrupted the interpreter saying “*Everyone speaks English, right?*” It was Chancellor Merkel who asked his patience so that his speech can also be heard in German translation.

### **II.2.2 Diplomatic translation**

As early as the first representations between human groups of different linguistic horizons there had been a challenge to understand the other. Avoiding the language barrier was very high at stake, so “heteronymous interpreters” were chosen, *volens nolens*, amongst the adverse party so that they could be used as translators/ interpreters. But a serious problem is raised as their loyalty is no longer assured. Adversely, to fix this security issue, political representation resorted to “autonomous interpreters” who are states’ own linguistic (and often diplomatic) trained professionals. So *‘the use of translators and interpreters was not a completely new phenomenon, as we have proof of the existence of people in charge of this task throughout the history of mankind.’<sup>77</sup>*

---

<sup>76</sup> *Idem*, p. 4

<sup>77</sup> *Idem*, p. 7

## A hermeneutic paradigm in diplomatic translation

It is a common knowledge that in ancient times diplomats were often translators and interpreters. This tradition was spread throughout the ancient world from Mesopotamia to Egypt. As for the Romans, for example, *'in diplomatic negotiations the interpreter participated in imperial decisions. In the signature and ratification of the peace treaty between Justinian and Chosroes I in AD 561 six Greek interpreters and six Persian interpreters were involved.'*<sup>78</sup>

Centuries earlier, another instance of the use of linguistic experts in political negotiations has occurred between Persian and Spartan officials:

*'Artaxerxes of Achaemenid Persia sent to Sparta a special messenger, named Artaphernes, with a complaint that he was unable to understand the many ambassadors who had been dispatched to his court, and urged the Spartans to choose someone who could speak plainly and be understood by him. Of interest, perhaps, is the highly complicated method involved in the transmittal of the above communication: it was prepared in Aramaic, written in Assyrian script, and in order to be acted upon by the Spartans required translation into Greek.'*<sup>79</sup>

Given the fact that relations between nations grew very complex due to different factors, like trade, ideology and technology, translation evolved and became commonplace practice, namely after the Treaty of Versailles and Nuremberg trials. One result of the above mentioned events was the systematic special training of diplomatic translators/interpreters. Modern practices of translators in the field tend to define this activity as that which is *'carried out within diplomatic missions, embassies or consulates. In certain aspects, we could relate this type of translation to that carried out within international bodies, in terms of the type of texts translated and the conventions established.'*<sup>80</sup> This definition entails that diplomatic translation has become, one may say, an institution by its own right.

---

<sup>78</sup> Daniel, PERETZ, "The Roman Interpreter and His Diplomatic and Military Roles", *Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte*, Vol. 55, N° 4, 2006, pp. 451-470

<sup>79</sup> OSTROWER, op. cit., p. 72.

<sup>80</sup> Adrián Fuentes, LUQUE, "An Approach to Diplomatic Translation," *Translation Journal*, Volume 3, N° 4 October 1999, <http://translationjournal.net/journal/10dipl.htm> (visited on 07/07/2016)

**II.2.2.a) Advantages and disadvantages of diplomatic translation**

The importance of translation in diplomacy is more than necessary; it is a vital tool in reaching mutual understanding between nations in contact. More important than all, diplomatic translation gives some invaluable advantages for diplomats during negotiations. One of these is the negotiating parties would have time for thinking what they should reply while the translator/interpreter is translating. It is also advantageous for parties in contact to observe and analyse nonverbal elements of communication.

However, the use of translators in diplomacy may be disadvantageous for one of the following reasons as well: on one hand, translation in political contexts is time consuming and very costly; on the other hand, translation may lead to imbroglios as a consequence of mistaken interpretations, which may cause harm to diplomatic relations.

**II.2.2.b) The competence of diplomatic translators and interpreters**

Communication is successful, when one knows when, what, to whom and how to say in order to reach a certain goal or effect. In this respect, a translator should have some competences so that one's translation could achieve the same effect as the original in the target language.

Firstly, the translator should have sufficient linguistic competence. In addition he/she needs to possess both a wide knowledge of the world in general, and the linguistic register expressing the details of the most various fields. Sometimes it is the translator (interpreter) who needs to help out the speaker (even a head of state) in expressing his thoughts in a more exact way.

Secondly, he should be culturally aware. In fact cultural awareness entails that different cultures have different ways of thinking. There is also a common knowledge that a translator in diplomatic contexts should know to avoid misunderstanding.

Thirdly, as a highly specialised field, domain-specific technical background is required, like *'events of international politics, geopolitical competences, the awareness of the*

## A hermeneutic paradigm in diplomatic translation

*systems of alliances and that of the possible conflicts, the knowledge concerning internal political issues of other states, and the topics of the actual meeting.*<sup>81</sup>

In addition to these, another competence which is more likely determining than the others is discretion and concentration. The translator should be impartial, too. However, all these competences are contributing equally to allow the translator to accomplish the task and ensure that the mediation is successful.

### **II.2.2.c) Difficulties of diplomatic translation**

Like any other field, diplomatic translation presents many difficulties which render the task of translators particularly hard. Some of these difficulties are:

Firstly, obscure ways of expressing thoughts: in this case the translator could decide very hardly whether these thoughts were intentioned in such an obscure way that they should be reflected in the translation or not;

Another difficulty is that sometimes original documents contain culturally unique phenomena. In this case diplomatic translators face a double challenge; on one hand, the translator should find a cultural equivalent that would fit the context; on the other hand, that equivalent should be politically effective because original occurrences of this nature are reasonably and deliberately intended to produce an anticipated effect or reaction;

Finally, original diplomatic documents may contain mistakes. If so is the case, the translator should be alert to detect eventual mistakes and propose one's corrections in order to avoid escalation or any undesired effect. For this reason some translators, especially interpreters, may intentionally mistranslate. This may be a provocation to the correction of the text in order to avoid diplomatic conflicts.

This said, one of world largest international bodies, homing the largest diplomatic translators' community, is the United Nations.

---

<sup>81</sup> BARANYAI, *op. cit.*, p. 9

### II. 3 Translation at the United Nations

Having presented the difficulties of this particular practice, i.e. diplomatic translation, it would be useful to put the above mentioned elements in context so that a clear framework is drawn. The title would be misleading though if one did not pay much attention to the fact that pragmatics is used here to refer to the immediate physical environment of the utterance.

As a matter of fact, many diplomats and participants in international meetings often do not know the other party's language and culture. Another fact is that at the United Nations there are, to facilitate communication and transmittal of messages so that participants understand each other, official languages approved by the institution, which are English, French, Spanish, Chinese, Russian, and Arabic (added later by an informal agreement). The working languages of the United Nations are English and French. The choice of these official languages is not arbitrary, because they are Languages of Wider Communication (LWCs).

At the United Nations documents may be produced in one of the official languages acknowledged by this international organization, and they are translated or interpreted into the other languages simultaneously.

*'Documents issued by the United Nations, relevant to international issues such as environmental protection, human rights, world trade, disarmament, globalization, world health and welfare ... are translated into the different official languages in order to allow the states' representatives to express their views, discuss, and comment on them. Therefore, we can say that translation at this multilateral institution facilitates communication, promotes understanding and spreads harmony among the members of United Nations.'*<sup>82</sup>

There is a dire need for translators in international meetings. States representatives from different cultures take part in negotiations; they need to know the other parties' languages and cultures, which is often impossible.

---

<sup>82</sup> Aziza, AFKIR, "Translation in Multilateral Diplomacy: Cultural and Political Hurdles," *Translation Journal*, <http://translationjournal.net/Featured-Article/translation-in-multilateral-diplomacy-cultural-and-political-hurdles.html> (visited on 31/08/2016)

## A hermeneutic paradigm in diplomatic translation

For a better dissemination of the legal content, United Nations documents designate universal concepts in different subject-fields. Translation at this institution is highly specialised; therefore, the translator should take into account various elements: accuracy, respect of deadlines in addition to cultural affinities.

### **II. 4 Steiner's fourth motion and Gadamer's hermeneutics of understanding**

Considering the act of translation in context, STEINER presented the hermeneutic motion as '*the act of elicitation and appropriative transfer of meaning*'<sup>83</sup> in four *moves* or stages:

The first move he dubbed *trust* or *faith* is vital, because every '*understanding, and the demonstrative statement of understanding which is translation, starts with an act of trust.*'<sup>84</sup> This act consists of the translator's assumption of '*a sense to be extracted and retrieved ... into and via his own speech.*'<sup>85</sup> Although this move is instantaneous and unconscious, it represents a vital assumption in every translation act.

The second move is *intrusive* and *extractive* which he baptised *aggression*, *penetration* or *decipherment*, and consists in the translator's onslaught on the text. '*The translator invades, extracts and brings home*'<sup>86</sup> the translation game, the meaning. He prevents, however, that '*this despoliation is illusory or is a mark of false translation,*'<sup>87</sup> because '*decipherment is dissective, leaving the shell smashed and the vital layers stripped.*'<sup>88</sup>

This said, a third phase is required to re-move the veil of falsity and allow the incorporation of meaning. This *incorporation* or *embodiment* movement is necessary since acts of translation add to our means, for the ontological condition of man according to the 'Heideggerian '*we are what we understand to be*' entails that our own being is modified by

---

<sup>83</sup> STEINER, op. cit., p. 296

<sup>84</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>85</sup> *idem*, p. 353

<sup>86</sup> *idem*, p. 298

<sup>87</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>88</sup> *Ibid.*

## A hermeneutic paradigm in diplomatic translation

each occurrence of comprehensive appropriation. *'No language, no traditional symbolic set or cultural ensemble imports without risk of being transformed.'*<sup>89</sup> This incorporation entails then that either the text is over-valued or completely depreciated by additions or truncations. In Steiner's word the text receives *'sacramental intake or incarnation,'* otherwise it would suffer an *'infection.'*<sup>90</sup>

To finally be able to restore equilibrium, the translator moves another stage further to compensate the intake and testify one's *fidelity*. In fact, *'this is only another way of saying that the hermeneutic motion is dangerously incomplete, that it is dangerous because it is incomplete, if it lacks its fourth stage.'*<sup>91</sup> It is dangerous because the translator is either lauded for his/ her faithfulness, or condemned for treasonous act.

The act of translation must end up by *compensation* for the original text, for the prejudice caused by the first aggressive move. *'The hermeneutic act must compensate. If it is to be authentic, it must mediate into exchange and restored parity.'*<sup>92</sup> However this authentic mediation is possible only if thought both ways; it should do justice to the original, on one hand, and add some value to target language and culture, on the other, so that exchange could happen.

By being faithful to the original the translator insures the integral presence of the original: *"the translator ... is faithful to his text, makes his response responsible, only when he endeavours to restore the balance of forces, of integral presence, which his appropriative comprehension has disrupted."*<sup>93</sup> Equally the translator should ensure that *'translation recompenses in that it can provide the original with a persistence and geographical-cultural range of survival which it would otherwise lack.'*<sup>94</sup>

---

<sup>89</sup> *Idem*, p.299

<sup>90</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>91</sup> *Idem*, p. 300

<sup>92</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>93</sup> *Idem*, p. 302

<sup>94</sup> *Idem*, p.396

#### II.4.1 Of self-understanding and ideology in diplomatic translation

It has been shown in the previous section that restitution of meaning in translation is subject to potential danger of either sacrament or infection according to whether the translator deals with the text from his own perspective or, otherwise, treats it looking from a distance. In this section the endeavour would be to measure the ideological intake in translation that is based on self-understanding.

Self-understanding is a result of the fact that humans are, given the speculative nature of language, linguistically conditioned and, as such, language exerts a tremendous power on perception and reception. *‘Every human being is in the power of the language he speaks. He and all his thoughts are its product.’*<sup>95</sup> In this sense, the individual is interpreting the world either over hastily or according to an authority, a pre-established paradigm that shapes understanding. By complying with prejudice, which is a *‘judgement that is rendered before all the elements that determine a situation have been finally examined,’*<sup>96</sup> the individual is making self-interpretations that would be determining his vision of the world.

One point that is important to make here is: self-understanding is not self-consciousness, because it *‘always occurs through understanding something other than the self, and includes the unity and integrity of the other.’*<sup>97</sup> Rather, *‘self understanding refers to a historical decision and not to something one possesses and controls.’*<sup>98</sup> However,

*‘the fact that our experience of the world is bound to language does not imply an exclusiveness of perspectives. If, by entering foreign language-worlds, we overcome the prejudices and limitations of our previous experience of the world, “this does not mean that we leave and negate our own world.” Like travelers (sic) we return home with new experiences.’*<sup>99</sup>

---

<sup>95</sup> SCHLEIERMACHER, *op. cit.*, p. 46

<sup>96</sup> GADAMER, *op.cit.*, p. 273

<sup>97</sup> *idem*, p. 83

<sup>98</sup> *Idem* p.522

<sup>99</sup> *idem*, p. 445

## A hermeneutic paradigm in diplomatic translation

In this regard, ideology enters into perspective and guides the process of reading and influences by the way the interpretations one makes of the text and even redirect and catches attention by highlighting some aspects more than others.

However, a definition of ideology is necessary to understand its impact on reading and translating processes. *'Ideology is interpreted as any constellation of beliefs or ideas, bearing on an aspect of social reality, which are experienced as fundamental or commonsensical and which can be observed to play a normative role.'*<sup>100</sup>

So ideology is the motive and normative platform for social action. In this capacity it can shape and reshape social models and cause paradigm-shift in meaning construction with regard to discursive practice and translation in particular.

Being a social act, diplomacy offers an inter-subjective basis for agreement and dissent. This inter-subjectivity is where ideology enters into play and guides the translator's reading, which may cause prejudice and lead to mistranslations. *'As in all good dialectical practice, the thesis (source language) and the antithesis (target language) are resolved in the synthesis of translation.'*<sup>101</sup>

This said, a translator who tries understanding a text has to stay at a distance when the text rejects any prejudiced reading.

*'Translation, like all interpretation, is a highlighting. A translator must understand that highlighting is part of his task. Obviously he must not leave open whatever is not clear to him. He must show his colors. Yet there are borderline cases in the original (and for the "original reader") where something is in fact unclear. But precisely these hermeneutical borderline cases show the straits in which the translator constantly finds himself. Here he must resign himself. He must state clearly how he understands. But since he is always in the position of not really being able to express all the dimensions of his text, he must make a constant renunciation. Every translation that takes its task seriously is at once clearer and flatter than the original. Even if it is a masterly re-creation, it must lack some of the overtones that vibrate in the original.'*<sup>102</sup>

---

<sup>100</sup> J., VERSCHUEREN, *Language and Ideology: Selected Papers from the 6th International Pragmatics Conference*, Antwerp: International Pragmatics Association (IprA), Vol 1, 1999.

<sup>101</sup> P., FAWCETT, *Translation and Language: Linguistic Theories Explained*, Manchester, St. Jerome. 1997

<sup>102</sup> *Idem*, p. 388

## A hermeneutic paradigm in diplomatic translation

It is clear then that any translation would never be an identical copy of the original. So the translator should not succumb to one's own interpretation, as could be mirrored in the linguistic reformulated *vouloir dire* of the author, but question it back in order not logic disqualifies his rhetoric.

### **II.4.2 Of reflective understanding and power in diplomatic translation**

A relationship between self-understanding and ideology in diplomacy being established, let us now turn to reflective understanding and attempt finding the guiding thread leading to soft forces pulling strings of power in the art of war. For war is, according to Clausewitz, a continuation of politics by other means, meaning that war starts with and fought by softer and materially less damaging means than heavy weaponry.

In the meantime, reflective understanding, the '*reflective activity of comparison and distinction, but in pointing, through the similarity, to what is copied,*'<sup>103</sup> is a determining factor in diplomatic discourse. In fact, the tenure of discourse on the diplomatic stage in terms of rhetoric and pragmatic elements is determined by the balance of power between interlocutors.

Moreover, reflective understanding is dependent on historical consciousness, which is a '*mode of self-knowledge,*'<sup>104</sup> contrasted by self-consciousness and spontaneity. Also, reflective understanding is not intuitive but, relying on a given method, hence deductive. This is why '*verbal experience of the world is absolute.*'<sup>105</sup> In this case the individual could easily be victim of misunderstanding, facilitated by the impression that prejudices are overcome in applying a method. In fact, the real fulfilment of the historical task is to determine and define anew the significance of what is examined.

Reflective understanding is the seat of power in the human mind where language is objectified. Is power different from ideology? Whereas ideology concerns basic beliefs and

---

<sup>103</sup> *Idem*, p. 134

<sup>104</sup> GADAMER, *op. cit.*, p. 228

<sup>105</sup> *idem*, p. 446

## A hermeneutic paradigm in diplomatic translation

ideas of people's actions, power is the expression with authority (it may be political, social or else) of these beliefs and ideas through concrete verbal and nonverbal acts.

Diplomacy, as a concrete verbal expression of political will and authority is the quintessential verbal power expression. This is why some scholars conceive of diplomacy as a '*weaponized language and misfired signs*.'<sup>106</sup> To give a clear account of what has been said so far, reflective understanding is generally expressed in diplomatic texts through solemn formulae, affirmative and direct style and utterances.

[As a weapon, translation] *is, of course, a rewriting of an original text. All rewritings, whatever their intention, reflect a certain ideology and a poetics and as such manipulate literature [discourse] to function in a given society in a given way. Rewriting is manipulation, undertaken in the service of power...*<sup>107</sup>

This said, a reflective understanding is just an antipodes of self-understanding, which, in terms of excessive reliance on method, would lead to imprecision and misunderstanding by miscalculation and other statistical as well as scientific approximations. This would hamper full understanding or comprehension based on mutual reflexion of otherness, or hermeneutic empathy, from taking place.

### **II.4.3 Of mutual understanding and culture in diplomatic translation**

Mutuality is from Latin *mūtāre*, to change. It means exchange and reciprocity. One derivative of *mutuality* is referring to a '*loan of movables, returnable in kind but without interest*.'<sup>108</sup> In this sense understanding is a possibility that two dialoguing or conversing entities enter into an enriching experience investing only their will to reach the other.

---

<sup>106</sup> Emily S., APTER, *The Translation Zone: a New Comparative Literature*, Princeton, Princeton University Press, 2006, p.7

<sup>107</sup> Susan, BASSNETT, André, LEFEVERE, in LEFEVERE, *op. cit.*, preface

<sup>108</sup> PARTRIDGE, *op. cit.*, p.2078

## A hermeneutic paradigm in diplomatic translation

Reaching the other implies that reciprocity is experienced as such, i.e. the movement of *'going backwards and forwards (like the sea), hence alternating, working both ways'*<sup>109</sup>

This movement is nothing but the hermeneutic circle which is the pathway from the whole to the part and back to the whole...

*'Schleiermacher elaborated this hermeneutic circle of part and whole in both its objective and its subjective aspects. As the single word belongs in the total context of the sentence, so the single text belongs in the total context of a writer's work, and the latter in the whole of the literary genre or of literature. At the same time, however, the same text, as a manifestation of a creative moment, belongs to the whole of its author's inner.'*<sup>110</sup>

This movement is *'neither objective nor subjective, but describes understanding as the interplay of the movement of tradition [text] and the movement of the interpreter [translator].'*<sup>111</sup> However, this circle is not a method of understanding; it is the ontological circle of understanding and it does not mean that it is not practically useful in cultural discourse analysis.

For any understanding to happen there has to be a mutuality, for *'the subject matter (Sache) is not merely an arbitrary object of discussion, independent of the process of mutual understanding (Sichverstehen), but rather is the path and goal of mutual understanding.'*<sup>112</sup>

The question that one may ask is: what does culture has to do with mutual understanding. Well, culture, from Latin *colere* meaning to cultivate, is not a stereotyped mode of existence. It is quite the opposite of stagnation and bareness. It is the process by which meaning is regenerated.

For GADAMER, the thesis that one expression can be substituted for another is contradicted by the moment of individualization in the speaking of a language as such. This is why any possibility of understanding should encompass the whole subject matter and translate according to an equation that involves self-understanding, reflective understanding and the

---

<sup>109</sup> *Idem*, p. 2705

<sup>110</sup> GADAMER, op. cit., p. 291

<sup>111</sup> *Idem*, p. 293

<sup>112</sup> *Idem*, p.180

## A hermeneutic paradigm in diplomatic translation

cultural awareness that would bridge the gap between the different horizons. Only non-culture is not universal, so realistically an impossibility.

### **II. 5 A hermeneutic paradigm to meaning restitution in diplomatic discourse**

The proposed hermeneutic paradigm is to be understood as the coalescence of the three elements which are questioning, prejudice and mediation. These elements might be approached as: a conversational demand; appropriateness or relevance; and finally the meaning implication. For this reason, a three-phased model is devised where restitution of meaning is analysed in light of consistency of the target text with the premises:

On one hand, the wording of the translation is considered as a reflexion of the understanding of the translator; on the other hand, ideology, politics (power position) and culture are not separable physical objects:

- a) They are in permanent interaction with each other; so are self-understanding, reflective understanding and mutual-understanding;
- b) Examples for each category are studied to highlight the intake or loss of meaning;
- c) The examples are analysed as to make the hermeneutic circle.

This said, restitution of meaning is conditioned by subjective and objective constraints. To determine the meaning of utterances, there has to be a common knowledge that allows the influx of information from the addressor to the addressee; otherwise, the statements would remain useless information.

The hermeneutic approach is one of the approaches that might be characterised as a holistic and multi-disciplinary approach that, as it will be seen later on in this study, seeks to bring together different insights in translation. It is significant that *'translations are made under a number of constraints of which language is arguably the least important.'*

**Chapter III:**  
**A hermeneutic**  
**analysis of Y. ARAFAT's**  
**speech at the UN (1974)**

## A hermeneutic analysis of Y. ARAFAT's speech at the UN (1974)

In this part of our paper we are going to present a series of examples to analyse in light of the hermeneutic paradigm as devised in the last part of the previous chapter. We thought it right to give some contextual elements that could help in interpreting correctly the original statements as well as their equivalent translations in English.

### **III.1 Presentation of the corpus**

The corpus under study is a translation of a speech delivered in Arabic by PLO leader Yasser Arafat at the United Nations on November 13<sup>th</sup> 1974. It was the first time a Palestinian voices directly his word to the independent nations of the world gathering in the 2282<sup>nd</sup> UN General Assembly Plenary Meeting.

It is a lengthy speech in which the orator tried pleading in favour of the martyred people of Palestine, whom he represented. In fact, after the protocol introduction, Yasser Arafat gave his speech centred on six themes:

Firstly, Zionism and Israel were the incarnation of evil. He claimed that they were not only imperialist, colonialist, racist ... profoundly reactionary and discriminatory, but they were even anti-Semitic and against the interests of Jews.

Second, he argued that Palestinians were always victims of oppression, violence, Western imperialism, and racial discrimination.

Third, he denied wholesale the charges of terrorism. The Palestinians were only rightly acting like the Americans did against the British, the Europeans against the Nazis, and Third World nationalists against colonialism.

Fourth, Arafat threatened that unless there was a just settlement there would be a calamitous future for the region, predicting a new war that would bring nuclear destruction and cataclysmic annihilation.

## A hermeneutic analysis of Y. ARAFAT's speech at the UN (1974)

Fifth, he insisted on the Palestinian national identity as an established fact whose complete recovery only be total victory. He stressed the point that Palestinians always yearn to return, and that nothing could change that goal.

Finally, he wanted to establish the PLO's unchallenged legitimacy. This was, based on four pillars: armed struggle, popular support, keeping a broad coalition, and backing from other Muslim countries.

### **III.2 About the translator**

The translator of ARAFAT's speech at the United Nations in 1974 was Edward W. SAID. He was born in 1935 in Jerusalem, more than a decade before the creation of Israel. He is very well known for his political activism for Palestine. He was also a literary theorist, cultural critic and author of many books of which *Orientalism*, published in 1978, is the foundation text of a field that is known as *post-colonial studies*.

Edward SAID, '*completely apolitical until 1967, he entered the public fray as a writer trying to correct misperceptions of the Arab people*'<sup>113</sup>; these misconceptions are created and nourished by western colonial domination and imperial ambitions in the Orient. One of SAID's most important undertakings in this perspective is the translation of ARAFAT's speech at the UN. '*He first met Yasir Arafat when the chairman of the [...] (PLO) came to the United Nations in 1974. He translated Arafat's speech from Arabic into English.*'<sup>114</sup>

This fact will be determinant in the analysis of the examples taken from the corpus because the translator, Said, believes that the '*only way of rising beyond the endless back-and-forth violence and dehumanization is to admit the universality and integrity of the other's*

---

<sup>113</sup> H. Aram, VEESER, *Edward Said: The Charisma of Criticism*, Routledge, London & New York, 2010, p. 7

<sup>114</sup> Ardi, IMSEIS, "Speaking truth to power: on Edward Said and the Palestinian Freedom Struggle" in Adel Iskandar, Hakem Rustom, *Edward Said: A Legacy of Emancipation and Representation*, California, University of California Press, 2010, p. 281

## A hermeneutic analysis of Y. ARAFAT's speech at the UN (1974)

*experience and to begin to plan a common life together*'<sup>115</sup> As an independentist, a sovereignist and a renowned universalist Edward SAID influenced decisively clearing doubts about the Palestinian struggle and the way English speaking receptors interpret PLO leader speech at three levels; ideology, power and culture.

### **III.3 Contextual background**

This speech was delivered in a very special context. After decades of armed struggle, namely the episode of Black September (1970), which was much criticised and in some ways caused Arab states backing to decrease and contest PLO leadership's policy. ARAFAT, unable to match any Arab government in military force can only resort to clandestine subversion. It was his '*conviction that Palestine had been taken away by fire and steel, and it will be recovered by fire and steel.*'<sup>116</sup>

The crisis was not abating, ARAFAT adopted a new strategy. Finally, he discovered that '*not only could armed struggle coexist with diplomacy but that even the most horrendous violence could strengthen his international position.*'<sup>117</sup> This is obviously a necessary adaptation to the new context; diplomacy was not an alternative to violence but a complement, according to the clausewitzian principle; war is the continuation of politics by other means.

In July 1974 PNC (Palestinian National Council) wrote a plan to create a Palestinian "authority" this time on Palestinian soil to avoid interference from other states, namely Arab governments. That was a stroke of genius. The invitation from the United Nations was a

---

<sup>115</sup> *Idem*, p. 70

<sup>116</sup> Barry, RUBIN, Judith Colp, RUBIN, *Yasir Arafat: a Political Biography*, New York, Oxford University, Press, 2003, p.28

<sup>117</sup> *Idem*, p. 68

## A hermeneutic analysis of Y. ARAFAT's speech at the UN (1974)

*'remarkable gift to a man who was openly seeking the destruction of a UN member state (sic) [Israel].'*<sup>118</sup> The resolution was passed by a margin of 105-4, and 20 abstentions.

Being allowed to speak at the UN rostrum was more than symbolic gesture; it was an act of political power. The speech was delivered at the 2282<sup>nd</sup> UN Plenary Meeting, on Wednesday, 13 November 1974, at 10.30 a.m. local time in New York.

Yasser ARAFAT was invited to address the United Nations by the President of the General Assembly, Mr. Abdelaziz BOUTEFLIKA (from Algeria).

### **III.4 A hermeneutic analysis and critique of the corpus**

At this level of the study, examples will be taken from the corpus and analysed in light of what has been discussed in the previous chapter. It will be divided into three sections with two examples for each, thus making a cluster of six examples in total, hence helping us scaffolding an answer to the problematic. The choice of the examples is dictated by the nature of the hypotheses formulated in each section. The evaluation of the translation is thus done by applying understanding typology and conclusions according to hypotheses.

---

<sup>118</sup> *Ibid.*

### III.4.1 Section one:

In this section focus is made on the ideological load in the translation of main concepts in quotes taken from the corpus; the aim behind this analysis is to establish possible ideological relationships between the reasons underlying the Arabic statements and the differences in meaning in the English translation. Two examples are analysed in light of what has been discussed in the theoretical chapter about self-understanding and ideology. In this section we hypothesise that the translator's ideological background may have influenced the translation. In the previous chapter we have seen how the translator may be *showing his colours* through **highlighting**.

#### Example 1:

The English target text	The Arabic source text
<p>'Despite abiding world crises, despite even the gloomy powers of backwardness and <b>disastrous wrong</b>, we live in a time of glorious change. An old world order is crumbling before our eyes, as imperialism, colonialism, neo-colonialism and racism, the chief form of which is zionism, <b>ineluctably</b> perish. <u>We are privileged to be able to witness a great wave of history bearing peoples forward into a new world that they have created.</u> In that world just causes will triumph. Of that we are confident.'</p> <p>(Appendix B, B-2 p. XLIX)</p>	<p>'رغم هذا الوضع المتأزم الذي يسود العالم برغم ما في عالمنا من قوى ظلام وتأخر فإن عالمنا اليوم يعيش أياماً مجيدة. أنه يشهد انهيار العالم القديم عالم الاستعمار والامبريالية والاستعمار الجديد والعنصرية بكافة أشكالها وأبرزها الصهيونية <u>ويشهد الاتجاه التاريخي العظيم لشعوب العالم نحو انبثاق عالم جديد تنتصر فيه القضايا العادلة، وأننا نثقون</u> من انتصار هذه القضايا.'</p> <p>(Appendix B, B-1, p. XXV)</p>

**Our translation:**

Despite prevailing crisis in the world, despite gloomy powers and forces of backwardness, our world is living its glorious days. Our world witnesses the collapse of an old world, that of colonialism, imperialism, neo-colonialism and racism in all its forms, the worst of which is Zionism. **The great movement forward of the history of the peoples of the world witnesses the emergence of a new world;** a world in which just causes will triumph. Of that we are confident.

**Analysis of the example**

In this example the literal meaning of the two statements is quite different from each other. In the Arabic source text focus is made on history itself “witnessing” a move on the right direction. Personification of an immaterial, say abstract, concept such as history is meant to influence the recipient’s perception of reality to induce him to feel it concretely. The strategy of embodiment may be intended here to provoke a sense of empathy as to feel the rupture in harmony caused by the injustices committed against Palestine, and elsewhere. On the other hand, it may be used to entice sympathy and the urgency to restore order.

This said, it is of paramount importance to notice that the act of taking the world as a witness of the events that are unfolding is not only a matter of pragmatics. It is worth noting also that the act of witnessing as it manifests itself in this context is not exclusively ocular or physical. The Arabic verb to witness “شهد” basically means to see with one’s own eyes, to observe and to be present<sup>119</sup>. The occurrence of witnessing as intended here may be revealing of a certain embedded belief in some transcendence of reality. In fact, political and ideological implications of this occurrence might be explained by the Islamic cultural representation of reality. In the Muslim lore, reality is a compound of two interacting realms: the first is called the world of the absence “عالم الغيب” or the Unseen World; the second is the world of the witnessed “عالم الشهادة” which is the accessible, tangible and seen world. Islam

---

<sup>119</sup> Hans, WEHR, *A Dictionary of Modern Written Arabic*, New York, Spoken Languages Services Inc., 3<sup>rd</sup> Ed., 1976, p. 623

## A hermeneutic analysis of Y. ARAFAT's speech at the UN (1974)

teaches that the latter would be evolving out of a transcendent causation and represents the enactment of divinely decreed historical process as written in the wholly tablet, also known as the Preserved Tablet, "اللوحة المحفوظة", in heaven. So, historical events occur by divine ordinance. This may explain for example the sense of fatalism or at least determinism in interpreting events with regard to the role assigned to each one actor on stage history as rendered explicitly by the translator in the English version.

The translator added the word "*ineluctably*" which appeared nowhere in the Arabic text to convey the idea that the *movement of history* is irreversible. However the translator may not share the same belief as the author. In fact, Edward Said believes that change is the result of human endeavour and more or less intelligent actions of the peoples. On the other hand, ambiguity in the Arabic statement may be a hint that irreversibility of any historical process is in a relative way not a matter of strategic calculations; it is a moralistic equation that is solved by the actor's ontological posture and strife in the right moment and on the right side. This can be interpreted as an embedded ideological belief in the Palestinian resistance movement as much as to hear the defunct founder and spiritual leader of Hamas, Sheikh Ahmed Yacine, stating that the state of Israel would cease to exist by 2027, yet he is no exception.<sup>120</sup> This, according to him, would be the fulfilment of a divine prophecy contained in the Quran. The missionary view of one's role in history is definitely obvious through the Islamic concept of generation. Furthermore, the eschatological worldview is well articulated by Bessam DJARAR in a book based on an interpretation of a passage of the seventh verse of Surah Al-Isra' (The Journey by Night) of the Quran, also called chapter of the children of Israel, Surah Banu Israel.<sup>121</sup> It says:

...فَإِذَا جَاءَ وَعْدُ الْآخِرَةِ لِيَسُوءُوا وُجُوهَكُمْ وَلِيَدْخُلُوا الْمَسْجِدَ كَمَا دَخَلُوهُ أَوَّلَ مَرَّةٍ وَلِيُتَبِّرُوا مَا عَلَوْا تَتْبِيرًا.

<sup>120</sup> قناة الجزيرة، حصة شاهد على العصر، حركة حماس كما يراها الشيخ أحمد ياسين، <http://www.aljazeera.net/programs/centurywitness/2005/1/10/8> حركة حماس-كما يراها-الشيخ أحمد ياسين-ح (visited on 10/06/2016)

<sup>121</sup> بسلام نهاد، جزائر، زوال إسرائيل 2022 م نبوءة أم صدف رقميّة، دار الشهاب، 1992

## A hermeneutic analysis of Y. ARAFAT's speech at the UN (1974)

which Yusuf Ali translates: “Then when **the final promise came**, [We sent your enemies] (sic) to sadden your faces and to enter the temple in Jerusalem, as they entered it the first time, and to destroy what they had taken over with [total] (sic) destruction.”

The passage in question is about the fulfilment of God's word, say ‘the final promise’ ( وَعْدُ الْأَجْرَةِ ) which is the pan-ultimate enforcement of God's decree upon mankind.

From this perspective Yasser ARAFAT stressed the point that this move forward of world history is not something to be ignored because he believes that it is a divinely ordained fate to recover the Palestinian's right to self-determination. More than that, one might infer from this ideological background that Yasser ARAFAT may have been convinced that the Palestinian people is invested with a divine mission to free the land from occupation whose leadership he should assume. John AMOS remarked that ‘*the charismatic theme [in legitimating leadership] is manifest in PLO ideologies, which are millennial [our highlight] in the sense that they look forward to some eschatological solution to the Palestine conflict [...]*’<sup>122</sup> He judiciously stated that this eschatological conviction is deep rooted in the Muslim world's psyche which holds in view that a solution to the Palestine question would only occur when the end of history draws nigh.

This idea is deep rooted in the Islamic dualistic vision of the world (*Weltanschauung*). According to this vision, the World is considered to be an arena where good and evil forces oppose each other in an existential fight. Regarding the immediate context, the paragraph containing the sentence under discussion where the translator describes “***gloomy powers of backwardness and disastrous wrong***” is a dense archetypal construct. The statement “**disastrous wrong**” did not occur in the Arabic source text, however. The intention of the

---

<sup>122</sup> John, AMOS, The PLO: Millennium and Organization, in: *Ideology And Power In The Middle East: Studies in Honor of George Lenczowski*, Peter J., CHELKOWSKI, Robert J., PRANGER, Durham and London: Duke University Press, 1988, , pp. 365-378

## A hermeneutic analysis of Y. ARAFAT's speech at the UN (1974)

translator to make this addition might be that of showing the evil side of occupation in a more direct moralistic way, though in concrete terms, as well as the irreversibility of the process.

But for this to happen would necessitate an investment in the just cause by putting one's contribution to make things to happen. This archetypal ideological adventist image is enhanced in the discourse by the dichotomy opposing light to darkness which is a universal theme to depict the eternal fight between good and evil. In fact, Yasser ARAFAT opposes the '**gloomy powers of backwardness and disastrous wrong**' to the emerging, rather **dawning**, new world order.

This world order would consecrate and enhance the aforementioned ideological factor in the struggle. This world order is heralded by a new dawn where benevolent forces could coalesce to chase the gloomy powers. This mental representation of reality is no baseless interpretation. Yasser ARAFAT operated a deep ideological anchoring by suggestion. He did not oppose overtly and explicitly light and darkness indeed. He provided one element of the dichotomy which is the word "**gloom**" or darkness "ظلام" to suggest the idea of light by isotopic substitution. The other element is the orator seeing the "**emergence of a new world**" (our literal translation) which corresponds, yet not necessarily equivalent, to the final part of the part containing the statement "انبثاق عالم جديد."

In this respect, the Arabs use the word "انبثاق" to mean 'outpouring, effusion, outpour, outburst; emanation' among other things. But it is also used colloquially exactly as suggested by Yasser ARAFAT "انبثق الفجر" meaning the same as "بزغ الفجر"; to dawn or to appear, radiate and spread its light as the sun rises. It is also used metaphorically to refer to the

## A hermeneutic analysis of Y. ARAFAT's speech at the UN (1974)

emergence of a new era.<sup>123</sup> The dawning (sun) of the new world symbol is not new. The USA Congress librarian introduced the origins of **the revolutionary faith** in these terms:

‘[There is] *also the more pointed, **millennial assumption** (our highlight) that, on the new day that was dawning, the sun would never set [ultimate **triumph of good over evil**]. Early during the French [Revolution] upheaval was born a "solar myth of the revolution," suggesting that the sun was rising on a new era in which darkness would vanish forever. This image became implanted "at a level of consciousness that simultaneously interpreted something real and produced a new reality."*<sup>124</sup>

To put this in simple words, ARAFAT used a metaphor to describe the changing reality of world history. This new reality that would be induced and produced by the power of this ideological symbol, and it is important not to be lost in the symbol, is likened to a dawning new day; the emergence of a new world up to the light of a new era, rather. The same imagery of a new world emerging out of a decaying one as depicted here by the orator is prevalent in the United Nations philosophical as well as cultural representations of this ideological orientation.

The Italian sculptor Arnaldo Pomodoro translated this ideal in a famous work named *Sphere within Sphere, Sfera con sfera* in Italian, representing a ripped up globe from which emerges a new one. This work is a gift from the Italian government to the United Nations in 1996. It is important to note that there are many versions of this sculpture in different places of the world, in California, Teheran, the Vatican City...and even in Tel Aviv.



*Sphere within Sphere* by Arnaldo Pomodoro on display at the Visitors' Plaza of the United Nations Headquarters, New York

Between the idea of a dawning new day and the contrasted new world emerging out of an old one, to a new era, the translator seems to have chosen another metaphor to translate the

<sup>123</sup> عمر، أحمد مختار، معجم اللغة العربية المعاصرة، القاهرة، مصر، عالم الكتب، ط. 1، م. 1، 2008، ص 159

<sup>124</sup> James H., BILLINGTON, *Fire In The Minds Of Men; Origins Of The Revolutionary Faith*, New York, Basic Books, 1980, p. 6

## A hermeneutic analysis of Y. ARAFAT's speech at the UN (1974)

idea of transition which ARAFAT emphasised strongly when he addressed the Nations of the world . We would suggest that the primary meaning of the occurrence of the term “انبثاق” seems to have misled the translator and deformed the whole image ARAFAT intended to convey. The translator decided to translate the aforementioned phrase by ‘[we...] **witness a great wave of history bearing peoples forward into a new world**’. But in either case the main message is the irresistible march of the peoples of the world to freedom and democracy.

Here too there is a similarity that may have allowed the translator to suggest that water might be as irresistibly cleansing and holy as light. This can be explained by the Christian cultural background of the translator, Edward SAID. This also might be viewed as a logical deduction of a universal principle, the destructive power of water, as we know that the translator favours secular responses to religious ones. For instance, the Chinese martial artist Sun TZU says: ‘*when the victorious get their people to go to battle as if they are directing a massive flood into a steep canyon, this is a matter of formation, [then victory is assured].*’<sup>125</sup> It is so much so that the translator decided to make another addition, this time overtly and ideologically affirmative, and confirming our interpretation, by attributing the power of change to **the people**. The translator says that the “great wave of history [is] bearing peoples forward into a new world that **they** [the people] **have created.**” The highlighted words are the addition that is more likely meant to convince the world of the success of the revolutionary will and action of the peoples, which success Yasser ARAFAT and Edward SAID are “confident” about, from *fides* meaning faith.

The original Arabic wording “الاتجاه التاريخي العظيم لشعوب العالم” literally translates “the great historical direction of the peoples of the world” which is in other words “the great historical **movement of the peoples of the world**”. The idea of *movement* shows the

---

<sup>125</sup> Sun, TZU, *The Art of War*, Boston and London, Shambhala, 1991, p. 31

A hermeneutic analysis of Y. ARAFAT's speech at the UN (1974)

aspiration of the peoples to self-determination, which evokes and implicates democracy which is also a fundamental principle in the United Nations charter, a “humane paradigm”.

In the end, the translator's subjectivity is obviously manifest in this translation namely in the way his vision of the world and his ideological position is marked decisively in the additions and of course in the historical perspective as he understands it.

**Example 2:**

The English target text	The Arabic source text
<p>“Let us remember that the Jews of Europe and the United States have been known to lead the struggles for <b>secularism</b> and the separation of Church and State. They have also been known to fight against discrimination on religious grounds. How can they then refuse this humane paradigm for the Holy Land? How then can they continue to support the most fanatic, discriminatory and closed of nations <b>in its policy</b>?”</p> <p>(Appendix B, B-2, p. LXVI)</p>	<p>لقد ناضل اليهود يا سيادة الرئيس في أوروبا وهنا في أمريكا من أجل أوطان <b>لا طائفية</b> تتفصل فيها الدول عن الكنيسة وقاتلوا ضد التمييز على أساس الدين . فكيف يمكن لهم أن يرفضوا هذا النموذج الإنساني المشرف على الأرض المقدسة، <b>أرض السلام والمساواة</b>[untranslated]؟ وكيف يمكن لهم أن يستمروا في دعم أكثر دول العالم انغلاقاً وتمييزاً وتعصباً؟</p> <p>(Appendix B, B-1, p. XLII)</p>

**Our translation:**

The Jews, Mr President, had fought in Europe and here in America for **nations free of sectarianism** and for the separation of Church and State. They have also fought against discrimination on religious grounds. How can they refuse this honourable humane model to the Holy Land, (**the land of peace and equality**)? How can they continue to support the most enclosed, discriminatory and fanatic State in the world?

### Analysis of the example

The concept in question here is “لا طائفية” and its translation by “secularism” which are in appearance not equivalent to each other. In Arabic the term is negated by the negative particle “لا”. The positive form “طَائِفِيَّة” derives from the radical “طَوَف; طَائِفَة” and has a pejorative meaning. Traditionally the term means a part of something which evolved to indicate 'a group of people gathered around a specific doctrine'<sup>126</sup> (our translation); its English equivalent is “a sect”, from Latin *secare*<sup>127</sup> to cut or to saw. It is pejorative too, though it is a nuanced concept when it refers to ‘a religious group’.<sup>128</sup> So literally speaking the equivalent term for “طَائِفِيَّة” is sectarianism. The phrase “لا طائفية” simply means “anti-sectarianism” in English. The problem is: anti-sectarianism is not an ideological system as it was intended in the phrase “لا طائفية تنفصل فيها الدول عن الكنيسة”, where separation between Church (not a sect in it) and State is clearly emphasised; it is a political attitude. A literal translation would give: “**anti-sectarianism where States are separated from the Church.**” This phrase is stylistically very poor and semantically inaccurate which makes this structure lacking fluency as well. So to avoid parting and ripping apart the people, **secularism** would be a better unifying ideology, in antipodes with Zionism and of course the radical resistance (the PLO) that would ultimately replace it, as perceived by some international community members. The translator himself is secular and advocates for a creation of a secular State where Jews and Arabs live together.

In this example the idea of secularism comes into view. Indeed, the wording in Arabic would correspond to the technical definition of secularism. But another idea is deeply hidden in the deep *layers* of history. Secularism denotes a profane system of governance where the Church, and religion in general, is relegated outside the political sphere of influence. The

---

<sup>126</sup> عمر، أحمد مختار ، معجم اللّغة العربية المعاصرة، القاهرة، مصر، عالم الكتب، ط. 1، م. 2، 2008، ص 1423

<sup>127</sup> PARTRIDGE, *op. cit.*, p. 2892

<sup>128</sup> P., H., COLLIN, *Easier English Student Dictionary*, London, Bloomsbury, 2<sup>nd</sup> Ed., 2000, p. 766

## A hermeneutic analysis of Y. ARAFAT's speech at the UN (1974)

equivalent term that is commonly used in Arabic for secularism is “عِلْمَانِيَّةٌ”, denoting science and rationality. Secularism is akin to the term seed<sup>129</sup> which is logically a good index as the French Marianne, a universal symbol for secularism (*laïcité* in French) is called *la Semeuse*, the sower woman. However, at its origin the word was pejorative; the first meaning was acquired by association: the Church as a sect, “طَائِفَةٌ”, had to be evicted from the central stage as an ideological actor.

The alternative that the translator may have been presumably proposing is an image of a new world order where secularism as a political model is highlighted powerfully to suggest that democracy is an inclusive model where all faiths and ideologies find room. This alternative is the only way to peace. This view of “**secularism**” as a “**humane paradigm**” may be a logical explanation for the deletion of the untranslated statement “أرض السلام” و”المساواة”. If it were to be applied in Palestine “**secularism**” would also allow restoration of peace and recovery of spoiled rights and hence effective settlement of the Question of Palestine.

Secularism is a “*belief that religion and religious bodies should have no official part in public life or in running public institutions*”<sup>130</sup> which is in other words synonymous with anti-sectarianism. Sectarianism is “*relating to relations between religious groups or denominations, especially when the groups hold rigidly to a set of doctrines and are intolerant of other views.*”<sup>131</sup> This intolerance is the nub of the question, and in order to restore peace and equality the translator sees that secularism is the best alternative because religious bodies would have no chance to officially run public institutions, namely those which represent sovereignty, and influence the policy of the State.

---

<sup>129</sup> *Idem*, p.2949

<sup>130</sup> COLLIN, *op. cit.*, p. 223

<sup>131</sup> *Ibid.*

## A hermeneutic analysis of Y. ARAFAT's speech at the UN (1974)

It is no secret that the PLO refused any secular solution to the conflict or at least for the majority of the movements involved in it. But for Edward SAID '*true intellectual is a secular being.*'<sup>132</sup>

This is why perhaps the final outcome of his unbridled secular interpretation has a determining effect on the other side as it enables another possibility of viewing and exposing the nature of the conflict to the world. '*Said's critical position exterior to the PLO demonstrates his commitment to the "secular" responsibilities of the radical intellectual and critic.*'<sup>133</sup>

The Arabic word for secularism "علمانية" has a negative connotation in the Arab mind-set and is thus unwelcome for the people who are fighting for their freedom, including the freedom to choose the political model or paradigm of governance. So the concept anti-sectarianism "لا طائفية" is likely impossible to be replaced by a secular reality in the Arab context. However, the translator is translating a message to a part of the international community, English speaking countries namely the US, whose political beliefs and tradition apparently tend to expunge religion from politics. In addition to this, the translator is himself a convinced secular thinker whose political activism confirms his positions.

As we can see, the restitution of meaning is heavily affected by the ideological background of the translator who has a secular understanding (approach) to politics. The ideological alignment of the translator determined greatly the reading and the translation of the statement.

---

<sup>132</sup> Edward, SAID, Representations of the Intellectual, in : Benjamin, GRAVES, "Edward W. Said's "Politics of Secular Interpretation"", <http://www.postcolonialweb.org/poldiscourse/said/said1.html> (visited on 15/03/2017)

<sup>133</sup> Benjamin, GRAVES, "Edward W. Said's "Politics of Secular Interpretation"", <http://www.postcolonialweb.org/poldiscourse/said/said1.html> (visited on 15/03/2017)

### III.5.2 Section two:

In this section focus will be made on political (power) implications of the translations provided in the quotes bellow. Here power is considered in light of the weight an entity wields in the balance of power on the international as well as on the regional levels. Internationally, the PLO has a less favourable reputation mainly in America and Western Europe; regionally, it enjoys relatively a better reputation despite contested positions from some Arab regimes. This is why we think that translation of some concepts might have been influenced by the position of power of the translator or that which is suggesting that the orator enjoys in his mediate or immediate environment.

#### Example 1:

The English target text	The Arabic source text
<p>“This legitimacy was further strengthened by the support of the entire Arab nation, and it was consecrated during the last Arab Summit Conference, which reiterated the right of the PLO, in its capacity as the sole representative of the Palestinian people, <u>to establish an independent national State</u> on all liberated Palestinian territory.”</p> <p>(Appendix B, B-2 p. LXIV)</p>	<p>قد تدعمت هذه الشرعية بمؤازرة الأمة العربية كلها لها. وكما تكرر هذا الدعم في مؤتمر القمة العربي الأخير بتأكيد حق منظمة التحرير الفلسطينية في <u>إقامة السلطة الوطنية المستقلة</u> على كل الأراضي الفلسطينية التي يتم تحريرها بصفتها الممثلة الشرعية الوحيدة للشعب الفلسطيني.</p> <p>(Appendix B, B-1, p. XL)</p>

#### Our translation:

This legitimacy is strengthened by the support of the entire Arab nations. It was consecrated by the Arab Summit Conference which reiterated the right of the PLO, in its

capacity as the sole representative of the Palestinian people, **to establish an independent national authority** on all Palestinian liberated land.

### **Analysis of the example:**

Translating “سلطة وطنية” by “national State” was a bold decision. This translation gives the Palestinian resistance movement a certain status (that of statehood) to achieve, however the PLO leader did not utter the word “State” at all. Whereas a State *‘is the government of a country,’*<sup>134</sup> an authority is *‘a ruling organisation’* which has the *‘power to do something,’*<sup>135</sup> which definition fits perfectly well the PLO. This definition shows clearly how far the translator went in his interpretation to assume that an Authority could mean a State. In Arabic the word for authority, “سُلْطَة”, means *‘a political power to which citizens are subjected.’*<sup>136</sup> The equivalent terms for it as provided in *Al-Mawrid* dictionary are “authority”, “power” and “reign”.<sup>137</sup>

As for the word “State”, its equivalent in Arabic is “دَوْلَة”, from “دَوَّل” meaning change in the state of something (namely time), suggesting the idea of transition; in technical terms it is *‘a territory with a system of governance enjoying political sovereignty* [our translation].’<sup>138</sup> In English the word state stands for *‘an independent country [...] the political system of a country represented by its government’*, and the author noted that the *‘state is the permanent embodiment of the political system.’*<sup>139</sup>

---

<sup>134</sup> COLLIN, P., H., *Easier English Student Dictionary*, London, Bloomsbury, 2<sup>nd</sup> Ed., 2000, p. 840

<sup>135</sup> *Idem*, p. 42

<sup>136</sup> عمر، أحمد مختار، مذكور أعلاه، م. 2، ص 1093

<sup>137</sup> روجي البعلبكي، المورد: قاموس عربي-إنجليزي، دار العلم للملايين، بيروت، ط. 7، 1995، ص. 640

<sup>138</sup> أحمد مختار، عمر، مذكور أعلاه، م. 1، ص 787-788

<sup>139</sup> P., H., COLLIN, *Dictionary of Politics And Government*, London, 3<sup>rd</sup> Ed., 2004, p. 233

## A hermeneutic analysis of Y. ARAFAT's speech at the UN (1974)

In addition to what has been said, another term that needs to be explained is country, for it may lead to confusion. A country is '*a land which is independent and governs itself*.'<sup>140</sup> It is called "بلد" in Arabic which is a bordered place settled by groups of people; it can refer to the whole territory.<sup>141</sup> So a country is a geographical area, a place, where people live independently from external constraints or control; whereas the struggle the people of Palestine is engaged in is located on the political level.

In this example the translator may have chosen any of the two words, i.e., authority or country. The latter term however is obviously inappropriate in this context; for if it was used that entails that the struggle is about borders to recover. This is true in fact but these borders need a State to confirm them. So it is firstly necessary that an organised entity that would incarnate the will of the Palestinian people is recognised; comes next the delimitation of its area of influence. Intrinsically, the struggle that is fought is not about the territory itself; it is about people's freedom and sovereignty, i.e. it is about control of the territory. In addition to that, if the term country was used that would suggest that the Palestinian attachment to the land is not politically consistent because its representative voice may be viewed as lacking a political frame, thus standing on fragile basis. What is at stake here is a political affirmation of the existence of a people, not merely a chauvinist belonging to a land. The main idea here is that of recovering political as well as civil rights and making an end to persecution and discrimination.

Yet the translator used interchangeably another term, sovereignty, to refer to nearly the same political ethos which is authority. In fact the term "sovereignty" is used to mean authority, too. In another occurrence Yasser ARAFAT says:

"اتوجه إليكم بأن تمكنوا شعبنا من إقامة سلطته الوطنية المستقلة وتأسيس كيانه الوطني على أرضه"

---

<sup>140</sup> *Idem*, p. 59

<sup>141</sup> عمر، أحمد مختار، مذكور أعلاه، م. 1، ص. 293

(Appendix B, B-2 p. LXVIII)

which is translated : “I appeal to you to enable our people to **establish national independent sovereignty over its own land.**” (Appendix B, B-1 p. XLVII)

This declaration reads clearly that the Palestinian people should rule by his own will and right his own land. Another point that is worth noting is the fact that the translator opted for a totally different translation of the same expression “إقامة سلطته الوطنية” as it is used in the occurrence of our case study “إقامة السلطة الوطنية” which, with the slight difference in writing or locution, it can lead to confusion. But as soon as they are taken back to their respective contexts they mean only one thing: authority and/or sovereignty of the Palestinians over their land. The question then is: why did the translator use interchangeably *State* and *sovereignty* to mean, or not, *authority* which did not occur a single time in the English version?

It is useful to mention that the co-text of the second utterance in the Arabic version argues strongly for the “establishment of an *independent* [self-governing] *authority*” “إقامة سلطته الوطنية المستقلة”, in other words the foundation of a “*sovereign*” “national entity on his [Palestinian] land” or a “*State*”. In other words, if the first and the second utterances as worded back in the English translation were put together in a single phrase, this would give: the establishment of a **national Sovereign State**.

So the unity of meaning, the expression “*independent authority*”, translated by strict respect of lexical and structural (grammatical) equivalence is open to interpretation when political stakes are advanced and power relations enter into play as it is clearly the case here.

The PLO (Hatf, حتف, meaning death in Arabic, changed euphemistically to Fatah فتح , conquest), an umbrella organisation that gathered almost all Palestinian factions ever since its

## A hermeneutic analysis of Y. ARAFAT's speech at the UN (1974)

foundation in 1962, is *de facto* the **ruling organisation** that is **empowered by the Arab States**, in addition to popular approbation, to represent the people of Palestine. By the way, the most appropriate term to render the concept of power given to someone to do something or the legal right to do something is "**authority**". However authority does not systematically imply independence. One can enjoy or exercise authority yet remains subordinate to the entity delegating its power. This is likely why Yasser Arafat never used the term "authority", "سلطة", separately from its contextual as well as teleological political correlate independence, "المستقلة".

So it is more likely that what is at stake here is more a functional adaptation of Yasser ARAFAT's speech and projection of a political agenda than a re-expression of his textual declaration. It is a political position that Edward SAID is assuming on behalf of Yasser Arafat in addressing the Western World with a tone of an actor who aspires to be considered as equal in political rights by creating a State incarnating the will of the Palestinian people. This change in terminology is important in a sense that the Arabic and the English receptors, namely State representatives, have not the same message. On one hand, the Arabs would not feel challenged by Yasser ARAFAT's leadership by stating explicitly his movement's political objectives. On the other hand, the Westerners, namely the Americans are challenged that his political agenda is explicitly and overtly the creation of a **national sovereign State** for the Palestinians (whatever their religious or political denominations). Only once, expressing a hope and a dream of democratic state on this land, did Yasser ARAFAT use the term "دولة" to refer to Palestine. So the outcome meaning of the hermeneutic analysis may be intended to support the argument for State creation as put forward in the premise "إقامة السلطة الوطنية", to have sovereignty over a national territory.

## A hermeneutic analysis of Y. ARAFAT's speech at the UN (1974)

Edward SAID's translation is determined not only by the textual meaning of the statement. It is determined both by his reflective understanding the receptor's predisposition and awareness of the subject and the political objective that is aimed at behind the discourse.

### **Example 2:**

The English target text	The Arabic source text
I am <b>a rebel</b> and freedom is my cause. (Appendix B, B-2, p. LXV)	إنني <b>ثائر</b> من أجل الحرية. (Appendix B, B-1, p. XLI)

### **Our translation:**

I am a **revolutionary** and freedom is my cause. (Literally)

### **Analysis of the example:**

In order for Palestinians to recover their freedom and right to exercise their own will, a political confirmation of their power is needed. For this reason an affirmation of the political stance of resistance as it is formulated in this quote is important. In this occurrence the speaker did ascribe to himself a political persona by which he would be referred to.

In fact, Yasser ARAFAT did use different terminology referring to the Palestinian fight for independence in addition to the term revolution "ثورة", such as struggle "نضال", fight "كفاح", combat "قتال", and armed struggles, "الصراعات المسلحة". However, we will be dealing with the epithet name by which Arafat designates himself many times literally as a revolutionary, "ثائر" translated exclusively by Edward Said as a "**rebel**" or a "**freedom-fighter**". Before delving into this latter with details it is useful to mention the references to the other fighters espousing the Palestinian cause than Yasser Arafat himself. In fact, he referred to these by calling them either "ثوار" revolutionaries or "مناضلين" freedom-fighters. But not

## A hermeneutic analysis of Y. ARAFAT's speech at the UN (1974)

once did he explicitly refer to Yasser ARAFAT as a “**revolutionary**”. The question is then why did the translator decided not to use the term revolutionary and choose the term **rebel** instead to designate ARAFAT?

Notice that Yasser ARAFAT referred many times to himself as “قائد الثورة”, which the translator always turned literally into English as the “**leader of the revolution**”. In addition to this the orator did use the term “ثورة”, revolution, and its different derivatives at least five times.

The first occurrence of the term in the Arabic version was used to distinguish between two modes of the use of psychological and brutal physical violence, in the fanonian meaning of the word; revolution and terrorism. This might be a logical result as ARAFAT is deeply influenced by the Algerian “freedom-fighters” and others as he admits that in the speech.

The term “**rebel**” is used only once to translate the first reference to ARAFAT by his function as “ثائر”, a revolutionary; yet in later references the translator used another word, “**freedom-fighter**”, to translate the same term “ثائر”, revolutionary. Why did he do so?

A rebel is ‘a person who fights against the government or against people in authority.’<sup>142</sup> A rebel is hence a person who is engaged in a rebellion, a fight against the government or those in authority in order to rectify injustices. A revolutionary is ‘a person who takes part in a revolution’, i.e. ‘an armed rising against a government or state or **the entire social system** [our highlight].’<sup>143</sup> So we have here the basic facts about our subject which are the political fight for Palestinian rights but also an armed struggle to free the occupied land. Yet these are minor arguments to justify the choice. In fact the struggle of the

---

<sup>142</sup> P., H., COLLIN, *Dictionary of Politics And Government*, London, 3<sup>rd</sup> Ed., 2004, p. 204

<sup>143</sup> *Idem*, p. 215

## A hermeneutic analysis of Y. ARAFAT's speech at the UN (1974)

Palestinians, as stated clearly in the speech, is against the entire unjust political system described as colonial, neo-colonial, imperial and racial. Its name is political Zionism.

The main distinction between a rebel and a revolutionary lies in the objective, not in the means or method, because both use organised psychological as well as physical violence. When a rebellion achieves its goals it becomes a revolution. The main objective of a rebellion is freedom from oppressive forces without overthrowing the social or political system. On the other hand, revolution seeks systematic radical change and uses any possible means to succeed in overthrowing the established order of things. This may explain the avoidance of the use of sole literal references to revolution because:

*“Violent Marxist-inspired revolutions in Russia, Yugoslavia, China, Vietnam, and Cuba in the twentieth century, the stark conflict of interests between the communist regimes and the market-oriented West, and such amoral-toned language as Bolshevik theorist Bukharin’s “revolutionary expedience” help account for the bad name given to revolution in the West.”<sup>144</sup>*

Is the use of the term “**rebel**” instead of “**revolutionary**” a misfit in this context? The answer is negative. The translator may have eluded the use of the term revolutionary because of the problem of reception from the English addressees, particularly the Americans whom he addressed directly; they have a negative perception of the term revolutionary, as *‘revolutionary itself is a striking, even potent word, yet for most Americans it carries the taint of illegitimacy.’<sup>145</sup>* This is where discourse comes to play a central role in power struggle, because each one actor uses name attributes to be referred to as such and declines any other names, epithet or attributes that are considered as demeaning. The actor chooses these references in order to restore or impose certain legitimacy. If the translator wants to produce the same effect the orator wanted he had to adapt the message to the American public so that they sympathise.

---

<sup>144</sup> *ibid.*

<sup>145</sup> Philip, HERBST, *Talking Terrorism: A Dictionary of the Loaded Language of Political Violence*, Greenwood Press, 2003, p.150

## A hermeneutic analysis of Y. ARAFAT's speech at the UN (1974)

In addition to the term “rebel”, the second part of the statement, “**freedom is my cause**”, gives consistence to the term “**rebel**” in a sense that the translator decided to translate the same term “تائر” in the historical “**today I have come bearing an olive branch and a freedom-fighter's gun.**” In “**freedom-fighter**” *‘still, the affirmative word freedom and the strong fighter combine to create a highly laudatory phrase.’*<sup>146</sup> This shows clearly the deliberate use of the term “rebel” rather than “revolutionary as an epithet name for Yasser Arafat. The translator’s reflective understanding and awareness of the effect this variant terminology could produce and his objective which consists in gaining the sympathy of the Americans may have been the sole reason explaining the choice of the term rebel.

Note that in America the term rebel has a very positive meaning which has to do with the struggle of the thirteen colonies for self-determination from British rule. Benjamin Franklin, supposedly (commissioned by the first committee with Thomas Jefferson and John Adams for the design of the reverse side of the Great Seal of the United States) coined the famous saying that goes: “*rebellion against tyrants is obedience to God.*”<sup>147</sup> So Edward Said seems to have been aware of this rational and its implications in power affirmation by legitimising the cause of the revolutionary Yasser ARAFAT.

To finish with, there is another term, “قائد الثورة”, which in a way or another has a positive acceptance in the English speaking world that the translator translated literally, “leader of a revolution”. This said, the term rebel is more powerful than revolutionary as it strengthens the position of the speaker by legitimising his cause. The translator is as good as Arafat in cultivating the way (according to Sun Tzu) to mutual understanding.

---

<sup>146</sup> *Idem*, p. 69

<sup>147</sup> The Great Seal, “Benjamin Franklin's Great Seal Design”  
<http://greatseal.com/committees/firstcomm/reverse.html>

**III.5.3 Section three:**

In this section we are going to apply the hermeneutic principle of mutual understanding and try to find whether the translator succeeded to meet the goal of reaching the other side. In fact, the aim of the orator is to convince the United Nations, namely the West, of his good intentions. For this the translator is meant to produce the effect intended not only of the author of the text but also of the people on behalf of whom he speaks.

**Example 1:**

The English target text	The Arabic source text
<p>I must mention the fire of the Al Aqsa Mosque and the disfiguration of <b>many of the monuments</b> which are both historic and religious in character. <b>Jerusalem, with <u>its religious history and its spiritual values</u>, bears witness to the future. It is proof of our eternal presence, of our civilization, of our human values.</b> It is therefore not surprising that under its sky <b><u>the three religions</u></b> were born and that under that sky these three religions shine in order to enlighten mankind...</p> <p>(Appendix B, B-2, pp. LX-LXI)</p>	<p>... لا حاجة لأن نسترسل في ذكر المسجد الأقصى (وسرقة ثروات كنيسة القيامة) [our highlight] والتشويه الذي لحق بعمرانها وطابعها الحضاري.. فالقدس بروعتها وبالعيق التاريخي المسيطر عليها تشهد لإجبالنا المتعاقبة التي مرت عليها تاركة في كل ركن من أركانها أثراً خالداً وبصمة <u>حنونة</u> ولمسة حضارية ونبضة إنسانية. وليس غريباً أن تتعانق في سمائها <u>الرسالات السماوية</u> <u>الثلاث</u> وتتهادى في ركبها وآفاقها تنير للبشرية طريق جلجلتها...</p> <p>(Appendix B, B-1, p. XXXVI)</p>

### **Our translation:**

No need to mention Al Aqsa mosque and the stealing of the Holy Sepulchre's treasures and the disfiguration of its architecture and cultural style. The wonderful Jerusalem **with her fragrances of history reaching out from the past**, that still replenish around the place, witness of generations, leaving on every corner an eternal mark of yearning and civilizational touch with humane pulse. No wonder, the three religions embrace each other in its sky providing guidance and insight to enlighten mankind's path to glory ...

### **Analysis of the example:**

In this example attention will be drawn to the way cultural awareness of the translator would have determined the outcome of the translation. We strongly argue that the translator, Edward SAID, may have had recourse to cultural adaptation of the original statement so that mutual understanding is potentially attained.

In this translation, we can notice a big difference in style and phraseology; nonetheless the overall meaning of the statement is transferred into English without undergoing fundamental change. The first difference is the downright omission of the subject “كنيسة القيامة”, the Holy Sepulchre, and its replacement by “many of the monuments” with the ensuing rewriting of the predicate statement. This may be understood as the willingness of the translator to be more inclusive by not restricting the example to two major symbolic constructions for Muslims and Christians (Al Aqsa mosque and the Holy Sepulchre), though explicitly stated in the previous paragraph.

However, the sentence that follows is rewritten wholesale. In fact the whole sentence “فالقدس...إنسانية” has undergone a total refocus of the subject matter as well as a syntactic and lexical substitution. As we can see, the translator gave only five (05) lexical equivalents for a statement (the Arabic one) that has a total of more than twenty words (> 20 lexical units, connectors excepted). The single, long and complex sentence is transformed into two short

## A hermeneutic analysis of Y. ARAFAT's speech at the UN (1974)

sentences. So the translation does not correspond to the original neither in style nor in vocabulary.

The meaning of the statement, by the way, is not entirely kept intact; and this is what we are concerned about. In the English version the translator did proceed to an over simplification of the message conveyed in the Arabic text. The occurrence of the Arabic word “عَبِقَ”, from “عَبِقَ” meaning ‘to cling (ب to), linger (ب on, of a scent); be fragrant, exhale fragrance; to be filled, be redolent (ب with a scent, etc.)’<sup>148</sup>, in the expression “العَبِقُ التاريخي” may have constituted a semantic stumbling block for the translator. This term is used metaphorically to translate the nostalgic or melancholic feeling or aspiration of the author as highlighted in the feeling of holiness implicitly evoked by the fragrances of the scents ascending into heaven.

In fact, the use of this expression does reflect a certain cultural representation of space and time with the idea of sacredness and sacralisation of history as well as the unfolding present processes which manifests itself in the image of spiritual exhalation of sacred scents that are still reaching out from the past to bear witnesses to the future with eternal exaltation and veneration of human spiritual values.

This sacredness and religious as well as spiritual connotation of the expression is conspicuously translated into English by “**religious history and its spiritual values**”. Which is, by interpreting the linguistic signs into cultural reality, the gist of the subject and true meaning of the statement.

In this regard, there is likely a relation between the Arabic word and its English equivalents. In fact, it has a double reference to temporal and spiritual realities. On the one hand, one of the uses of the term “عَبِقَ” is meant to refer to space as in the following

---

<sup>148</sup> WEHR, *op. cit.*, p. 588

## A hermeneutic analysis of Y. ARAFAT's speech at the UN (1974)

example: “عَبَقَ بِالْمَكَانِ: أَقَامَ فِيهِ”<sup>149</sup>. In this sense it is close in meaning to “religion” which is from Latin *religāre* (s relig-), to bind again, hence, int, to bind strongly, is *religiō* (s relig-), a binding back, or very strongly, sc to one's faith or ethic, o/s *religiōn-*, as in the acc *religiōnem*, whence OF-F *religion*.<sup>150</sup> On the other hand, the term “عَبِق” can refer to spiritual values as well. In this sense the word acquires this meaning by considering the odours, the scent and fragrances by analogy with air they fill which humans breathe. For this is the meaning of the Latin word *spiritus*, or the Greek *anemos*, meaning breath, life, soul, etc.<sup>151</sup> It is important not to confuse religion with spiritual experience.

Translating “العَبَقُ التَّارِيخِي” by “**religious history and its spiritual values**” is perhaps due to the cultural background of the receiving parties of the message. For indeed the Arabic version is characterised by redundant circumlocution or long-winded wordiness. This technique, however, could be counterproductive in English because the message could suffer a loss because of indisposition or cultural unawareness of the English addressee.

In the English version the translator operated a change in perspective when he says that this “religious history...**bears witness to the future**” while the meaning in Arabic is rather clear, knowing that the word “عَقَبَ”, the **posterior** part of the feet, the heel, whence the idea of the hind and backwardness, as in the occurrence “لِإِجْبَالِنَا الْمَتَعَابَةَ”, almost always refers to the past and never to the future. The meaning of the statement in Arabic is a retrospective look back into history in order to advocate for cultural inclusiveness of the people of Palestine; in English the translator choose to focus the future to argue about possible coexistence, instead.

---

<sup>149</sup> عمر، أحمد مختار، مذكور أعلاه، ط. 1، م. 2، ص 1452

<sup>150</sup> PARTRIDGE, *op. cit.*, p. 1779

<sup>151</sup> *Idem*, p.3178-3180

## A hermeneutic analysis of Y. ARAFAT's speech at the UN (1974)

Once again the translator operated a paradigm shift in descriptive discourse. The other example that shows clearly how the translator's perspective differs from that of the source text is the translation of "الرسالات السماوية" by "**the three religions**" in reference to Judaism, Christianity and Islam. The linguistic as well as cultural equivalent for it is "revealed religions" which is more precise and concise.

A question needs an answer: why did the translator operate such a change in perspective? This may be due to his secular approach to cultural and literary critique analysis that tends to evacuate any biased declaration and liquefy it in order to be able to pass through the foreign cultural filter. We can remark that the whole paragraph is reduced to its essential elements. This may be explained by the pragmatic challenge to reach the other with minimum effort and prevent misunderstanding of ARAFAT's speech by explicit and straightforward cultural references.

### **Example 2:**

The English target text	The Arabic source text
Today I have come bearing an olive branch and a <b>freedom-fighter's gun</b> . Do not let the <b>olive branch</b> fall from my hand. (Appendix B, B-2, p. LXVIII)	لقد جننتكم يا سيادة الرئيس بغصن الزيتون مع بندقية ثائر... فلا تسقطوا الغصن الأخضر من يدي. (Appendix B, B-1, p. XLIII)

### **Our translation:**

I come to you, Mr President, bearing an olive branch and a **revolutionary's gun**...do not let **the green branch** fall from my hand.

### **Analysis of the example:**

In the first example of this chapter we have seen the orator using a dual reference to light and darkness; in this example another dual imagery is obviously used perhaps to convey a message of peace but also a menace to the recalcitrant; indeed Arafat, used the dual symbolic reference to violence/death and peace/life through the gun and the olive branch when he said:

“لقد جئتكم يا سيادة الرئيس بغصن الزيتون مع بندقية ثائر... فلا تسقطوا الغصن الأخضر من يدي.”

which saying the translator turned into English in these words: “Today I have come bearing an **olive branch** and a **freedom-fighter's gun**. Do not let the **olive branch** fall from my hand.”

There are in this translation at least two adaptations to the English language of the terms “بندقية ثائر” and “الغصن الأخضر”, literally meaning a “**revolutionary's gun**” and “**the green branch**”. What is more important in this example is the actual references of Arafat to the gun because ‘*on highlighting his revolutionary credentials and method of operation, Arafat wanted to deliver his November 13, 1974, speech carrying a gun and had to be talked into leaving it behind, though he did wear his empty holster.*’<sup>152</sup>

The gun is the symbol of power and violence and it is dangerous as it can take out life easily. The idea is: ARAFAT is making a proposal of a peace of the brave according to an old principle: *si vis pacem, para bellum*. The main message



*Non-Violence* by Carl Fredrik Reuterswärd , standing on the outdoor plaza, at the UN Visitors Entrance on the 46<sup>th</sup> street and 1<sup>st</sup> Avenue, New York

<sup>152</sup> RUBIN, RUBIN, *op. cit.* p.71

## A hermeneutic analysis of Y. ARAFAT's speech at the UN (1974)

is that Yasser ARAFAT is ready to make peace as long as his people's dignity and freedom are respected (self-determination). The reference to the gun is not fortuitous as the meaning of the symbol is very well known at the United Nations.

In fact, a massive bronze statue of a knotted gun donated by the State of Luxemburg in 1988 to the United Nations of which former Secretary General and Nobel prize laureate Kofi ANNAN said: '*the sculpture Non-Violence has not only endowed the United Nations with a cherished work of art; it has enriched the consciousness of humanity with a powerful symbol that incapsulates, in a few simple curves, **the greatest prayer of man; that which asks not for victory, but for peace*** [our highlight]<sup>153</sup> The main theme of this sculpture is a symbolic annulation of the function of the gun, which function is as we shall see is contrasted by the olive branch. The sculpture, as well as the quote, is posterior to the delivery of the speech but the theme is an old one.

However, this annulation is not heard of with that ear, at least for the revolutionary leader, because only life can give birth to peace; a divine peace that illuminates the whole world. In reality, the United Nations used the same symbol, two conventionalised branches of the olive tree, in its logo ever since the creation of the organisation in 1945.<sup>154</sup>



UN Photo/John Isaac: The flag of the United Nation with the olive branches enclosing the Earth floating at the UN

So the olive branch, as it reaches all the peoples of the world, is a universal symbol for peace indeed. Rather, what is problematic in this translation is the emphatic “الغصن الأخضر” which is translated as merely the “**olive branch**”. The reference is true but the hidden

<sup>153</sup> United Nations Visitor Centre, “Knotted Gun sculpture at UN – Did you know?”,

<http://visit.un.org/content/knotted-gun-sculpture-un-%E2%80%93-did-you-know> (visited on 10/04/2016)

<sup>154</sup> United Nations, “UN Logo and Flag”, <http://www.un.org/en/sections/about-un/un-logo-and-flag/index.html> (visited on 10/04/2017)

## A hermeneutic analysis of Y. ARAFAT's speech at the UN (1974)

meaning conveyed in the Arabic text is truncated; the English text lacks consistency as to the implications of the green colour.

The olive is, for the westerners, heirs of Hellenistic and Roman lore, a '*symbol of peace, sacred to ATHENA/MINERVA* [a possible relation to the statue of Liberty, bearer of light] *though, in her earliest, pre-Hellenic manifestations, she was a war-goddess.*'<sup>155</sup> It is worth noting that Athena '*became patron of Athens by winning a competition against Poseidon. Whereas he produced only salt water (or the horse), she invented the more useful olive tree* [our highlight].' Athena, symbolising wisdom and reason '*is depicted wearing a helmet and carrying a shield* [a defence against ignorance] *and spear* [representing a ray of light]. *Her birds were the cock* [first creature to see the light at dawn, after the darkness of the night] *and the owl (or crane)* [a creature endowed with capacity of sight in darkness], *her tree the olive and her animal the serpent* [symbol of wisdom].'<sup>156</sup>

All of Athena's attributes and symbolic references are also those of light. So the attribution of the olive tree to her can be interpreted as being itself a symbol of light. The olive tree with the oil that it gives symbolizes purity, protection, health and **light** (versus "**gloomy powers** of backwardness"). It is an archetypal representation of positive energy in nature. This is true for the ancients as well as for the Jews (they observe a festival of lights, *Chanukkah*, the central feature of the celebration is olive oil) and the Christians (Jesus himself being a Jew was, even if factually wrong, the Messiah, the anointed with this holy liquid). For Muslims this tree is taken at high esteem as it appears in the Quran, chapter 24, The Light, "النور", verse 35:

*"...The Parable of His Light is as if there were a Niche and within it a Lamp: the Lamp enclosed in Glass: the glass as it were a brilliant star: Lit from a blessed Tree, an*

---

<sup>155</sup> James, HALL, *Illustrated Dictionary of Symbols in Eastern And Western Art*, Westview press, 1996, p. 152

<sup>156</sup> J.C., COLEMAN, *The Dictionary of Mythology: An A-Z Of Themes, Legends And Heroes*, Arcturus, Singapore, 2007, p. 107

## A hermeneutic analysis of Y. ARAFAT's speech at the UN (1974)

*Olive, neither of the east nor of the west, whose oil is well-nigh luminous, though fire scarce touched it: **Light upon Light!**...*<sup>157</sup> [translated by Yusuf Ali with our highlights].

The use of the olive branch is meant to symbolise peace, a peace that is only possible when “**gloomy powers of backwardness and disastrous wrong**” are overcome by the holy **light** of “**truth**” and “**justice**”. Note that, reputed for its longevity (2000 years) and ... the olive tree is also a symbol of resistance. This said we come now to discuss the implication of the green colour in the original Arabic source text in the statement “الغصن الأخضر”.

The term green has an implicit meaning in Arabic as well as in English; life and renewal or rebirth. The Greek word for green, *chloros*, ‘had a broader range of meanings though it is cognate with English “yellow” and “gold,” the primary sense of Greek *chloros* may have been “sappy” or “having sap”, and hence “**vital**”[our highlight].’<sup>158</sup> The Latin word for “green” is *viridis* whence the English “**verdant**” which the translator used to translate “أرضاً خضراء معمورة”.

The colour green represents life as opposed to death. There is a legend of a Green Man, also known under many appellations such as "Green Jack, "Jack-in-the-Green" and "Green George", in many cultures as we shall see. In many western churches (France, England, Germany...) for example, there are sculptures and stained glass depictions of a face with *‘foliage emerging from the mouth’*<sup>159</sup> representing allegorically nature regenerating itself in spring which is the symbol of rebirth.



The "Green Man" of the Rosslyn Chapel is depicted with vines coming out of his mouth and surrounded by foliage. Credit: <http://www.ancient-origins.net/myths-legends/unraveling-nature-and-identity-green-man-002620>

<sup>157</sup> Quran Explorer, <http://www.quranexplorer.com/quran/> (visited on 10/04/2016)

<sup>158</sup> Michael, FERBER, *A Dictionary of Literary Symbols*, New York, Cambridge University Press, 1999, p. 88

<sup>159</sup> COLEMAN, *op. cit.*, p. 430

## A hermeneutic analysis of Y. ARAFAT's speech at the UN (1974)

The legend of Al Khidre (The Green One) common to Greeks and Persians is also very familiar to the Muslims. *'He appears unnamed in the Koran, and many of the tales attached to him are those told about Elijah and Rabbi Joshua ben Levi in Jewish tradition and St. George in Christian belief.'*<sup>160</sup> Al Khidre is believed to have drunk of the Fountain of Life, "عين الحياة",<sup>161</sup> or Immortality and youth. He is best reputed for his wealth of knowledge. According to the Muslim tradition, Moses goes to Al Khidre as a disciple. He accepted to take Moses on the condition that he must not question anything the master does, which conditions Moses did not fulfil, causing their separation. The lessons Moses learnt from The Green Man are sacrifice, patience and humility.

The implicit meaning of the statement "العصن الأخضر" is that the "green sappy live olive branch" can die in indifference if the United Nations stands still before the injustices and forfeitures committed by colonial brutal force in the Holy Land. This fatality makes things even holier for the speaker because if the branch falls this can mean not only death and martyrdom of resistance and peace, but in addition to this, the annihilation of life in the region if Zionism triumphs.

The final analysis of the example leads us to conclude that Yasser Arafat did use the word "الأخضر" advertently to contrast two concepts conveyed by their respective symbols; first, unjust death, wretched life and desolation caused by war, symbolised in the gun; second, peace and felicity in times of freedom symbolised in the olive branch. If the branch falls then this means that the man is dead. This, Arafat cannot allow to happen because he cannot bear to kneel down to oppression. This means also that he will fight to death or freedom as the olive branch stands also for resistance. Only when death takes him can the branch fall down. So the idea of sacrifice is present in the text along with that of resistance, yet implicit.

---

<sup>160</sup> Graham, SEAL, *Encyclopedia of Folk Heroes*, Santa Barbara, Calif., ABC-CLIO, 2001, p. 141

<sup>161</sup> الحافظ، ابن كثير، تفسير القرآن الكريم، دار طيبة، الرياض، ط. 2، 1999، ص. 174

## A hermeneutic analysis of Y. ARAFAT's speech at the UN (1974)

What can justify the omission of this cultural feature which is not culture specific to the Arabs, yet remains very dominant in it, is the fact that the translator seems be aware of the other connotations in English literature that do not come into good terms with the Arabic one which is still very religious. In fact, according to FERBER the '*meaning of "green" as "naive," "gullible," or "foolish,"*<sup>162</sup>' is prevalent in western literature, classic or modern.

The decision to translate "الغصن الأخضر" by "olive branch" is thus perhaps dictated by pragmatic reasons in order to reach the other side straightforward without leaving much room to excessive interpretations, knowing that the olive branch symbol, with its universal reach, already epitomises in itself all possible references to peace and its means (struggle). In addition to this, it suffices alone to allow reaching mutual understanding by combining ideological and power elements in one compact image which the context strengthens to explicitly oppose violence and peace. The main difference: Edward Said's omission seems to have been deliberate because of his literary and critical background as well as his intellectual positioning as a secular literary and cultural critique.

In this chapter we have seen how diplomatic translation is very difficult to realise because there is no clear cut separation between the different types of understanding. However, the translator succeeded to manage his way through the sea of tumultuous and tremendous potential of possible interpretations by translating only the concrete symbol. This allows fluent reading and mutual understanding to happen by limiting the range of speculation about any other meanings than peace as radically opposed to violence, either verbal or else.

---

<sup>162</sup> FERBER, *op. cit.*, p. 88

# **Conclusion**

## Conclusion

After close analysis of our subject and verification, through case study examples taken from the corpus, Yasser ARAFAT's speech delivered at the United Nation on November 13<sup>th</sup> 1974, presented in chapter three, in light of the hermeneutic approach, we can draw conclusions about the application of GADAMER's hermeneutic understanding typology (self-understanding, reflective understanding and mutual understanding), as well as its respective ideological, power and cultural correlations in addition to STEINER's hermeneutic motion, in multilateral diplomacy translations.

First of all, to answer our problematic questions we can say that the translator succeeded in conciliating two opposite stances in the translation by highlighting his secular ideological beliefs rather than those of the author, and emphatically stressing the point in an attempt to strengthen and empower at least discursively in TT, the author's position, which conciliation is possible only through cultural common ground that transcends ideology and politics (power). This is a confirmation of our hypotheses set up in the theoretical part.

Secondly, as a logical deduction from the latter conclusion, we can confidently say that the instrument that allowed the restitution of meaning, without jeopardising the author's objectives set up in his political agenda (manifestation of power in discourse), is the questioning back and forth process, from ST to TT and vice versa, in order to be able to grasp the meaning and transfer it by compensating the additions and the losses with a final fusion of horizons.

Thirdly, the final result of the analysis confirms the consistency of the hermeneutic approach to diplomatic translation analysis. In fact, it helped us understand, in a relative way, the reasons underlying the translation choices that may determine the final result of the translation.

In addition to this, it is of paramount importance to notice that diplomatic translation is concerned more about the meaning than the linguistic form. This is because what is at stake in this kind of translation is more the perlocutory purposes which can be hindered by factors that

## Conclusion

the translator should overcome in order to transfer meaning without endangering the diplomatic process. These factors range from the translator's subjective vision of the world to the balance of power between SL and TT language communities. In addition to this, there is the moral obligation of the translator to meaning restitution without manipulating the text.

These results led us to draw some recommendations which may enable translators to overcome the difficulties pertaining to translation diplomatic texts. These difficulties transcend the linguistic code to become a tool in making peace or waging war. Being so, diplomatic translation should be approached in a multidisciplinary perspective. Since war is the continuation of politics by other means, it is then highly recommended that diplomatic translators, whose main concern is to reach mutual understanding, be aware of, in addition to linguistic competences, the ideological and power implications of discourse. So, linguistic meanings are less important when compared to the pragmatic problem solving between the two parties of the dialogic diplomatic communication.

Before ending our conclusion, we would like to talk about our perspective which we set throughout our research and which attracts most our attention. We think that it would not be a vain effort to try to explore the hermeneutic field in order to find a comprehensive theory of interpretation namely in figuring out how to translate alterity from and into foreign cultures.

# **Bibliography**

## Bibliography

### The corpus:

خطاب ياسر عرفات امام الجمعية العامة للأمم المتحدة في 13/11/1974، فتح نيوز، مكتب الاعلام و العلاقات الخارجية مصر، <http://www.fateheg.org/خطاب-ياسر-عرفات-امام-الجمعية-العامة-لل-الخطاب.aspx>

(2016/08/26)

Yasser Arafat Speech at the united Nations on 13/11/1974, A/PV.2282 and Corr.1 of 13 November 1974, *United Nations* General Assembly *Twenty-Ninth Session Official Records* <https://unispal.un.org/DPA/DPR/unispal.nsf/0/A238EC7A3E13EED18>, (visited on 05/04/2016)

### Dictionaries and encyclopaedias

COLEMAN, J.C., *The Dictionary of Mythology: An A-Z Of Themes, Legends And Heroes*, Arcturus, Singapore, 2007, p. 107

FERBER, Michael, *A Dictionary of Literary Symbols*, Cambridge University Press, New York, 1999

*Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics*, Elsevier Science, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition, 2005

GERRIDGE, G.R., JAMES, Alan, *A Dictionary of Diplomacy*, New York, Palgrave, 2001

HALL, James, *Illustrated Dictionary of Symbols in Eastern and Western Art*, Westview press, 1996, p. 152

HERBST, Philip, *Talking Terrorism: A Dictionary of the Loaded Language of Political Violence*, Greenwood Press, 2003

PARTRIDGE, Eric, *Origins: A Short Etymological Dictionary of Modern English*, London and New York, Routledge, 1958

SMITH, William, *A New Classical Dictionary of Greek and Roman Biography, Mythology and Geography*, New York, Harper & Brothers, 1884

WEHR, Hans, *A Dictionary of Modern Written Arabic*, New York, Spoken Languages Services Inc., 3<sup>rd</sup> Ed., 1976

**English references:**

ABU JABER, Kamel, S., “Language and diplomacy”, *Language and diplomacy*, Malta, Mediterranean Academy of Diplomatic Studies, 2001

ADEMOLLO, Francesco, *The Cratylus of Plato: A Commentary*, New York, Cambridge University Press, 2011

AMOS, John, The PLO: Millennium and Organization, in: *Ideology And Power In The Middle East: Studies in Honor of George Lenczowski*, CHELKOWSKI, Peter J., PRANGER, Robert J., Durham and London: Duke University Press, 1988, pp. 365-378

APTER, Emily, S., *The Translation Zone: a New Comparative Literature*, Princeton, Princeton University Press, 2006

BEHLER, Ernst, “Theory of language, hermeneutics, and encyclopaedistics”, *German Romantic Literary Theory*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1993

BILLINGTON, James H., *Fire In The Minds Of Men; Origins Of The Revolutionary Faith*, New York, Basic Books, 1980

BLACK, Jeremy, *A history of diplomacy*, London, Reaktion Books, 2010

## Bibliography

BUSSMANN, Hadumod, *Routledge dictionary of language and linguistics*, London, Routledge, 1996

CATFORD, J., C., *A linguistic Theory of Translation: an Essay in Applied Linguistics*, London, Oxford University Press, 1965

EBELING, Florian, *The Secret History of Hermes Trismegistus: Hermeticism from Ancient to Modern Times*, Ithaca and London, Cornell University Press, 2007

*Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics*, Elsevier Science, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition, 2005

FAIRCLOUGH, Norman, *Discourse and power*, New York: Longman Inc., 1989

FAWCETT, P., *Translation and Language: Linguistic Theories Explained*, Manchester, St. Jerome. 1997

GADAMER, Hans-George, *Truth and Method*, London, New York, Continuum, 2<sup>nd</sup> revised edition, 2004

HECKETHORN, Charles William, *Secret Societies of all Ages and Countries*, Richard Bentley and Son, London, 1875

HEIDEGGER, Martin, *On the Way to Language*, Harper & Row publishers, 1982

JÖNSON, Christer, HALL, Martin, *Essence of Diplomacy*, New York, Palgrave Macmillan, 2005

KEARNEY, Richard, *Paul Ricoeur and the Hermeneutics of Translation*, Research in Phenomenology, Brill, N° 37, 2007

LACHMAN, Gary, *The quest for Hermes Trismegistus: from Ancient Egypt to the Modern World*, Edinburgh, Floris Books, 2011

LEFEVERE, André, *Translation, History, Culture: a Sourcebook*, London and New York, Routledge, 1992

## Bibliography

- MORRIS, Ruth, “The Moral Dilemmas of Court Interpreting”, *The Translator*, Manchester, St. Jerome Publishing, Vol.1, N° 1, 1995
- O’CONNOR, Catherine, MICHAELS, Sarah, “When is dialogue ‘dialogic?’”, *Human development*, 2007, N° 50, pp. 275–285
- OSTROWER, A. *Language, Law, and Diplomacy*, Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press, 1965
- PERETZ, Daniel, “The Roman Interpreter and His Diplomatic and Military Roles”, *Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte*, Vol. 55, N° 4, 2006, pp. 451-470
- RUBIN, Barry, RUBIN, Judith Colp, *Yasir Arafat: a Political Biography*, New York, Oxford University, Press, 2003
- SCLEIERMACHER, Friedrich, “*On the Different Methods of Translating*”, in Lawrence, VENUTI, *The Translation Studies Reader*, London, Routledge, 2012
- SEAL, Graham, *Encyclopedia of Folk Heroes*, Santa Barbara, Calif., ABC-CLIO, 2001
- STEINER, George, *After Babel: Aspects of Language and Translation*, London, Oxford University Press, 1975
- TZU, Sun, *The Art of War*, Boston, London, Shambhala, 1991
- United Nations, *Treaty Series; treaties and international agreements registered or filed and recorded with the Secretariat of the United Nations*, New York, vol. 500, 1965
- Van BLADEL, Kevin, *The Arabic Hermes: from a Pagan Sage to a Prophet of Science*, New York, Oxford University Press, 2009
- Van DIJK, Teun, *Macrostructures: An Interdisciplinary Study of Global Structures in Discourse, Interaction, and Cognition*, New Jersey, New Jersey, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1980

VERSCHUEREN, J., *Language and Ideology: Selected Papers from the 6th International Pragmatics Conference*, Antwerp: International Pragmatics Association (IprA), Vol 1, 1999.

ZHANG, Wei, *Heidegger, Rorty, and the Eastern Thinkers: A Hermeneutics of Cross-Cultural Understanding*, State University of New York Press, 2006

**Arabic references:**

أحمد مختار، عمر، معجم اللّغة العربية المعاصرة، عالم الكتب، القاهرة، ط.1، م. 1، 2008

أحمد مختار، عمر، معجم اللّغة العربية المعاصرة، عالم الكتب، القاهرة، ط.1، م. 2، 2008

جرّار، بسّام نهاد، زوال إسرائيل 2022 م نبوءة أم صُدف رقميّة، دار الشهاب، 1992

ابن كيثير، الحافظ، تفسير القرآن الكريم، دار طيبة، الرياض، ط. 2، م. 5، 1999

البلعبيكي، روجي، المورد: قاموس عربي-إنجليزي، دار العلم للملايين، بيروت، ط.7، 1995

**Online references**

ABU JABER, Kamel, S., "Language and diplomacy", *Language and diplomacy*, Malta, Mediterranean Academy of Diplomatic Studies, 2001

<https://www.diplomacy.edu/resources/general/language-and-diplomacy> (visited 26/06/2016)

AFKIR, Aziza, "Translation in Multilateral Diplomacy: Cultural and Political Hurdles," *Translation Journal*, <http://translationjournal.net/Featured-Article/translation-in-multilateral-diplomacy-cultural-and-political-hurdles.html> (visited on 31/08/2016)

BARANYAI, Tamas, "The role of translation and interpretation in the diplomatic communication," *Skase Journal of Translation and Interpretation*, Vol. 5, N° 2, 2011  
[http://www.skase.sk/Volumes/JTI06/pdf\\_doc/01.pdf](http://www.skase.sk/Volumes/JTI06/pdf_doc/01.pdf) (visited on 23/03/2016)

BERRIDGE, G.R., *Diplomacy: Theory and Practice*, Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2002 "cited in" *The Language of Diplomacy: A Linguistic Analysis of Jerzy Buzek's Address on "Eu-China: Strategic Partnership in Light of the Challenges for Global Governance"*, Held at the

## Bibliography

University of Nanjing, 28 May 2010”, *mediAzioni* 12, <http://mediazioni.sitlec.unibo.it>, (visited on 30/06/2016)

GROSS, Alexander, “Hermes—God of Translators and Interpreter the Antiquity of Interpreting Distinguishing Fact from Speculation”, *Published Papers, Articles, & Translations by Alexander Gross* <http://language2.home.sprynet.com/f/hermes2.htm#top> (visited on 20/02/2015)

HERDER, Peter, Diplomats, *Britannica Online Encyclopedia* <http://www.britannica.com/print/article/164633> (visited on 26/06/2016)

HERNANDO, James D., *Dictionary of hermeneutics: a concise guide to terms, names, methods and expressions*, Missouri, Gospel Publishing House, 2012 revised edition, sample at <https://www.overdrive.com/media/1204530/dictionary-of-hermeneutics> (visited on 08/06/2016)

[http://www.diplomacy.edu/sites/default/files/Language\\_Diplomacy\\_Chapter2.PDF](http://www.diplomacy.edu/sites/default/files/Language_Diplomacy_Chapter2.PDF) (visited on 15/06/2016)

KAPPELER, Dietrich, “Texts in diplomacy”, *Language and diplomacy*, Malta, Mediterranean Academy of Diplomatic Studies, 2001 <http://www.diplomacy.edu/resources/general/texts-diplomacy> (visited on 26/06/2016)

LUQUE, Adrián Fuentes, “An Approach to Diplomatic Translation”, *Translation Journal*, Volume 3, N° 4 October 1999, <http://translationjournal.net/journal/10dipl.htm> (visited on 07/07/2016)

NICK, Stanko, “Use of Language in Diplomacy”, *Language and diplomacy*, Malta, Mediterranean Academy of Diplomatic Studies, 2001 [http://www.diplomacy.edu/sites/default/files/Language\\_Diplomacy\\_Chapter2.PDF](http://www.diplomacy.edu/sites/default/files/Language_Diplomacy_Chapter2.PDF) (visited on 15/06/2016)

Quran Explorer, <http://www.quranexplorer.com/quran/> (visited on 10/04/2016)

## Bibliography

SAID, Edward, Representations of the Intellectual, in: GRAVES, Benjamin, “Edward W. Said's "Politics of Secular Interpretation””, <http://www.postcolonialweb.org/poldiscourse/said/said1.html> (visited on 15/03/2017)

The Great Seal, “Benjamin Franklin's Great Seal Design” <http://greatseal.com/committees/firstcomm/reverse.html> (visited on 24/06/2016)

United Nations Visitor Centre, “Knotted Gun sculpture at UN – Did you know?” <http://visit.un.org/content/knotted-gun-sculpture-un-%E2%80%93-did-you-know> (visited on 10/04/2016)

UNITED NATIONS (The), “UN Logo and Flag”, <http://www.un.org/en/sections/about-un/un-logo-and-flag/index.html> (visited on 10/04/2016)

Van DIJK, Teun, *Discourse and Knowledge*, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=sxfg-WJRKEM> (visited on 24/06/2016)

<http://www.aljazeera.net/programs/centurywitness/2005/1/10/8-حركة-حماس-كما-يراهها-الشيخ-أحمد-ياسين-ح>  
قناة الجزيرة، حصة شاهد على العصر، حركة حماس كما يراها الشيخ أحمد ياسين، ياسين-ح  
(visited on 10/06/2016)

## Appendix A

### Glossary A : English-Arabic

A	
Aggression	عدوان
Agreement	اتفاقية
Allegory	رمز ، قصة رمزية
Ambassador	سفير
Ambiguity	غموض
Ambivalence	تناقض وجداني
Analysis	تحليل
Antiquity	عصور قديمة
Approach	مقاربة
Aramaic	آرامي
Argument	حجة
Assyrian	آشوري (نسبة لمدينة آشور القديمة)
Authority	سلطة، حجة، سلطان، مرجع ثقة
Autonomous	مستقل
B	
Babylon	بابل
Balance of power	توازن القوى
Body (international)	هيئة دولية

Appendix A, Glossary A : English-Arabic

C	
Capacity	قدرة
Characteristic	مزية، خاصة
Christianity	مسيحية
Chronology	توقيت
Circumspection	حرص، حذر، احتراز
Coexistence	تعایش
Coherence	ترابط
Cohesion	تماسك
Communication	تواصل، اتصال
Community (International)	المجتمع الدولي
Complaint	شكوى
Complexity	تعقد
Conflict	صراع
Consistency	انسجام
Conspiracy مؤامرة	مؤامرة
Consulate	قنصلية
Context	سياق
Convention	اتفاقية
Conventional	اصطلاحي
Conversation	محادثة

Appendix A, Glossary A : English-Arabic

Copy	نسخة
Costly	مكلف
Culture-bound	مرتبط بالثقافة
Cunning	مكر، خبث،
D	
Deceiver	مخادع
Decision	قرار
Dexterity	حذق، خفة
Dialogue	حوار
Diplomacy	دبلوماسية
Diplomat	دبلوماسي
Diplomatic note	مذكرة دبلوماسية
Discourse	خطاب
Doctrine	مذهب
Document	وثيقة
Domination	سيطرة، غلبة
Draft	مسودة
E	
Economic	اقتصادي
Embassy	سفارة
Emissary	مبعوث

Appendix A, Glossary A : English-Arabic

Enlightenment (the)	عصور التنوير
Enoch	أخنوخ، إدريس
Equivalence	تكافؤ
Equivoque	لبس
Esoteric	سرّي، غامض
Etymology	علم أصل الكلمات
Etymon	أصل الكلمة
Euphrates	نهر الفرات
Evidence	دليل
Exchange	تبادل
Exegesis	تفسير (لكتاب مقدّس)
Exoteric	علني
Explanation	شرح
F	
Foreign	أجنبي
Formalism	صورية، شكلية
Formulation	صياغة
Framework	إطار
Fraud	تزوير، غش
G	
Genre	نوع، جنس

Appendix A, Glossary A : English-Arabic

Geography	جغرافية
H	
Herald	مناد، رسول، بشير، نذير
Hermeneutics	علم التأويل
Hermes	هرميس
Hermeticism	استغلاق
Heteronymous	تابع
Hieratic	هيروغليفي
Historicity	تأريخية، كتابة التاريخ
Holistic	شمولي
I	
Ideal	مثالي، مبتغى
Idealist	مثالي
Ideology	أيديولوجية
Immunity	حصانة
Inclination	ميل
Information gathering	جمع المعلومات
Interest	مصلحة
Interlocutor	متحدث
International relations	دولية علاقات
Interpretation	تأويل

Appendix A, Glossary A : English-Arabic

Interpreter	مفسر، متأول، ترجمان
Investigation	بحث، تحري، تحقيق
Involvement	تضمنين، إشراك
J	
Jargon	رطانة، لغة اصطلاحية
K	
Kingdom	مملكة
Knowledge	معرفة
L	
Legend	أسطورة
Liberation	تحرير
Linguistic	لساني، لغوي
Literature	أدب
M	
Manipulation	تلاعب
Meaning	معنى
Mechanism	ألية
Mediation	وساطة
Medium, Mediator	وسيط
Message	رسالة
Messenger	رسول

Appendix A, Glossary A : English-Arabic

Method	منهج
Methodology	منهجية
Middle-East	شرق أوسط
Mission (diplomatic)	بعثة (دبلوماسية)
Misunderstanding	سؤ الفهم
Model	نموذج
Monologic	منولوجي
Movement	حركة
Multi-disciplinary	متعدد التخصصات
Multi-modal	متعدد النمط
N	
Negotiation	مفاوضة، تفاوض
Neutrality	حياد
O	
Official	رسمي
Ontology	علم الوجود
Oppression	اضطهاد
Oracle	مهبط الوحي، وحي، شخص حكيم، مبلغ
Order (hermetic)	منظمة سرية
P	
Paradigm	صيغة، نموذج

Appendix A, Glossary A : English-Arabic

Patron	راع، داعم
Patronage	رعاية، دعم
Pattern	نموذج، نمط
Performative	إنجازي، مؤدي
Perjury	حنث اليمين
Phenomenon	ظاهرة
Philosophy	فلسفة
Plato	أفلاطون
Pleading	مرافعة
PLO (Palestine Liberation Organisation)	منظمة تحرير فلسطين
Political	سياسي
Power	قوة، سلطة
Practice	ممارسة
Precondition	شروط أولي
Principle	مبدأ
Process	سيرورة، مسار
Promote	رقي
Protection	حماية
Protocol	تشريفات
Prudence	حذر
Pythagoras	فيثاغورث

Appendix A, Glossary A : English-Arabic

Q	
Question	قضية، سؤال
R	
Rational	عقلاني
Receiving state	دولة مستقبلة
Receptivity	استقبالية
Redundancy	حشو، إطناب، إسهاب
Reflexion	فكر، تفكير، عكس (الضوء)
Register	أسلوب كلامي
Relation	علاقة
Relationship	علاقة
Representation	تمثيل
Representative	ممثّل
Resistance	مقاومة
Revolution	ثورة
Romantic	رومانسي
S	
Scholar	عالم
Self-understanding	فهم ذاتي، فهم الذات
Semiotic	سيمائي
Sending state	دولة موفدة

Appendix A, Glossary A : English-Arabic

Sequence	سلسلة
Seth	شيث
Settlement	حل، مستوطنة
Shape	شكل
Signalling	تأشير، إشارة
Sovereignty	سيادة
Speech	خطبة، كلام
Spontaneity	عفوية، تلقائية
Stage	مرحلة
State	دولة
Statement	تصريح
Strategic	استراتيجي
Struggle	نضال، كفاح
Subjectivity	عاطفية
Symbol	رمز
T	
Teaching	تعليمية
Technique	تقنية
Teleology	غائية ( أو علم ال )
Text	نص
Thought	فكر

Appendix A, Glossary A : English-Arabic

Tigris	نهر الدجلة
Tradition	تقليد
Translation	ترجمة
Translator	مترجم
Transmittal	توصيل
Treaty	معاهدة
Truth	حقيقة
U	
Understanding	تفاهم
Understatement	تحفظ في التصريح
Universal	عالمي، كوني
Utterance	تلفظ
Z	
Zionism	صهيونية

## Glossary B : Arabic-English

أ	
Agreement , Convention	إتفاقية
Social	إجتماعي
Foreign	أجنبي
Literature	أدب
Aramaic	آرامي
Antiquity	الأزمنة القديمة
Strategic	إستراتيجي
Hermeticism	إستغلاق
Receptivity	إستقبالية
Legend	أسطورة
Register	أسلوب كلامي
Assyrian	آشوري (نسبة لمدينة آشور القديمة)
Conventional	إصطلاحي
Etymon	أصل الكلمة
Oppression	إضطهاد
Framework	إطار
Plato	أفلاطون
Economic	إقتصادي
Mechanism	آلية

Appendix A, Glossary B : Arabic-English

Performative	إنجازي، (مؤدي)
Consistency	إنسجام
Enoch	أنوش (إدريس)
Ideology	أيديولوجية
ب	
Babylon	بابل
Mission (diplomatic)	بعثة (دبلوماسية)
Heteronymous	تابع
ت	
Historicity	تأريخية (كتابة التاريخ)
Signalling	تأشير
Exchange	تبادل
Liberation	تحرير
Liberation	تحرير
Understatement	تحفظ في التصريح
Analysis	تحليل
Coherence	ترابط
Translation	ترجمة
Protocol	تشریفات
Statement	تصريح
Coexistence	تعایش

Appendix A, Glossary B : Arabic-English

Complexity	تعقّد
Teaching	تعلّيمية
Understanding	تفاهم
Interpretation	تفسير
Exegesis	تفسير (لكتاب مقدّس)
Tradition	تقليد
Technique	تقنية
Equivalence	تكافؤ
Manipulation	تلاعب
Utterance	تلفظ
Cohesion	تماسك
Representation	تمثيل
Ambivalence	تناقض وجداني
Balance of power	توازن القوى
Communication	اتصال
Transmittal	توصيل
Chronology	توقيت
Revolution	ثورة
ج	
Geography	جغرافية
Information gathering	جمع المعلومات

Appendix A, Glossary B : Arabic-English

ح	
Argument	حجة
Prudence	حذر
Dexterity	حذق، خفة
Circumspection	حرص (حذر، احتراز)
Movement	حركة
Redundancy	حشو (إطناب، إسهاب)
Immunity	حصانة
Truth	حقيقة
Settlement	حل
Protection	حماية
Perjury	حنث اليمين
Dialogue	حوار
Neutrality	حياد
خ	
Discourse	خطاب
Speech	خطبة (او كلام)
د	
Diplomat	دبلوماسي
Diplomacy	دبلوماسية
Study	دراسة

Appendix A, Glossary B : Arabic-English

Evidence	دليل
State	دولة
State	دولة
Sending (state)	دولة موفدة
International relations	دولية علاقات
ر	
Patron	راع
Message	رسالة
Official	رسمي
Messenger	رسول
Jargon	رطانة (لغة اصطلاحية)
Patronage	رعاية
Promote	رقي
Symbol	رمز
Allegory	رمز (قصة رمزية)
Romantic	رومانسي
س	
Esoteric	سري (غامض)
Embassy	سفارة
Ambassador	سفير
Sequence	سلسلة

Appendix A, Glossary B : Arabic-English

Authority	سلطة
Misunderstanding	سؤ الفهم
Political	سياسي
Context	سياق
Process	سيرورة
Domination	سيطرة
Semiotic	سيمائي
ش	
Explanation	شرح
Precondition	شرط أولي
Middle-East	شرق الأوسط (الـ)
Shape	شكل
Complaint	شكوى
Holistic	شمولي
Seth	شيث
ص	
Conflict	صراع
Zionism	صهيونية
Formalism	صورية
Formulation	صياغة
Paradigm	نموذج

Appendix A, Glossary B : Arabic-English

ظ	
Phenomenon	ظاهرة
ع	
Subjectivity	عاطفية
Scholar	عالم
Aggression	عدوان
Enlightenment (the)	عصور التنوير
Spontaneity	عفوية (تلقائية)
Rational	عقلاني
Relation	علاقة
Relationship	علاقة
Etymology	علم أصل الكلمات
Hermeneutics	علم التفسير
Ontology	علم الوجود
Exoteric	علني
غ	
Teleology	غائية (علم ال)
Fraud	غش
Ambiguity	غموض
ف	
Thought	فكر

Appendix A, Glossary B : Arabic-English

Reflexion	فكر (تفكير)
Philosophy	فلسفة
Self-understanding	فهم ذاتي فهم الذات
Pythagoras	فيثاغورث
ق	
Capacity	قدرة
Decision	قرار
Question	قضية
Consulate	قنصلية
Power	سلطة
ك	
Universal	كوني(عالمي)
ل	
Equivoque	لبس
Linguistic	لساني
م	
Principle	مبدأ
Emissary	مبعوث
Interlocutor	متحدث
Translator	مترجم
Multi-disciplinary	متعدد التخصصات

Appendix A, Glossary B : Arabic-English

Multi-modal	متعدد النمط
Idealist	مثالي
Ideal	مثالي
Community (International)	مجتمع الدولي (ال)
Conversation	محادثة
Deceiver	مخادع
Diplomatic note	مذكرة دبلوماسية
Doctrine	مذهب
Pleading	مرافعة
Culture-bound	مرتبط بالثقافة
Stage	مرحلة
Characteristic	مزية
Autonomous	مستقل
Draft	مسودة
Christianity	مسيحية
Egypt	مصر
Interest	مصلحة
Treaty	معاهدة
Knowledge	معرفة
Meaning	معنى
Negotiation	مفاوضة (تفاوض)

Appendix A, Glossary B : Arabic-English

Interpreter	مفسر (او ترجمان)
Approach	مقاربة
Cunning	مكر
Costly	مكلف
Practice	ممارسة
Representative	ممثّل
Kingdom	مملكة
Herald	مناد (رسول، بشير، نذير)
PLO (Palestine Liberation Organisation)	منظمة تحرير فلسطين
Order (hermetic)	منظمة سرية
Method	منهج
Methodology	منهجية
Monologic	منولوجي
Skill	مهارة
Oracle	وحي (او مهبط الوحي، ، شخص حكيم، مبلغ)
Conspiracy	مؤامرة
Inclination	ميل
ن	
Copy	نسخة
Text	نص
Struggle	نضال

Appendix A, Glossary B : Arabic-English

Model	نموذج
Tigris	نهر الدجلة
Euphrates	نهر الفرات
Genre	جنس
هـ	
Hermes	هرميس
Hieratic	هيروغليفي
Body (international)	هيئة دولية
و	
Document	وثيقة
Mediation	وساطة
Medium	وسيط

## Appendix B

### The corpus

#### B-1: The Arabic Source text

خطاب ياسر عرفات في الأمم المتحدة في 1974

سيدي الرئيس ،،

أشكر لكم دعوتكم منظمة التحرير الفلسطينية لتشارك في هذه الدورة من دورات الجمعية العامة لهيئة الأمم المتحدة. وأشكر كل الأعضاء المحترمين في هيئة الأمم المتحدة الذين أسهموا في تقرير إدراج قضية فلسطين على جدول أعمال هذه الجمعية وفي إصدار قرار بدعوتنا لعرض قضية فلسطين.

إنها لمناسبة هامة أن يعود بحث قضية فلسطين إلى هيئة الأمم المتحدة. وأنا نعتبر هذه الخطوة انتصار للمنظمة الدولية كما هو انتصار لقضية شعبنا. وإن ذلك يشكل مؤشراً جديداً على أن هيئة الأمم اليوم ليست هيئة الأمم أمس، ذلك لأن عالم اليوم ليس هو عالم الأمس.

فقد أصبحت هيئة الأمم اليوم تمثل 138 دولة وأصبحت تعكس بصورة نسبية أوضاع إرادة المجموعة الدولية، ومن ثم فقد أصبحت أكثر قدرة على تطبيق ميثاقها ومبادئ الإعلان العالمي لحقوق الإنسان، وأكثر قدرة على نصره قضايا العدل والسلام.

وهذا ما بدأ يلمسه شعبنا وتلمسه شعوب آسيا وإفريقيا وأمريكا اللاتينية، الأمر الذي أخذ يعطي مكانة هذه المنظمة الدولية في عيون شعبنا وعيون بقية الشعوب، ويزيد من الآمال التي تعلقها شعوب العالم على مساهمة هيئة الأمم المتحدة في نصره قضايا السلم والعدل والحرية والاستقلال، وتشديد عالم خالٍ من الاستعمار والإمبريالية والاستعمار الجديد والعنصرية بكافة أشكالها بما فيها الصهيونية .

سيدي الرئيس ،،

إننا نعيش في عالم يطمح للسلام والعدل والمساواة والحرية، يطمح إلى أن يرى الأمم المظلومة الراضحة تحت الاستعمار والاضطهاد العنصري وهي تمارس حريتها وحققها في تقرير المصير، يطمح إلى أن يرى العلاقات الدولية بين الدول كافة تقوم على أساس المساواة والتعايش السلمي وعدم التدخل في الشؤون الداخلية، وتأمين السيادة الوطنية.

وما زالت دول آسيا وإفريقيا وأمريكا اللاتينية تواجه اعتداءات ضارية على نضالها من أجل تغيير النظام الاقتصادي العالمي الحالي بنظام اقتصادي عالمي جديد أكثر معقولة ومنطقية، وقد عبرت هذه البلدان عن ذلك في مؤتمر (( المواد الأولية والتنمية )) حيث لابد أن يوضع حد لعمليات النهب والاستغلال وامتصاص ثروات الشعوب الفقيرة وعرقلة جهودها من أجل التنمية والسيطرة على ثرواتها ورفع الحيف عن أسعار موادها الأولية .

وكذلك فإن هذه الدول ما زالت تواجه عراقيل أمام مطالبها العادلة المعبر عنها في مؤتمر البحار في كرا كاس، ومؤتمر السكان، ومؤتمر التغذية، ولابد للهيئة الدولية من أن تقف بحزم إلى جانب النضال من أجل إحداث تغييرات جذرية في النظام الاقتصادي العالمي لأن ذلك وحده يتيح للشعوب المختلفة إمكانية التقدم بسرعة. ولابد لهذه الهيئة من أن تقف بحزم ضد القوى التي تحاول تحميل مسؤولية التضخم المالي على كاهل البلدان النامية، خاصة البلدان المنتجة للبتترول، وأن تشجب التهديدات التي تتعرض لها هذه البلدان بسبب مطالبها العادلة

سيدي الرئيس ،،

ما زال السباق على التسلح على أشده في العالم، الأمر الذي يهدد العالم بضياع ثروته وتبديد جهوده على هذا السباق، فضلاً عن إبقائه في خيار انفجارات مسلحة خطيرة. إن الحد من السباق على التسلح، وصولاً

## Appendix B, The corpus, The Arabic Source text

إلى تدمير الأسلحة النووية وتخصيص ما يصرف من مبالغ طائلة على مجالات التقنيات العسكرية في ميدان تقدم العلوم وزيادة الإنتاج وتحقيق الرفاه للعالم. هذا ما تتوقع الشعوب إن تعمل هيئة الأمم المتحدة باتجاهه. وما زال الاضطراب على أشده في منطقتنا. فالكيان الصهيوني مثبت بالأراضي العربية التي احتلها ويتابع عدوانه علينا بجانب استعداداته العسكرية المحمومة بشن حرب عدوانية جديدة ستكون الخامسة كم سلسلة حروبه العدوانية ولنا أن نتحسب مع ما يصدر من إشارات عنه من أن تكون حرباً نووية تحمل الفناء والدمار.

سيدي الرئيس ،،،

إن العالم بحاجة إلى أقصى الجهود من أجل تحقيق مطامحه في السلم والحرية والعدل والمساواة والتنمية وفي مكافحة الاستعمار والامبريالية والاستعمار الجديد والعنصرية بكافة أشكالها بما فيها الصهيونية لأن هو الطريق الوحيد لتحقيق آمال الشعوب كافة بما في ذلك شعوب الدول التي تعارض هذا الطريق. أنه طريق لتكريس مبادئ ميثاق هيئة الأمم المتحدة والإعلان العالمي لحقوق الإنسان. إما بقاء الوضع الحالي فلن يفعل أكثر من أن يبقى العالم معرضاً لأخطر الصراعات المسلحة، للكوارث الاقتصادية والإنسانية والطبيعية .

سيدي الرئيس ،،،

رغم هذا الوضع المتأزم الذي يسود العالم برغم ما في عالمنا من قوى ظلام وتأخر فإن عالمنا اليوم يعيش أياماً مجيدة. أنه يشهد انهيار العالم القديم عالم الاستعمار والامبريالية والاستعمار الجديد والعنصرية بكافة أشكالها وأبرزها الصهيونية ويشهد الاتجاه التاريخي العظيم لشعوب العالم نحو انبثاق عالم جديد تنتصر فيه القضايا العادلة، وأنا واثقون من انتصار هذه القضايا.

سيدي الرئيس ،،،

## Appendix B, The corpus, The Arabic Source text

إن قضية فلسطين تدخل كجزء هام بين القضايا العادلة التي تناضل في سبيلها الشعوب التي تعاني الاستعمار الاضطهاد، وإذا كانت الفرصة قد أتحت لي أن أعرضها أمامكم فإنني لن أنسى أن مثل هذه الفرصة يجب أن تتاح لكل حركات التحرر المناضلة ضد العنصرية والاستعمار. في تقرير مصيرها، أدعوكم أن تعيروا قضاياهم، كما قضيتنا، من همومكم واهتمامكم الأولوية ذاتها مما يشكل مرتكزاً أساسياً لحماية السلم في العالم وتكريس عالم جديد تعيش الشعوب في ظلاله بعيداً عن الاضطهاد والظلم والخوف والاستغلال، ولهذا فإنني سأعرض قضيتنا ضمن هذا الإطار وفي سبيل هذا الهدف .

وإننا حين نتكلم من على هذا المنبر الدولي فإن ذلك تعبير في حد ذاته عن إيماننا بالنضال السياسي والدبلوماسي مكملاً معززاً لنضالنا المسلح وتعبير عن تقديرنا للدور الذي يمكن للأمم المتحدة أن تقوم به في حل المشكلات العالمية، بعد أن تغيرت بنيتها في صالح أمانى الشعوب وفي حل مشكلتنا التي تتحمل فيها المؤسسة الدولية مسئولية خاصة .

إن شعبنا يتكلم وهو يتطلع إلى المستقبل أكثر مما هو مقيد بمآسي الماضي وأغلال الحاضر. وإذا كنا، ونحن نتحدث عن الحاضر نعود إلى الماضي فلأننا نريد أن نوضح بداية الطريق الذي نشقه إلى المستقبل المشرق مع كل شعوب العالم عامة، وحركات التحرير خاصة. وإذا كنا نعود إلى جذور قضيتنا فإنه ما زال بين الحاضرين هنا من يحتل بيوتنا ويرتع في حقولنا ويقطف ثمار أشجارنا ويدعي أننا أشباح لا وجود لها ولا تراث ولا مستقبل. وأن هناك من كان يتصور، وإلى وقت قريب، وربما حتى الآن، أن مشكلتنا هي مشكلة لاجئين، أو أن مشكلة الشرق الأوسط هي مشكلة خلاف على حدود بين الدول العربية وبين الكيان الصهيوني أو يتصور أن شعبنا يدعي حقوقاً ليست له ويقا تل دونما سبب معقول ومشروع إلا الرغبة في تعكير السلم وإرهاب الآخرين . ولأن هناك بينكم وأعني الولايات المتحدة الأمريكية وغيرها من يمون عدونا بطائراته وقنابله وكل أدوات الفتك والتدمير ويقف منا موقف العداء ويعمد إلى تشويه حقيقة

المشكلة، كل ذلك على حساب الشعب الأمريكي وعلى حساب رفايته وعلى حساب الصداقة التي نتطلع إليها مع هذا الشعب العظيم الذي نكن له ولتجاربه في النضال من أجل حريته ووحدة أرضه كل تقدير.

وأنتي لانتهز هذه المناسبة لا توجه إلى الشعب الأمريكي وأخاطبه من مكاني هنا أن يقف مع شعبنا الشجاع المناضل. أن يقف مع الحق والعدالة. أن يتذكر بطله جورج واشنطن الذي ناضل لاستقلال أمريكا وحريتها. ويتذكر أبراهام لنكولن الذي وقف مع المحرومين والمعذبين ويتذكر وصايا ويلسون الأربع عشرة والتي يتبناها شعبنا إيماناً بهذه المبادئ الإنسانية العظيمة.

وأتوجه إلى الشعب الأمريكي وأتساءل هل هذه التظاهرات المعادية التي تنطلق في الخارج هي وجهه الحقيقي. وما هي الجريمة التي ارتكبتها شعبنا ضد الشعب الأمريكي. . .

لماذا هذا الوجه المعادي. هل هو لصالح أمريكا. هل هو لصالح الجماهير الأمريكية. حتماً لا. وأرجو أن يتذكر الشعب الأمريكي أن صداقته مع أمتنا العربية هي أهم وهي أبقى وهي أنفع.

سيدي الرئيس ،،،

إن شرحنا لجذور قضيتنا نابع من إيماننا بأن العودة إلى أصول القضايا التي تشغل العالم أمر ضروري عند تلمس الحلول لها. وهذا منهج نطرحه على السياسة الدولية لتأخذ به بعد أن عانت الكثير وعانت الشعوب معها من المحاولات تجاهل الأصول والقفز عليها أو إنكارها رضوخاً واستسلاماً للأمر الواقع.

ترجع جذور المشكلة الفلسطينية إلى أواخر القرن التاسع عشر أو بكلمات أخرى إلى ذلك العهد الذي كان يسمى عصر الاستعمار والاستيطان وبداية انتقال إلى عصر الإمبريالية حيث بدأ التخطيط الصهيوني الاستعماري لغزوأرض فلسطين بمهاجرين من يهود أوروبا كما كان الحال بالنسبة للغزو الاستيطاني لإفريقيا. في تلك الحقبة التي توطدت فيها سطوة عتاة الاستعمار القادمين من الغرب إلى أفريقيا وآسيا

## Appendix B, The corpus, The Arabic Source text

وأمرىكا اللاتينية للاستيطان وإقامة المستعمرات وممارسة أشد أشكال الاستغلال والاضطهاد والنهب لشعوب القارات الثلاث. إنها الحقبة التي ما زلنا نشهد آثارها العنصرية البشعة في الجنوب الإفريقي وكذلك في فلسطين.

وكما استخدم الاستعمار والمستوطنون أفكار ((التمدن والتحضّر)) لتبرير الغزو والنهب والعدوان في إفريقيا وغيرها. كذلك استخدمت هذه الذرائع لغزو فلسطين بموجات المهاجرين الصهاينة. وكما استخدم الاستعمار والمستوطنون الدين واللون والعرق والغة لتبرير عملية استغلال الشعوب وإخضاعها بالتمييز والتفرقة والإرهاب في إفريقيا، كذلك استخدمت هذه الأساليب لاغتصاب الوطن الفلسطيني واضطهاد شعبه ومن ثم تشريده.

وكما استخدم الاستعمار، وقتئذ، المحرومين والفقراء والمستغلين كوقود لنار عدوانه، ومرتكزات الاستيطان، كذلك استخدم الاستعمار العالمي والقادة الصهاينة اليهود المحرومين والمضطهدين في أوروبا كوقود للعدوان ومرتكزات للاستيطان والتمييز العنصري.

إن الإيديولوجية الصهيونية التي استخدمت ضد شعبنا لاستيطان فلسطين بالغزاة الوافدين من الغرب استخدمت في الوقت ذاته لاقتلاع اليهود من جورهم في أوطانهم المختلفة ولتغريبهم عن الأمم.

إنها أيديولوجيا استعمارية استيطانية عنصرية تمييزية رجعية تلتقي مع اللاسامية في منطلقاتها، بل هي الوجه الآخر للعملة نفسها. فعندما نقول أن تابعي دين معين هو اليهود، أيًا كان وطنهم، لا ينتسبون إلى ذلك الوطن ولا يمكن أن يعيشوا كمواطنين متساوين مع بقية المواطنين من الطوائف الأخرى، فإن تلك اللقاء مباشر مع دعاة اللاسامية، وعندما يقولون أن الحل الوحيد لمشكلتهم هو أن ينفصلوا عن الأمم والمجتمعات التي هم جزء منها عبر تاريخ طويل، ثم يهاجرون ليستوطنوا أرض شعب آخر ويحلوا محله بالقوة والإرهاب يأخذون من غيرهم الموقف نفسه الذي أخذه دعاة اللاسامية منهم.

## Appendix B, The corpus, The Arabic Source text

ومن هنا نلاحظ مثلاً العلاقة الوثقى بين ردوس وهو يبسط استعماره الاستيطاني في جنوب شرقي القارة الإفريقية وبين هرتزل الذي راح يخطط ويصمم لاستعماره الاستيطاني على أرض فلسطين.

وعندما حصل هرتزل على شهادة حسن سلوك استعماري استيطاني من رودس قدمها للحكومة البريطانية ليستصدر منها قرار التأييد والدعم مقابل أن يبني على أرض فلسطين قاعدة للاستعمار تؤمن مصالحه في أهم النقاط الاستراتيجية في الشرق الأوسط.

وهكذا باشرت الحركة الصهيونية متحالفة مع الاستعمار العالمي غزوتها لبلادنا. واسمحوا لي أن أوجز بعض الحقائق التالية حولها:

كان عدد سكان فلسطين عند بداية الغزوة عام 1881 وقبل قدوم أول موجة استيطان حوالي نصف مليون نسمة كلهم من العرب، مسلمين ومسيحيين ومنهم حوالي عشرون ألفاً من يهود فلسطين يعيشون جميعاً في كنف التسامح الديني الذي اشتهرت به حضارتنا.

وكانت فلسطين أرضاً خضراء معمورة بشعبها العربي الذي يبني الحياة في وطنه ويغني ثقافته.

وعمدت الحركة الصهيونية إلى تهجير حوالي خمسين ألف يهودي أوروبي بين عامي 1882 و 1917 لاجئة إلى شتى أساليب الاحتيايل لتغرسهم في أرضنا. ونجحت في الحصول على تصريح بلفور من بريطانيا، فجسد التصريح حقيقة التحالف الصهيوني الاستعماري، وعبر هذا التصريح عن مدى ظلم الاستعمار للشعوب حيث أعطت بريطانيا وهي لا تملك وعداً للحركة الصهيونية وهي لا تستحق. وخذلت عصبه الأمم بتركيبها القديم شعبنا العربي وتبخرت وعود ومبادئ ويلسون في الهواء وفرضت علينا قسراً الاستعمار البريطاني بصورة الانتداب، وتعهد صك الانتداب الذي أصدرته عصبة الأمم المتحدة صراحة بالتمكين للغزوة الصهيونية من أرضنا.

## Appendix B, The corpus, The Arabic Source text

وعلى مدى ثلاثين عاماً بعد صدور تصريح بلفور نجحت الحركة الصهيونية مع حليفها الاستعماري في تهجير مزيد من يهود أوروبا واغتصاب أراضي عربي فلسطين. وهكذا أصبح عدد اليهود في فلسطين عام 1947 حوالي ستمائة ألف يملكون أقل من 6 % من أراضي فلسطين الخصبة. بينما كان تعداد عرب فلسطين حوالي مليون وربع المليون نسمة.

وبفعل تواطؤ الدولة المنتدبة مع الحركة الصهيونية ودعم الولايات المتحدة لهما صدر عن هذه الجمعية وهي ف يبداءة عهدا التوصية بتقسيم وطننا فلسطين في 29 نوفمبر 1947 وسط تحركات مريبة وضغوط شديدة، فقسمت ما لا يجوز لها أن تقسم: أرض الوطن الواحد، وحين رفضنا ذلك القرار فلأننا مثل أم الطفل الحقيقية التي رفضت أن يقسم سليمان طفلها حين نازعتها عليه امرأة أخرى. ومع ذلك فقد منح قرار التقسيم المستوطنين الاستعماريين 54 % من أرض فلسطين. وكأن ذلك لم يكن كافياً بالنسبة إليهم، فشنوا حرباً إرهابية ضدا لسكان المدنيين العرب واحتلوا 81 % من مجموع مساحة فلسطين وشردوا مليون عربي.

مغتصبين بذلك 524 قرية ومدينة عربية. ودمروا منها 385 مدينة وقرية تدميراً كاملاً محاها من الوجود. وحيث فعلوا ذلك أقاموا مستوطناتهم ومستعمراتهم فوق الأنقاض وبين بساتيننا وحقولنا.

ومن هنا يبدأ جذر المشكلة الفلسطينية، أن هذا يعني أن أساس المشكلة ليس خلافاً دينياً أو قومياً بين دينين أو قوميتين وليس نزاعاً على حدود بين دول متجاورة، انه قضية شعب اغتصب وطنه وشرد من أرضه لتعيش أغلبيته في المنافي والخيام.

وقد استطاع هذا الكيان الصهيوني وبدعم من دول الاستعمار والامبريالية وعلى رأسها الولايات المتحدة الأمريكية أن يتحايل على هيئة الأمم لقبوله في عضويتها ومن ثم على شطب قضية فلسطين من دول

## Appendix B, The corpus, The Arabic Source text

أعمالها، وتضليل الرأي العام العالمي بتصوير المشكلة كمشكلة لاجئين بحاجة إلى عطف المحسنين أو إعادة توطينهم في بلاد الآخرين.

على أن هذه الدولة العنصرية التي قامت على أساس الاستعمار الاستيطاني لم تكتف بكل ذلك حيث جعلت من نفسها قاعدة للإمبريالية وراحت تتحول إلى ترسانة من الأسلحة لإكمال مهمتها في إخضاع الشعوب العربية والعدوان عليها طمعاً في المزيد من التوسع على الأرض الفلسطينية والأراضي العربية. فإلى جانب عشرات الاعتداءات التي شنتها هذه الدولة ضد البلاد العربية قامت بحربين توسعيتين كبيرتين عام 1956 وعام 1967 عرضت خلالهما السلم العالمي لخطر حقيقي.

فقد كان من نتائج العدوان الصهيوني في حزيران 1967 أن احتل العدو سيناء المصرية حتى مشارف السويس، واحتل الجولان السورية فضلاً عن احتلاله للأرض الفلسطينية حتى نهر الأردن، الأمر الذي شكل وضعاً جديداً في منطقتنا وخلق ما يسمى بمشكلة الشرط الأوسط. ومما جعل الوضع يتفاقم أكثر إصرار العدو على استمرار الاحتلال وتكريسه، مشكلاً رأس حربة للاستعمار العالمي ضد أمتنا العربية، وقد ضرب عرض الحائط بكل قرارات مجلس الأمن ونداءات الرأي العام العالمي للانسحاب من الأراضي التي احتلها بعد حزيران ولم تجد كل المساعي السلمية والدبلوماسية لردعه عن هذه السياسة التوسعية، فما كان أمام أمتنا العربية وفي مقدمتها دولتا مصر وسوريا إلا أن تبذل الجهود المضنية في الاستعداد العسكري من أجل الصمود في وجه هذه الغزوة الهمجية المسلحة بالقوة، وثانياً من أجل تحرير تلك الأراضي واستعادة حقوق الشعب الفلسطيني بعد استنفاد كل الوسائل السلمية، وضمن هذا الإطار اندلعت الحرب الرابعة، حرب تشرين لتؤكد للعدو الصهيوني عقم سياسته الاحتلالية التوسعية واعتماده على شريعة القوة العسكرية، ولكن رغم ذلك فإن قادة الكيان الصهيوني مازالوا بعيدين عن الاتعاض بهذه الدروس، فهم يعدون العدة للحرب الخامسة، ليعودوا من جديد إلى سياسية مخاطبة العرب بلغة التفوق العسكري سياسة العدوان والإرهاب والإخضاع للحرب.

سيدي الرئيس،،،

لشد ما يتألم شعبنا حين يسمع تلك الدعايات التي نقول أن أراضيها كانت صحراء فعمرها المستوطنون الأجانب، وأن وطنه كان خالياً من السكان، وأنه لم يتضرر أحد من بني البشر نتيجة قيام هذا الكيان الاستيطاني، لا.. يا سيدي الرئيس، يجب أن تدحض هذه الأكاذيب من على هذا المنبر العالمي، ويجب أن يعرف الجميع أن فلسطين كانت مهدياً لأقدم الحضارات والثقافات استثمر شعبها العربي ينشر الحضرة والبناء والحضارة والثقافة في بروعها طوال آلاف السنين ويرفع لواء التسامح الديني ضارباً المثل على حرية العقيدة وحارساً أميناً على مقدسات جميع الأديان في ظنه.

وأني كأحد أبناء بيت المقدس احتفظ لنفسي ولشعبي بذكريات جميلة وصور رائعة عن مظاهر التأخي الديني التي كانت تتألف في مدينتنا المقدسة قبل حلول النكبة بها، ولم ينقطع شعبنا عن ذلك إلا بعد تمكن الغزوة الصهيونية الهمجية من إقامة دولة إسرائيل وتشريده.

ولكنه مازال مصمماً على الاستمرار ف أداء دوره الحضاري والإنساني على أرض فلسطين، ولا يسمح بأن تتحول هذه الأراضي إلى بؤر للعدوان على الشعوب، وإلى معسكر عنصري ضد الحضارة والثقافة والتقدم والسلام. ولهذا فإن شعبنا لا يستطيع إلا أن يواصل تراث أجداده في الكفاح ضد الغزاة وأن يحمل شرف المسؤولية في الدفاع عن وطنه وعن أمانته العربية وعن الثقافة والحضارة ومهد الديانات السماوية، وتكفينا نظرة سريعة لمواقف إسرائيل العنصرية عندما دعمت منظمة الجيش السرية في الجزائر، وفي دعمها للمستعمرين في أفريقيا سواء في الكونغو وانغولا وموزمبيق وزمبابوي وفي وقوفها إل جانب حكومة فيتنام ضد الثورة الفيتنامية، فضلاً عن مواقفها المتتابعة في هذا السياق إلى جانب الاستعماريين والعنصرين في كل مكان وعرققتها لعمل لجنة تصفية الاستعمار ورفضها التصويت لمصلحة استقلال بلدان أفريقيا ووقوفها ضد مطالب بلدان آسيا وإفريقيا وأمريكا اللاتينية وبلدان عديدة أخرى في مؤتمرات "المواد الأولية

## Appendix B, The corpus, The Arabic Source text

والتنمية" و"قانون البحار" و "السكان" و "التغذية". كل ذلك يعطي دليلاً إضافياً على صورة العدو الذي اغتصب بلادنا، ويكشف عن شرف النضال الذي نخوضه ضده. اننا ندافع عن حلم المستقبل، وهو يدافع عن أساطير الماضي.

سيدي الرئيس،،،

إن لهذا العدو الذي نواجهه سجلاً حافلاً ضد اليهود أنفسهم فهناك في داخل الكيان الصهيوني تمييز عنصري بشع ضد اليهود الشرقيين. وإذا كنا ندين بكل ما أوتينا من قوة مذابح اليهود تحت الحكم النازي، فإن القادة الصهاينة كما يبدو أن همهم الأكبر حينذاك هو استغلالها لتحقيق الهجرة إلى فلسطين.

سيدي الرئيس،،،

لو كان تهجيرهم إلى فلسطين بهدف العيش كمواطنين متساوين معنا بالحقوق والواجبات لكنا أفسحنا المجال لهم ضمن إمكانات وطننا، كما حدث مع عشرات الآلاف من الأرمن الشركس الذين ما زالوا بيننا أخوة مواطنين مثلنا تماماً، أما أن يكون هدف ذلك اغتصاب أراضينا وتشريدنا وتحويلنا إلى مواطنين من الدرجة الثانية وإنزال المعاملة نفسها بنا فهذا ما لا يمكن أن ينصحنا أحد القبول به أو الإذعان له. ولهذا فإن ثورتنا منذ البداية لا تقوم على أسس عرقية أو دينية عنصرية، وليست موجهة للإنسان اليهودي من حيث كونه إنساناً وإنما هي موجهة ضد العنصرية الصهيونية وضد العدوان. وبهذا المعنى فإن ثورتنا هي أيضاً من أجل الإنسان اليهودي. إننا نناضل من أجل أن يعيش اليهود والمسيحيون والمسلمون بمساواة في الحقوق والواجبات وبلا تمييز عنصر أو ديني.

أ. إننا إذن يا سيادة الرئيس نفرق بين اليهودية وبين الصهيونية. وفي الوقت الذي نعادي الحركة الصهيونية الاستعمارية، فإننا نحترم الدين اليهودي وإننا نحذر اليوم، وبعد قرابة قرن من بروز هذه الحركة العنصرية، من أن خطرها يتزايد ضد اليهود في العالم، وضد شعبنا العربي وضد أمن العالم وسلامته،

## Appendix B, The corpus, The Arabic Source text

فالصهيونية لا تزال متمسكة بتهجير اليهود من أوطانهم واصطناع قومية لهم يستبدلون بها قومياتهم الأصلية. إن الصهيونية تتابع نشاطها التخريبي هذا على الرغم من ظهور فشل الحل الذي قدمته، وأن ظاهرة النزوح من التجمع الإسرائيلي المستمرة منذ قيامه والتي ستقوى مع سقوط قلاع الاستعمار الاستيطاني العنصري في العالم، لدليل على هذا الفشل.

ب. إننا ندعو جميع الشعوب والحكومات لمجابهة مخططات الصهيونية الرامية إلى تهجير مزيد من يهود العالم من أوطانهم ليغتصبوا وطننا. وندعوهم في الوقت نفسه للوقوف في وجه أي اضطهاد للإنسان بسبب دينه أو جنسه أو لونه.

ت. وإنني أتساءل يا سيادة الرئيس، لماذا يتحمل شعبنا ووطننا مسؤولية مشكلة الهجرة اليهودية إذا كانت لا زالت مثل هذه المشكلة في مخيلة البعض؟ وأتساءل لماذا لا يتحمل المتحمسون لهذه المشكلة إن وجدت، المسؤولية فيفتحوا بلادهم الكبيرة الرقعة والقادرة لاستيعاب هؤلاء المهاجرين ومساعدتهم؟

سيدي الرئيس ،،،

إن الذين ينعنون ثورتنا بالإرهاب، إنما يفعلون ذلك لكي يضلوا الرأي العام العالمي عن رؤية الحقائق، من روية وجهنا الذي يمثل جانب العدل والدفاع عن النفس ووجههم الذي يمثل جانب الظلم والإرهاب.

إن الجانب الذي يقف فيه حامل السلاح هو الذي يميز بين الثائر والإرهابي، فمن يقف في جانب قضية عادل ومن يقاتل من أجل حرية وطنه واستقلاله ضد الغزو والاحتلال والاستعمار لا يمكن أن تنطبق عليه بأي شكل من الأشكال صفة إرهابي وإلا اعتبر الشعب الأمريكي حين حمل السلاح ضد الاستعمار البريطاني إرهابياً واعتبرت المقاومة الأوروبية ضد النازية إرهاباً، واعتبر نضال شعوب آسيا وإفريقيا وأمريكا اللاتينية إرهاباً. لا يا سيدي الرئيس إن هذا هو الكفاح العادل والمشروع والذي يكرسه ميثاق هيئة الأمم والإعلان العالمي لحقوق الإنسان. أما الذي يحمل السلاح ضد القضايا العادل... الذي يشن الحرب

## Appendix B, The corpus, The Arabic Source text

لاحتلال أوطان الآخرين ونهبم واستغلالها واستعمارهم فذلك هو الإرهابي وأعماله هي التي يجب أن تدان وينسحب عليه لقب مجرم حرب ذلك أن عدالة القضية هي التي تقرر عدالة السلاح

سيدي الرئيس،،،

إن الإرهاب الصهيوني الذي ارتكب بحق الشعب الفلسطيني لإجلائه عن وطنه واقتلعه من أرضه مدون لديكم في وثائق رسمية وزعت في الأمم المتحدة، لقد ذبح الآلاف من أبناء شعبنا في قراهم ومدنهم وأجبر عشرات الألوف تحت نار البندقية وقصف المدافع والطائرات أن يتركوا بيوتهم وما زرعوا في أرض أجدادهم. وكم من مرة أجبر فيها أبناء من شعبنا نساء وأطفال وشيوخ على الخروج من دون زاد أو ماء وأرغموا على تسلق الجبال والتهيه في الصحراء.

إن الكوارث التي حلت عام 1948 بأهالي المئات من القرى والمدن في السهل والجبل، في القدس ويافا واللد والرملة والجليل، لم ولن ينساها من عانى أهوال لحظة لحظة رغماً عن التعقيم الإعلامي العالمي الذي نجح في إخفاء هذه الأهوال كما أخفى أثر 385 قرية ومدينة فلسطينية دمرت في حينه وأزيلت من الوجود، إن نصف 19 ألف منزل على مدى السنوات السبع الأخيرة أي ما يساوي تدمير مائتي قرية فلسطينية أخرى تدميراً كاملاً والأعداد الضخمة من مشوهي الإرهاب والتعذيب ومن في السجون لا يمكن أن يطمسه التعقيم الإعلامي . لقد وصل إرهابهم إلى الحد حتى على شجرة الزيتون في بلادي التي اعتبروها علماً شامخاً يذكرهم بسكان البلاد الأصليين، يصرخ أن الأرض فلسطينية، فراحوا يعملون على اقتلاعها أو قتلها بالإهمال والتحطيم، ماذا يمكن أن يسمى تصريح غولدا مائير عندما عبرت عن قلقها من الأطفال الفلسطينيين الذين يولدون كل صباح". إنهم يرون في الطفل الفلسطيني والشجرة الفلسطينية عدواً يجب التخلص منه، يا سيادة الرئيس، طيلة عشرات السنين وهم يتعقبون قيادات شعبنا الثقافية والسياسية والاجتماعية والفنية بالإرهاب والتقتيل والاعتقال أو التشريد. لقد سرقوا تراثنا الحضاري،

## Appendix B, The corpus, The Arabic Source text

وفولكلورنا الشعبي وادعوه لهم ومدوا إرهابهم إلى مقدساتنا في مدينة السلام القدس الحبيبة وعمدوا إلى إفقادها طابعها العربي المسيحي الإسلامي من خلال تهجير سكانها وضمها لدولتهم، ولا حاجة لأن نسترسل في ذكر المسجد الأقصى وسرقة ثروات كنيسة القيامة والتشويه الذي لحق بعمرانها وطابعها الحضاري.. فالقدس بروعتها وبالعبق التاريخي المسيطر عليها تشهد لأجيالنا المتعاقبة التي مرت عليها تاركة في كل ركن من أركانها أثراً خالداً وبصمة حنونة ولمسة حضارية ونبضة إنسانية.

وليس غريباً أن تتعاقب في سمائها الرسائل السماوية الثلاث وتتهادى في ركبها وآفاقها تنير للبشرية طريق جلجلتها وهي تحمل أشواكها وآلامها لترسم مستقبلها بكل ما فيه من آمال وأمان ومعطيات .

سيدي الرئيس،،،

إننا العدد القليل من العرب الفلسطينيين الذين لم يستطع العدو تهجيرهم من أرضهم عام 1948 هم الآن لاجئون على أرضهم وقد عوملوا في القانون الإسرائيلي كمواطنين من الدرجة الثانية، بل والثالثة باعتبار أن اليهود الشرقيين هم مواطنوا الدرجة الثانية ومورست ضدهم كل أشكال التمييز العنصري والإرهاب وصودرت أراضيهم وممتلكاتهم، وتعرضوا لمذابح دامية كما حدث في قرية كفر قاسم، وهجروا من قراهم وحرموا من العودة لها كما حدث لأهالي قريتي كفربرعم وأقرت، كما أهلنا عاشوا هناك ثمانية عشر عاماً تحت الحكم العرفي لا يحق لهم الانتقال من مكان إلى مكان مجاور دون إذن مسبق من الحاكم العسكري. تصور، يا سيادة الرئيس، في الوقت الذي يسن فيه المشرع الإسرائيلي قانوناً حقاً تلقائياً بالمواطنة لأي يهودي يهاجر إلى أرضنا فور أن يطأها، يسن قانوناً آخر يعتبر الفلسطينيين الذين بقوا في فلسطين ولم يكونوا في قراهم أو مدنهم ساعة احتلالها محرومين من المواطنة.

سيدي الرئيس،،،

## Appendix B, The corpus, The Arabic Source text

إن سجل حكام إسرائيل الحافل بجرائم الإرهاب يمتد ليشمل عدداً من أبناء أمتنا العربية الذين بقوا تحت الاحتلال في سيناء أو الجولان كما أن ذكرى جريمة قصف مدرسة بحر البقر ومصنع أبو زعبل في مصر العربي ما زالت ماثلة للأذهان، وأما تدمير مدينة القنيطرة السورية مازال شاهداً لكل من يريد أن يرى ما يفعله الإرهاب، وإذا فتح سجل الإرهاب الصهيوني على جنوبي لبنان وهو الإرهاب الذي ما زال ميمراً، فسوف تقشع الأبدان من هول ما يرتكب من أعمال القرصنة والقصف والعدوان، بما في ذلك تهجير المدنيين وتدمير بيوتهم وخطفهم وحرق مزارعهم إلى جانب الاعتداءات المستمرة على سيادة الدولة اللبنانية، والإعداد لسرقة مياه نهر الليطاني، ولنذكر في هذا المجال بالمقررات العديدة التي صدرت عن هذه المنظمة، والتي تدين إسرائيل بارتكاب الاعتداءات ضد الدولة العربية وبالاعتداء على حقوق الإنسان، وفيما يتعلق بضم القدس وتغيير وضعها السابق للاحتلال وإدانتها لمخالفات متعددة لبنود اتفاقيات جنيف في حالة الحرب.

سيدي الرئيس،،،

إن التأمل بكل هذه الأعمال لا يمكن أن يطلق عليه من وصف غير وصف الإرهاب الهمجي، ومع ذلك يتجرأ أولئك الإرهابيون الغزاة العنصرين على تسمية نضالات شعبنا العادلة بالأعمال الإرهابية.

هل يوجد ثمة تجرؤ على الباطل والتزيف أشد من هذا . وإنما نقول أن على أولئك الذين اغتصبوا أرضنا وارتكبوا من جرائم الإرهاب والتمييز العنصري أكثر مما فعل ويفعل العنصريون في جنوبي إفريقيا، أن يتذكروا قرار الجمعية العامة لهيئة الأمم المتحدة الذي أعلن طرد جنوبي إفريقيا من عضويتها، لأن ذلك هو المصير المحتوم لكل الدول العنصرية التي تطبق شريعة الغاب وتغتصب وطن الآخرين وتضطهدهم.

سيدي الرئيس،،،

## Appendix B, The corpus, The Arabic Source text

لقد قاوم شعبنا الفلسطيني خلال ثلاثين عاماً تحت الاحتلال البريطاني والغزو الصهيوني كل محاولات انتزاع أرضه، وناضل في ثورات ست، ومئة خلال عشرات الانتفاضات الشعبية ومن أجل إحباط المؤامرة ليبقى على أرضه وفوق تراب وطنه، قدم في سبيل ذلك ولغاية 1948 ثلاثين ألف شهيد (أي ما يوازي 6 ملايين أمريكي بالنسبة لعدد سكان اليوم).

وعندما اقتلعت غالبية من الأرض الفلسطينية التي احتلت عام 1948 ظل يقوم في ظروف صعبة محاولات إنفائه. وحاول شعبنا بكل الطرق استمرار نضاله السياسي من أجل حقوقه، دون جدوى.

وناضل للحفاظ على وجوده فتعلم أبناؤه في النزوح والشتات وكدحوا تحت أصعب الظروف ليستطيعوا الاستمرار، وأصبح لدى الشعب الفلسطيني آلاف الأطباء والمهندسين والأساتذة والعلماء توجهوا بعملهم وإمكانياتهم للأقطار العربية المحيطة بوطنهم المغتصب، فساهموا في البناء والتعمير والتطوير وحصلوا على دخل استخدموه لمساعدة أقربائهم الصغار والعجائز الذين استحال عليهم مغادرة مخيمات النزوح، علم الأخ أخاه أخته وحافظ على والديه وربى أولاده ولكنه ظل يحلم في قلب ذاته بالعودة إلى فلسطين.. ظل فلسطينياً متمسكاً بوطنه لا يهتز ولاؤه لها ولا تهن عزيمته ولا يفتر حماسه، لم يغيره شيء للتخلي عن فلسطينيته ووطنه فلسطين.

لا ولم ينسه الزمن إياها كما توقع المتوقعون.

وعندما خابت آمال شعبنا بالأسرة الدولية التي نسيتها وتغافلت عن حقوقه وثبت لشعبنا عجز النضال السياسي وحده عن استعادة شبر أرض من وطنه لجأ شعبنا إلى الثورة الفلسطينية وأعطاه كل إمكانياته المادية والبشرية وخيرة شبابه.. وواجه شعبنا ببسالة إرهاباً إسرائيلياً لا يتخيله بشر ليشيه عن طريق النضال.

## Appendix B, The corpus, The Arabic Source text

لقد قدم شعبنا في السنوات العشر الأخيرة من نضاله آلاف الشهداء وأضعافهم من الجرحى والمشوهين والأسرى والمعتقلين من أجل أ يفتنى أو يذوب ومن أجل انتزاع حقه في تقرير مصيره على وطنه وفي عودته إلى ترابه.

وتعيش جماهير شعبنا الآن تحت الاحتلال الصهيوني تقاوم بكل الكبرياء المتأصلة فيها، بكل الشموخ الثوري الملازم لها سواء من زج منها في السجون والمعتقلات أو من يعيش داخل السجن الكبير في قفص الاحتلال، يقاومون من أجل البقاء والوجود و يناضلون من أجل أن تبقى الأرض عربية ويكافحون الطغيان والظلم والإرهاب بشتى صوره المأساوية الخطيرة.

ومن خلال ثورة شعبنا المسلحة تبلورت قيادته السياسية وترسخت مؤسساته الوطنية وبنيت حركة التحرير الوطنية التي تضم كل فصائله وتنظيماته وقدراته والتي جسدها منظمة التحرير الفلسطينية.

ومن خلال حركة التحرر الوطنية الفلسطينية نضج نضال شعبنا وتعددت أساليبه فشمّل النضال السياسي والاجتماعي بالإضافة للنضال المسلح، واندفعت منظماتنا تساهم في بناء الإنسان الفلسطيني المؤهل لبناء المستقبل الفلسطيني وليس لتعبئته لمواجهة تحديات الحاضر.

وتعتز منظمة التحرير الفلسطينية بإنها وهي تخوض المعارك المسلحة وتواجه قساوة الإرهاب الصهيوني، قامت بمآثر عديدة حضارية وثقافية فشكّلت مؤسسات البحث العلمي، والتطوير الزراعي والرعاية الصحية وإحياء التراث الحضاري لشعبنا، وتطوير الفولكلور الشعبي وخرجت من بين صفوفها عدداً من الشعراء والفنانين والكتاب الذين يسهمون في تطوير الثقافة العربية، وربما امتد ذلك إلى الثقافة العالمية، وكان المحتوى لكل ذلك يحمل طابعاً إنسانياً عميقاً آثار إعجاب كل الأصدقاء الذين أطلعوا عليه وكنا بذلك النقيض لعدونا الذي قام على هدم الحضارة والثقافة بترويج الأفكار العنصرية والاستعمارية وكل ما هو معاد للشعوب والتقدم والعدل والديمقراطية والسلام.

## Appendix B, The corpus, The Arabic Source text

سيدي الرئيس،،،

لقد اكتسبت منظمة التحرير الفلسطينية شرعيتها من طليعتها في التضحية ومن قيادتها للنضال بكافة أشكاله، واكتسبتها من الجماهير الفلسطينية التي أولتها قيادة العمل واستجابت لتوجيهها... واكتسبها من تمثيل كل فصيل ونقابة وتجمع وكفاءة فلسطينية في مجلسها الوطني ومؤسساتها الجماهيرية، وقد تدعمت هذه الشرعية بمؤازرة الأمة العربية كلها لها. وكما تكرر هذا الدعم في مؤتمر القمة العربي الأخير بتأكيد حق منظمة التحرير الفلسطينية في إقامة السلطة الوطنية المستقلة على كل الأراضي الفلسطينية التي يتم تحريرها بصفتها الممثلة الشرعية الوحيدة للشعب الفلسطيني.

كما أن شرعيتها تعمقت من خلال دعم الأخوة في حركات التحرر ودول العالم الصديقة المناصرة التي وقفت إلى جانب المنظمة تدعمها وتشد أزرها في نضالها من أجل حقوق الشعب الفلسطيني.

وهنا لا بد أن أعلن بكل اعتزاز شكر ثوارنا وشعبنا للمواقف المشرفة التي وقفتها مع نضال شعبنا دول عدم الانحياز والدول الاشتراكية والدول الإسلامية الإفريقية والدول الصديقة في أوروبا وكذلك الأصدقاء في آسيا وأفريقيا وأمريكا اللاتينية.

سيدي الرئيس،،،

إن منظمة التحرير الفلسطينية هي الممثل الشرعي والوحيد للشعب الفلسطيني وهي بهذه الصفة تنتقل إليكم تلك الرغبات والأمانى وتحملكم مسؤولية تاريخية كبيرة تجاه قضيتنا العادلة.

سيادة الرئيس،،،

لقد تعرض شعبنا لويلات الحرب والدمار والتشريد سنين طويلة، ودفع شعبنا من دماء أبنائه وأرواحهم ما يعوّض بثمن.

## Appendix B, The corpus, The Arabic Source text

وعانى من الاحتلال والتشريد والنزوح والإرهاب ما لم يعان منه شعب آخر. ولكن ذلك كله لا يجعل شعبنا حاقداً يحلم بالانتقام، كما أنه لا يجعلنا يا سيادة الرئيس تقع في سقطة عدونا العنصرية أو نفق الرؤية الحقيقية في تحديد أعدائنا وأصدقائنا.

إننا ندين كل الجرائم التي ارتكبت ضد اليهود وكل أنواع التمييز الصريح والمقنع الذي عانى منه معتنقو اليهودية.

سيدي الرئيس،،،

إنني نائر من أجل الحرية. واعرّف أن كثيرين من الجالسين في هذه القاعة كانوا في مثل المواقع النضالية التي أقتل منها الآن. واستطاعوا من خلال نضالهم أن يحولوا أحلامهم إلى حقائق. إنهم شركائي في الحلم إذن، من هنا أسألهم أن نمضي في تحويل الحلم المشترك بمستقبل السلام في هذه الأرض الفلسطينية المقدسة إلى حقائق ساطعة.

لقد وقف المناضل اليهودي أهود أديف في المحكمة العسكرية الإسرائيلية قائلاً: أنا لست مخرباً... أنا من المؤمنين بإقامة الدول الديمقراطية على هذه الأرض، أنه الآن في غياهب سجون الزمرة العسكرية الصهيونية مع زملاء له.

ويمثل الآن، أمام هذه المحاكم ذاتها، أمير شجاع من أمراء الكنيسة المسيحية هو المطران كبوجي. انه يرفع أصابعه بعلامة النصر - شعار ثوارنا - ويقول: " إنني أعمل من أجل السلام في فلسطين ليعيش الجميع على أرض السلام بسلام". وسيلقى هذا الأمير الراهب المصير ذاته في غياهب السجون.

فلماذا لا أحلم، يا سيادة الرئيس، وأمل، والثورة هي صناعة تحقيق الأحلام والآمال، فلنعمل معاً على تحقيق الحلم في أن أعود مع شعبي منمنفاي لأعيش مع هذا المناضل اليهودي ورفاقه، ومع هذا

## Appendix B, The corpus, The Arabic Source text

المناضل الراهب المسيحي وإخوانه في ظل دولة واحدة ديمقراطية يعيش فيها المسيحي والمسلم في كنف المساواة والعدل والإخاء.

ألا يستحق هذا الهدف الإنساني النبيل أن أناضل من أجل تحقيقه مع كل الشرفاء في العالم؟ ولعل أروع ما في هذا الهدف العظيم هو أنه من أجل فلسطين... أرض القداسة والسلام، أرض الاستشهاد والبطولة.

لقد ناضل اليهود يا سيادة الرئيس في أوروبا وهنا في أمريكا من أجل أوطان لا طائفية تتفصل فيها الدول عن الكنيسة وقاتلوا ضد التمييز على أساس الدين. فكيف يمكن لهم أن يرفضوا هذا النموذج الإنساني المشرف على الأرض المقدسة، أرض السلام والمساواة؟ وكيف يمكن لهم أن يستمروا في دعم أكثر دول العالم انغلاقاً وتمييزاً وتعصباً؟

إنني أعلن أمامكم هنا كرئيس لمنظمة التحرير الفلسطينية وقائد للثورة الفلسطينية أننا عندما نتحدث عن آمالنا المشتركة من أجل فلسطين الغد فنحن نشمل في تطلعاتنا كل اليهود الذين يعيشون الآن في فلسطين ويقبلون العيش معنا في سلام ودون تمييز على أرض فلسطين.

إنني بصفتي رئيساً لمنظمة التحرير وقائداً لقوات الثورة الفلسطينية أدعوا اليهود فرداً فرداً ليعيدوا النظر في طريق الهاوية الذي تقودهم إليه الصهيونية والقيادات الإسرائيلية وهي التي لم تقدم لهم غير النزيف الدموي الدائم والاستمرار في خوض الحروب واستخدامهم كوقود دائم لها.

إننا ندعوكم للخروج إلى مجال الاختيار الرحب بعيداً عن محاولات قيادتكم لغرس عقديّة المساواة وجعلها قدراً لكم.

إننا نقدم لكم أكرم دعوة... أن نعيش معاً في إطار السلام العادل في فلسطيننا الديمقراطية.

## Appendix B, The corpus, The Arabic Source text

إنني كرئيس لمنظمة التحرير الفلسطينية وكقائد للثورة الفلسطينية أعلن هنا أننا لا نريد إراقة نقطة دم يهودية أو عربية... ولا نستعذب استمرار القتال دقيقة واحدة إذا حل السلام العادل المبني على حقوق شعبنا وتطلعاته وأمانه.

إنني كرئيس لمنظمة التحرير الفلسطينية وكقائد للثورة الفلسطينية أتوجه إليكم أن تقفوا مع نضال شعبنا من أجل تطبيق حقه في تقرير مصيره، هذا الحق الذي كرسه ميثاق منظماتكم وأقرته جمعيتكم الموقرة في مناسبات عديدة.. وإنني أتوجه إليكم أيضاً أن تمكنوا شعبنا من العودة منمنفاه الإجمالي الذي دفع إليه تحت حراب البنادق وبالعسف والظلم ليعيش في ظنه ودياره وتحت ظلال أشجار حراً سيداً متمتعاً بكافة حقوقه القومية ليشارك في ركب الحضارة البشرية وفي مجالات الإبداع الإنساني بكل ما فيه من إمكانات وطاقات وليحمي قدسه الحبيبة كما فعل دائماً عبر التاريخ ويجعلها قبلة حرة لجميع الأديان بعيداً عن الإرهاب والقهر.

كما أتوجه إليكم بأن تمكنوا شعبنا من إقامة سلطته الوطنية المستقلة وتأسيس كيانه الوطني على أرضه.

لقد جننكم يا سيادة الرئيس بغصن الزيتون مع بندقية تائر.. فلا تسقطوا الغصن الأخضر من يدي.

سيادة الرئيس....

الحرب تتدلح من فلسطين والسلام يبدأ من فلسطين.

## B-2: The English target text



# General Assembly

A/PV.2282 and Corr.1  
13 November 1974

*United Nations*  
GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
TWENTY-NINTH SESSION  
*Official Records*

2282nd  
**PLENARY MEETING**  
*Wednesday, 13 November 1974,*  
*at 10.30 a.m.*  
NEW YORK

### CONTENTS

Agenda item 108:  
Question of Palestine (*continued*) .....Page 861

*President: Mr. Abdelaziz BOUTEFLIKA*  
*(Algeria)*

---

### AGENDA ITEM 108

#### **Question of Palestine (*continued*)\***

1. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): Members will recall that the General Assembly, in its resolution 3210 (XXIX), adopted on 14 October 1974, decided to invite the Palestine Liberation Organization [PLO], the representative of the Palestinian people, to participate in the deliberations of the General Assembly on the question of Palestine in plenary meetings. [*The President continued in Arabic*]
2. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Arabic*): On behalf of the General Assembly, I wish to extend a warm welcome to Mr. Yasser Arafat, Chairman of the Executive Committee of the Palestine Liberation Organization and Commander-in-Chief of the Palestine Revolution. I now invite him to address the General Assembly.
3. Mr. ARAFAT (*interpretation from Arabic*): In the name of the people of Palestine and the leader of its national struggle, the Palestine Liberation Organization, I take this

## Appendix B, The corpus, The English target text

opportunity to extend to you, Mr. President, my warmest congratulations on your election to the presidency of the twenty-ninth session of the United Nations General Assembly. We have, of course, long known you to be a sincere and devoted defender of the cause of freedom, justice and peace. We have known you also to be in the vanguard of the freedom fighters in their heroic Algerian war of national liberation. Today Algeria has attained a distinguished position in the world community and has assumed its responsibilities both in the national and in the international fields, thus earning the support and esteem of all the countries of the world.

4. I also avail myself of this opportunity to extend my sincerest appreciation to Mr. Kurt Waldheim, the Secretary-General of the United Nations, for the great efforts he has made and is still making to enable us to assume our responsibilities in the smoothest possible way.

5. In the name of the people of Palestine I take this opportunity to congratulate three States that have recently been admitted to membership in the United Nations after obtaining their national independence: Guinea-Bissau, Bangladesh and Grenada. I extend our best wishes to the leaders of those Member States and wish them progress and success.

6. Mr. President, I thank you for having invited the PLO to participate in this plenary session of the United Nations General Assembly. I am grateful to all those representatives of States of the United Nations who contributed to the decision to introduce the question of Palestine as a separate item on the agenda of this Assembly. That decision made possible the Assembly's resolution inviting us to address it on the question of Palestine

7. This is a very important occasion. The question of Palestine is being re-examined by the United Nations, and we consider that step to be a victory for the world Organization as much as a victory for the cause of our people. It indicates anew that the United Nations of today is not the United Nations of the past, just as today's world is not yesterday's world.

## Appendix B, The corpus, The English target text

Today's United Nations represents 138 nations, a number that more clearly reflects the will of the international community. Thus today's United Nations is more nearly capable of implementing the principles embodied in its Charter and in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, as well as being more truly empowered to support causes of peace and justice.

8. Our peoples are now beginning to feel that change. Along with them, the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America also feel the change. As a result, the United Nations acquires greater esteem both in our people's view and in the view of other peoples. Our hope is thereby strengthened that the United Nations can contribute actively to the pursuit and triumph of the causes of peace, justice, freedom and independence. Our resolve to build a new world is fortified -- a world free of colonialism, imperialism, neo-colonialism and racism in each of its instances, including zionism [sic].

9. Our world aspires to peace, justice, equality and freedom. It wishes that oppressed nations, bent under the weight of imperialism, might gain their freedom and their right to self-determination. It hopes to place the relations between nations on a basis of equality, peaceful coexistence, mutual respect for each other's internal affairs, secure national sovereignty, independence and territorial unity on the basis of justice and mutual benefit. This world resolves that the economic ties binding it together should be grounded in justice, parity and mutual interest. It aspires finally to direct its human resources against the scourge of poverty, famine, disease and natural calamity, toward the development of productive scientific and technical capabilities to enhance human wealth -- all this in the hope of reducing the disparity between the developing and the developed countries. But all such aspirations cannot be realized in a world that is at present ruled over by tension, injustice, oppression, racial discrimination and exploitation, a world also threatened with unending economic disasters, war and crisis.

## Appendix B, The corpus, The English target text

10. Great numbers of peoples, including those of Zimbabwe, Namibia, South Africa and Palestine, among many others, are still victims of oppression and violence. Their areas of the world are gripped by armed struggles provoked by imperialism and racial discrimination, both merely forms of aggression and terror. Those are instances of oppressed peoples compelled by intolerable circumstances into confrontation with such oppression. But wherever that confrontation occurs it is legitimate and just.

11. It is imperative that the international community should support these peoples in their struggles, in the furtherance of their rightful causes and the attainment of their right to self-determination.

12. In Indo-China, the peoples are still exposed to aggression. They remain subjected to conspiracies preventing them from attaining peace and realizing their goals. Although peoples everywhere have welcomed the agreements on peace reached in Laos and South Viet Nam, no one can say that genuine peace has been achieved, nor that those forces responsible in the first place for aggression have now desisted from their attacks on Viet Nam. The same can be said of the present military aggression against the people of Cambodia. It is therefore incumbent on the international community to support these oppressed peoples, and also to condemn the oppressors for their designs against peace. Moreover, despite the positive stand taken by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea with regard to a peaceful, just solution of the Korean question, there is as yet no settlement of that question.

13. A few months ago the problem of Cyprus erupted violently before us. All peoples everywhere shared in the suffering of the Cypriots. We ask that the United Nations continue its efforts to reach a just solution in Cyprus, thereby sparing the Cypriots further war and ensuring peace and independence for them instead. Undoubtedly, however,

Appendix B, The corpus, The English target text

consideration of the question of Cyprus belongs within that of Middle Eastern problems as well as of Mediterranean problems.

14. In their efforts to replace an outmoded but still dominant world economic system with a new, more logically rational one, the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America must nevertheless face implacable attacks on these efforts. These countries have expressed their views at the sixth special session of the General Assembly on raw materials and development. Thus the plundering, the exploitation, the siphoning-off of the wealth of impoverished peoples must be terminated forthwith. There must be no deterring of these peoples' efforts to develop and control their wealth. Furthermore, there is a grave necessity for arriving at fair prices for raw materials from these countries.

15. In addition, these countries continue to be hampered in the attainment of their primary objectives formulated at the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea at Caracas, at the World Population Conference at Bucharest and at the World Food Conference in Rome. The United Nations should therefore bend every effort to achieve a radical alteration of the world economic system, making it possible for developing countries to develop. The United Nations must shoulder the responsibility for fighting inflation, now borne most heavily by the developing countries, especially the oil-producing countries. The United Nations must firmly condemn any threats made against these countries simply because they demand their just rights.

16. The world-wide armaments race shows no sign of abating. As a consequence, the entire world is threatened with the dispersion of its wealth and the utter waste of its energies. Armed violence is made more likely everywhere. We expect the United Nations to devote itself single-mindedly to curbing the unlimited acquisition of arms; to preventing even the possibility of nuclear destruction; to reducing the vast sums spent on military technology;

## Appendix B, The corpus, The English target text

to converting expenditure on war into projects for development, for increasing production, and for benefiting common humanity.

17. And still, the highest tension exists in our part of the world. There the Zionist entity clings tenaciously to occupied Arab territory; zionism persists , in its aggressions against us and our territory. New military preparations are feverishly being made. These anticipate another, fifth war of aggression to be launched against us. Such signs bear the closest possible watching, since there is a grave likelihood that this war would forebode nuclear destruction and cataclysmic annihilation.

18. The world is in need of tremendous efforts if its aspirations to peace, freedom justice, equality and development are to be realized if its struggle is to be victorious over colonialism, imperialism, neo-colonialism and racism in all its forms, including zionism. Only by such efforts can actual form be given to the aspirations of all peoples, including the aspirations of peoples whose States oppose such efforts. It is this road that leads to the fulfilment of those principles emphasized by the United Nations Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Were the status quo simply to be maintained, however, the world would instead be exposed to prolonged armed conflict, in addition to economic. human and natural calamity.

19. Despite abiding world crises, despite even the gloomy powers of backwardness and disastrous wrong, we live in a time of glorious change. An old world order is crumbling before our eyes, as imperialism, colonialism, neo-colonialism and racism, the chief form of which is zionism, ineluctably perish. We are privileged to be able to witness a great wave of history bearing peoples forward into a new world that they have created. In that world just causes will triumph. Of that we are confident.

20. The question of Palestine belongs in this perspective of emergence and struggle. Palestine is crucial amongst those just causes fought for unstintingly by masses labouring

## Appendix B, The corpus, The English target text

under imperialism and aggression. It cannot be, and is not, lost on me today, as I stand here before the General Assembly, that if I have been given the opportunity to address the General Assembly, so too must the opportunity be given to all liberation movements fighting against racism and imperialism. In their names, in the name of every human being struggling for freedom and self-determination, I call upon the General Assembly urgently to give their just causes the same full attention the General Assembly has so rightly given to our cause. Such recognitions once made, there will be a secure foundation thereafter for the preservation of universal peace. For only with such peace will a new world order endure in which peoples can live free of oppression fear, terror and the suppression of their rights. As I said earlier, this is the true perspective in which to set the question of Palestine. I shall now do so for the General Assembly, keeping firmly in mind both the perspective and the goal of a coming world order.

21. Even as today we address the General Assembly from what is before all else an international rostrum, we are also expressing our faith in political and diplomatic struggle as complements, as enhancements of our armed struggle. Furthermore, we express our appreciation of the role the United Nations is capable of playing in settling problems of international scope. But this capability, I said a moment ago, became real only once the United Nations had accommodated itself to the living actuality of aspiring peoples, towards which an Organization of so truly international a dimension owes unique obligations.

22. In addressing the General Assembly today, our people proclaims its faith in the future, unencumbered either by past tragedies or present limitations. If, as we discuss the present, we enlist the past in our service, we do so only to light up our journey into the future alongside other movements of national liberation. If we return now to the historical roots of our cause we do so because present at this very moment in our midst are those who, while they occupy our homes, as their cattle graze in our pastures, and as their hands pluck

## Appendix B, The corpus, The English target text

the fruit of our trees, claim at the same time that we are disembodied spirits, fictions without presence, without traditions or future. We speak of our roots also because until recently some people have regarded -- and continued to regard -- our problem as merely a problem of refugees. They have portrayed the Middle East question as little more than a border dispute between the Arab States and the Zionist entity. They have imagined that our people claims rights not rightfully its own and fights neither with logic nor valid motive, with a simple wish only to disturb the peace and to terrorize wantonly. For there are amongst you -- and here I refer to the United States of America and others like it -- those who supply our enemy freely with planes and bombs and with every variety of murderous weapon. They take hostile positions against us, deliberately distorting the true essence of the problem. All this is done not only at our expense, but at the expense of the American people, and of the friendship we continue to hope can be cemented between us and this great people, whose history of struggle for the sake of freedom we honour and salute.

23. I cannot now forgo this opportunity to appeal from this rostrum directly to the American people, asking it to give its support to our heroic and fighting people. I ask it whole-heartedly to endorse right and justice, to recall George Washington to mind, heroic Washington whose purpose was his nation's freedom and independence, Abraham Lincoln, champion of the destitute and the wretched, and also Woodrow Wilson. whose doctrine of Fourteen Points remains subscribed to and venerated by our people. I ask the American people whether the demonstrations of hostility and enmity taking place outside this great hall reflect the true intent of America's will. What crime, I ask you plainly, has our people committed against the American people? Why do you fight us so? Does such unwarranted belligerence really serve your interests? Does it serve the interests of the American masses? No, definitely not. I can only hope that the American people will remember that their friendship with the whole Arab nation is too great, too abiding and too rewarding for any such demonstrations to harm it.

## Appendix B, The corpus, The English target text

24. In any event, as our discussion of the question of Palestine focuses upon historical roots, we do so because we believe that any question now exercising the world's concern must be viewed radically, in the true root sense of that word. if a real solution is ever to be grasped. We propose this radical approach as an antidote to an approach to international issues that obscures historical origins behind ignorance, denial, and a slavish obeisance to the present.

25. The roots of the Palestinian question reach back into the closing years of the nineteenth century, in other words, to that period we call the era of colonialism and settlement as we know it today. This is precisely the period during which zionism as a scheme was born; its aim was the conquest of Palestine by European immigrants, just as settlers colonized, and indeed raided, most of Africa. This is the period during which, pouring forth out of the west, colonialism spread into the furthest reaches of Africa, Asia and Latin America, building colonies, everywhere cruelly exploiting, oppressing, plundering the peoples of those three continents. This period persists into the present. Marked evidence of its totally reprehensible presence can be readily perceived in the racism practised both in South Africa and in Palestine.

26. Just as colonialism and its demagogues dignified their conquests, their plunder and limitless attacks upon the natives of Africa with appeals to a "civilizing and modernizing" mission, so too did waves of Zionist immigrants disguise their purposes as they conquered Palestine. Just as colonialism as a system and colonialists as its instrument used religion, colour, race and language to justify the African's exploitation and his cruel subjugation by terror and discrimination, so too were these methods employed as Palestine was usurped and its people hounded from their national homeland.

27. Just as colonialism heedlessly used the wretched, the poor, the exploited as mere inert matter with which to build and to carry out settler colonialism, so too were destitute,

## Appendix B, The corpus, The English target text

oppressed European Jews employed on behalf of world imperialism and of the Zionist leaders. European Jews were transformed into the instruments of aggression -- they became the elements of settler colonialism intimately allied to racial discrimination.

28. Zionist theology was utilized against our Palestinian people: the purpose was not only the establishment of Western-style settler colonialism but also the severing of Jews from their various homelands and subsequently their estrangement from their nations. Zionism is an ideology that is imperialist, colonialist, racist; it is profoundly reactionary and discriminatory; it is united with anti-Semitism in its retrograde tenets and is, when all is said and done, another side of the same base coin. For when what is proposed is that adherents of the Jewish faith, regardless of their national residence, should neither owe allegiance to their national residence nor live on equal footing with its other, non-Jewish citizens -- when that is proposed we hear anti-Semitism being proposed. When it is proposed that the only solution for the Jewish problem is that Jews must alienate themselves from communities or nations of which they have been a historical part, when it is proposed that Jews solve the Jewish problem by immigrating to and forcibly settling the land of another people -- when this occurs, exactly the same position is being advocated as the one urged by anti-Semites against Jews.

29. Thus, for instance, we can understand the close connexion between Cecil Rhodes, who promoted settler colonialism in south-east Africa, and Theodor Herzl, who had settler colonialist designs upon Palestine. Having received a certificate of good settler colonialist conduct from Rhodes, Herzl then turned around and presented this certificate to the British Government, hoping thus to secure a formal resolution supporting Zionist policy. In exchange, the Zionists promised Britain an imperialist base on Palestinian soil so that imperial interests could be safeguarded at one of their chief strategic points.

## Appendix B, The corpus, The English target text

30. So the Zionist movement allied itself directly with world colonialism in a common raid on our land. Allow me now to present a selection of historical truths about this alliance.

31. The Jewish invasion of Palestine began in 1881. Before the first large wave of immigrants started arriving, Palestine had a population of half a million; most of the population was either Muslim or Christian, and only 20,000 were Jewish. Every segment of the population enjoyed the religious tolerance characteristic of our civilization.

32. Palestine was then a verdant land, inhabited mainly by an Arab people in the course of building its life and dynamically enriching its indigenous culture.

33. Between 1882 and 1917 the Zionist movement settled approximately 50,000 European Jews in our homeland. To do that it resorted to trickery and deceit in order to implant them in our midst. Its success in getting Britain to issue the Balfour Declaration once again demonstrated the alliance between Zionism and imperialism. Furthermore, by promising to the Zionist movement what was not its to give, Britain showed how oppressive was the rule of imperialism. As it was constituted then, the League of Nations abandoned our Arab people, and Wilson's pledges and promises came to nought. In the guise of a Mandate, British imperialism was cruelly and directly imposed upon us. The Mandate issued by the League of Nations was to enable the Zionist invaders to consolidate their gains in our homeland.

34. Over a period of 30 years after the Balfour Declaration, the Zionist movement, together with its colonial ally, succeeded in bringing about the immigration of more European Jews and the usurpation of the lands of the Arabs of Palestine. Thus, in 1947 the Jewish population of Palestine was approximately 600,000, owning less than 6 per cent of the fertile lands of Palestine, while the Arab population of Palestine numbered approximately 1,250,000.

## Appendix B, The corpus, The English target text

35. As a result of the collusion between the Mandatory Power and the Zionist movement and with the support of some countries, this General Assembly early in its history approved a recommendation to partition our Palestinian homeland. This took place in an atmosphere poisoned with questionable actions and strong pressure. The General Assembly partitioned what it had no right to divide -- an indivisible homeland. When we rejected that decision, our position corresponded to that of the natural mother who refused to permit King Solomon to cut her son in two when the unnatural mother claimed the child for herself and agreed to his dismemberment. Furthermore, even though the partition resolution granted the colonialist settlers 54 per cent of the land of Palestine, their dissatisfaction with the decision prompted them to wage a war of terror against the civilian Arab population. They occupied 81 per cent of the total area of Palestine, uprooting a million Arabs. Thus, they occupied 524 Arab towns and villages, of which they destroyed 385, completely obliterating them in the process. Having done so, they built their own settlements and colonies on the ruins of our farms and our groves. The roots of the Palestine question lie here. Its causes do not stem from any conflict between two religions or two nationalisms. Neither is it a border conflict between neighboring [sic] States. It is the cause of people deprived of its homeland, dispersed and uprooted, and living mostly in exile and in refugee camps.

36. With support from imperialist and colonialist Powers, the Zionist entity managed to get itself accepted as a Member of the United Nations. It further succeeded in getting the Palestine question deleted from the agenda of the United Nations and in deceiving world public opinion by presenting our cause as a problem of refugees in need either of charity from do-gooders, or settlement in a land not theirs.

37. Not satisfied with all this, the racist entity, founded on the imperialist-colonialist concept, turned itself into a base of imperialism and into an arsenal of weapons. This enabled it to assume its role of subjugating the Arab people and of committing aggression

Appendix B, The corpus, The English target text

against them, in order to satisfy its ambitions for further expansion on Palestinian and other Arab lands. In addition to the many instances of aggression committed by this entity against the Arab States, it has launched two large-scale wars, in 1956 and 1967, thus endangering world peace and security.

38. As a result of Zionist aggression in June 1967, the enemy occupied Egyptian Sinai as far as the Suez Canal. The enemy occupied Syria's Golan Heights, in addition to all Palestinian land west of the Jordan. All these developments have led to the creation in our area of what has come to be known as the "Middle East problem". The situation has been rendered more serious by the enemy's persistence in maintaining its unlawful occupation and in further consolidating it, thus establishing a beachhead for world imperialism's thrust against our Arab nation. All Security Council decisions and appeals to world public opinion for withdrawal from the lands occupied in June 1967 have been ignored. Despite all the peaceful efforts on the international level, the enemy has not been deterred from its expansionist policy. The only alternative open before our Arab nations, chiefly Egypt and Syria, was to expend exhaustive efforts in preparing forcefully to resist that barbarous armed invasion -- and this in order to liberate Arab lands and to restore the rights of the Palestinian people, after all other peaceful means had failed.

39. Under these circumstances, the fourth war broke out in October 1973, bringing home to the Zionist enemy the bankruptcy of its policy of occupation, expansion and its reliance on the concept of military might. Despite all this, the leaders of the Zionist entity are far from having learned any lesson from their experience. They are making preparations for the fifth war, resorting once more to the language of military superiority, aggression, terrorism, subjugation and, finally, always to war in their dealings with the Arabs.

40. It pains our people greatly to witness the propagation of the myth that its homeland was a desert until it was made to bloom by the toil of foreign settlers, that it was a land

## Appendix B, The corpus, The English target text

without a people, and that the colonialist entity caused no harm to any human being. No: such lies must be exposed from this rostrum, for the world must know that Palestine was the cradle of the most ancient cultures and civilizations. Its Arab people were engaged in farming and building, spreading culture throughout the land for thousands of years, setting an example in the practice of freedom of worship, acting as faithful guardians of the holy places of all religions. As a son of Jerusalem, I treasure for myself and my people beautiful memories and vivid images of the religious brotherhood that was the hallmark of our Holy City before it succumbed to catastrophe. Our people continued to pursue this enlightened policy until the establishment of the State of Israel and their dispersion. This did not deter our people from pursuing their humanitarian role on Palestinian soil. Nor will they permit their land to become a launching pad for aggression or a racist camp predicated on the destruction of civilization, cultures, progress and peace. Our people cannot but maintain the heritage of their ancestors in resisting the invaders, in assuming the privileged task of defending their native land, their Arab nationhood, their culture and civilization, and in safeguarding the cradle of monotheistic religions.

41. By contrast, we need only mention briefly some Israeli stands: its support of the Secret Army Organization in Algeria, its bolstering of the settler-colonialists in Africa -- whether in the Congo, Angola, Mozambique, Zimbabwe, Azania or South Africa -- and its backing of South Viet Nam against the Vietnamese revolution. In addition, one can mention Israel's continuing support of imperialists and racists everywhere, its obstructionist stand in the Committee of Twenty-four, its refusal to cast its vote in support of independence for the African States, and its opposition to the demands of many Asian, African and Latin American nations, and several other States in the conferences on raw materials, population, the law of the sea, and food. All these facts offer further proof of the character of the enemy that has usurped our land. They justify the honourable struggle we are waging against it. As we defend a vision of the future, our enemy upholds the myths of the past.

## Appendix B, The corpus, The English target text

42. The enemy we face has a long record of hostility even towards the Jews themselves, for there is within the Zionist entity a built-in racism against Oriental Jews. While we were vociferously condemning the massacres of Jews under Nazi rule, Zionist leadership appeared more interested at that time in exploiting them as best it could in order to realize its goal of immigration into Palestine.

43. If the immigration of Jews to Palestine had had as its objective the goal of enabling them to live side by side with us, enjoying the same rights and assuming the same duties, we would have opened our doors to them, as far as our homeland's capacity for absorption permitted. Such was the case with the thousands of Armenians and Circassians who still live among us in equality as brethren and citizens. But that the goal of this immigration should be to usurp our homeland, disperse our people, and turn us into second-class citizens -- this is what no one can conceivably demand that we acquiesce in or submit to. Therefore, since its inception, our evolution has not been motivated by racial or religious factors. Its target has never been the Jew, as a person, but racist zionism and undisguised aggression. In this sense, ours is also a revolution for the Jew, as a human being, as well. We are struggling so that Jews, Christians and Muslims may live in equality, enjoying the same rights and assuming the same duties, free from racial or religious discrimination.

44. We do distinguish between Judaism and zionism. While we maintain our opposition to the colonialist Zionist movement, we respect the Jewish faith. Today, almost one century after the rise of the Zionist movement, we wish to warn of its increasing danger to the Jews of the world, to our Arab people and to world peace and security. For zionism encourages the Jew to emigrate out of his homeland and grants him an artificially-created nationality. The Zionists proceed with their terrorist activities even though these have proved ineffective. The phenomenon of constant emigration from Israel, which is bound to grow as the bastions of colonialism and racism in the world fall, is an example of the inevitability of the failure of such activities. 45. We urge the people and Governments of

## Appendix B, The corpus, The English target text

the world to stand firm against Zionist attempts at encouraging world Jewry to emigrate from their countries and to usurp our land. We urge them as well firmly to oppose any discrimination against any human being as to religion, race, or colour.

46. Why should our Arab Palestinian people pay the price of such discrimination in the world? Why should our people be responsible for the problems of Jewish immigration, if such problems exist in the minds of some people? Why do not the supporters of these problems open their own countries, which can absorb and help these immigrants?

47. Those who call us terrorists wish to prevent world public opinion from discovering the truth about us and from seeing the justice on our faces. They seek to hide the terrorism and tyranny of their acts, and our own posture of self-defence.

48. The difference between the revolutionary and the terrorist lies in the reason for which each fights. For whoever stands by a just cause and fights for the freedom and liberation of his land from the invaders, the settlers and the colonialists cannot possibly be called terrorist, otherwise the American people in their struggle for liberation from the British colonialists would have been terrorists; the European resistance against the Nazis would be terrorism, the struggle of the Asian, African and Latin American peoples would also be terrorism, and many of you who are in this Assembly hall were considered terrorists. This is actually a just and proper struggle consecrated by the United Nations Charter and by the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. As to those who fight against the just causes, those who wage war to occupy, colonize and oppress other people, those are the terrorists. Those are the people whose actions should be condemned, who should be called war criminals: for the justice of the cause determines the right to struggle.

49. Zionist terrorism which was waged against the Palestinian people to evict it from its country and usurp its land is registered in your official documents. Thousands of our people were assassinated in their villages and towns; tens of thousands of others were

## Appendix B, The corpus, The English target text

forced at gunpoint to leave their homes and the lands of their fathers. Time and time again our children, women and aged were evicted and had to wander in the deserts and climb mountains without any food or water. No one in 1948 witnessed the catastrophe that befell the inhabitants of hundreds of villages and towns -- in Jerusalem, Jaffa, Lydda, Ramle and Galilee -- no one who has been a witness to that catastrophe will ever forget the experience, even though the mass black-out has succeeded in hiding these horrors as it has hidden the traces of 385 Palestinian villages and towns destroyed at the time and erased from the map. The destruction of 19,000 houses during the past seven years, which is equivalent to the complete destruction of 200 more Palestinian villages, and the great number of maimed as a result of the treatment they were subjected to in Israeli prisons cannot be hidden by any black-out.

50. Their terrorism fed on hatred and this hatred was even directed against the olive tree in my country, which has been a proud symbol and which reminded them of the indigenous inhabitants of the land, a living reminder that the land is Palestinian. Thus they sought to destroy it. How can one describe the statement by Golda Meir which expressed her disquiet about "the Palestinian children born every day"? They see in the Palestinian child, in the Palestinian tree, an enemy that should be exterminated. For tens of years Zionists have been harrasing our people's cultural, political, social and artistic leaders, terrorizing them and assassinating them. They have stolen our cultural heritage, our popular folklore and have claimed it as theirs. Their terrorism even reached our sacred places in our beloved and peaceful Jerusalem. They have endeavoured to de-Arabize it and make it lose its Muslim and Christian character by evicting its inhabitants and annexing it.

51. I must mention the fire of the Al Aqsa Mosque and the disfiguration of many of the monuments which are both historic and religious in character. Jerusalem, with its religious history and its spiritual values, bears witness to the future. It is proof of our eternal presence, of our civilization, of our human values. It is therefore not surprising that under

## Appendix B, The corpus, The English target text

its sky the three religions were born and that under that sky these three religions shine in order to enlighten mankind so that it might express the tribulations and hopes of humanity, and that it might mark out the road of the future with its hopes.

52. The small number of Palestinian Arabs who were not uprooted by the Zionists in 1948 are at present refugees in their own homeland. Israeli law treats them as second-class citizens -- and even as third-class citizens since Oriental Jews are second-class citizens -- and they have been subject to all forms of racial discrimination and terrorism after confiscation of their land and property. They have been victims of bloody massacres such as that of Kfar Kassim; they have been expelled from their villages and denied the right to return, as in the case of the inhabitants of Ikrit and Kfar Birim. For 26 years, our population has been living under martial law and was denied freedom of movement without prior permission from the Israeli military governor, this at a time when an Israeli law was promulgated granting citizenship to any Jew anywhere who wanted to emigrate to our homeland. Moreover, another Israeli law stipulated that Palestinians who were not present in their villages or towns at the time of the occupation were not entitled to Israeli citizenship.

53. The record of Israeli rulers is replete with acts of terror perpetrated on those of our people who remained under occupation in Sinai and the Golan Heights. The criminal bombardment of the Bahr-al-Bakar School and the Abou Zaabal factory are but two such unforgettable acts of terrorism. The total destruction of the Syrian city of Quneitra is yet another tangible instance of systematic terrorism. If a record of Zionist terrorism in South Lebanon were to be compiled, the enormity of its acts would shock even the most hardened: piracy, bombardments, scorched-earth policy, destruction of hundreds of homes, eviction of civilians and the kidnapping of Lebanese citizens. This clearly constitutes a violation of Lebanese sovereignty and is in preparation for the diversion of the Litani River waters.

Appendix B, The corpus, The English target text

54. Need one remind this Assembly of the numerous resolutions adopted by it condemning Israeli aggressions committed against Arab countries, Israeli violations of human rights and the articles of the Geneva Conventions, as well as the resolutions pertaining to the annexation of the city of Jerusalem and its restoration to its former status?

55. The only description for these acts is that they are acts of barbarism and terrorism. And yet, the Zionist racists and colonialists have the temerity to describe the just struggle of our people as terror. Could there be a more flagrant distortion of truth than this? We ask those who usurped our land, who are committing murderous acts of terrorism against our people and are practising racial discrimination more extensively than the racists of South Africa, we ask them to keep in mind the General Assembly resolution that called for the one-year suspension of the membership of the Government of South Africa from the United Nations. Such is the inevitable fate of every racist country that adopts the law of the jungle, usurps the homeland of others and persists in oppression.

56. For the past 30 years, our people have had to struggle against British occupation and Zionist invasion, both of which had one intention, namely, the usurpation of our land. Six major revolts and tens of popular uprisings were staged to foil these attempts, so that our homeland might remain ours. Over 30,000 martyrs, the equivalent in comparative terms of 6 million Americans, died in the process.

57. When the majority of the Palestinian people was uprooted from its homeland in 1948, the Palestinian struggle for self-determination continued under the most difficult conditions. We tried every possible means to continue our political struggle to attain our national rights, but to no avail. Meanwhile, we had to struggle for sheer existence. Even in exile we educated our children. This was all a part of trying to survive.

58. The Palestinian people produced thousands of physicians, lawyers, teachers and scientists who actively participated in the development of the Arab countries bordering on

## Appendix B, The corpus, The English target text

their usurped homeland. They utilized their income to assist the young and aged amongst their people who remained in the refugee camps. They educated their younger sisters and brothers, supported their parents and cared for their children. All along, the Palestinian dreamt of return. Neither the Palestinian's allegiance to Palestine nor his determination to return waned; nothing could persuade him to relinquish his Palestinian identity or to forsake his homeland. The passage of time did not make him forget, as some hoped he would. When our people lost faith in the international community, which persisted in ignoring its rights, and when it became obvious that the Palestinians would not recuperate one inch of Palestine through exclusively political means, our people had no choice but to resort to armed struggle. Into that struggle it poured its material and human resources. We bravely faced the most vicious acts of Israeli terrorism, which were aimed at diverting our struggle and arresting it.

59. In the past 10 years of our struggle, thousands of martyrs and twice as many wounded, maimed and imprisoned were offered in sacrifice, all in an effort to resist the imminent threat of liquidation, to regain our right to self-determination and our undisputed right to return to our homeland. With the utmost dignity and the most admirable revolutionary spirit, our Palestinian people has not lost its spirit in Israeli prisons and concentration camps or when faced with all forms of harassment and intimidation. It struggles for sheer existence and it continues to strive to preserve the Arab character of its land. Thus it resists oppression, tyranny and terrorism in their ugliest forms.

60. It is through our popular armed struggle that our political leadership and our national institutions finally crystallized and a national liberation movement, comprising all the Palestinian factions, organizations and capabilities, materialized in the PLO.

61. Through our militant Palestine national liberation movement, our people's struggle matured and grew enough to accommodate political and social struggle in addition to

## Appendix B, The corpus, The English target text

armed struggle. The PLO was a major factor in creating a new Palestinian individual, qualified to shape the future of our Palestine, not merely content with mobilizing the Palestinians for the challenges of the present.

62. The PLO can be proud of having a large number of cultural and educational activities, even while engaged in armed struggle, and at a time when it faced increasingly vicious blows of Zionist terrorism. We established institutes for scientific research, agricultural development and social welfare, as well as centres for the revival of our cultural heritage and the preservation of our folklore. Many Palestinian poets, artists and writers have enriched Arab culture in particular, and world culture generally. Their profoundly humane works have won the admiration of all those familiar with them. In contrast to that, our enemy has been systematically destroying our culture and disseminating racist, imperialist ideologies; in short, everything that impedes progress, justice, democracy and peace.

63. The PLO has earned its legitimacy because of the sacrifice inherent in its pioneering role, and also because of its dedicated leadership of the struggle. It has also been granted this legitimacy by the Palestinian masses, which in harmony with it have chosen it to lead the struggle according to its directives. The PLO has also gained its legitimacy by representing every faction, union or group as well as every Palestinian talent, either in the National Council or in people's institutions. This legitimacy was further strengthened by the support of the entire Arab nation, and it was consecrated during the last Arab Summit Conference, which reiterated the right of the PLO, in its capacity as the sole representative of the Palestinian people, to establish an independent national State on all liberated Palestinian territory.

64. Moreover, the legitimacy of the PLO was intensified as a result of fraternal support given by other liberation movements and by friendly, like-minded nations that stood by our side, encouraging and aiding us in our struggle to secure our national rights.

Appendix B, The corpus, The English target text

65. Here I must also warmly convey the gratitude of our revolutionary fighters and that of our people to the non-aligned countries, the socialist countries, the Islamic countries, the African countries and friendly European countries, as well as all our other friends in Asia, Africa and Latin America.

66. The PLO represents the Palestinian people, legitimately and uniquely. Because of this, the PLO expresses the wishes and hopes of its people. Because of this, too, it brings these very wishes and hopes before you, urging you not to shirk the momentous historic responsibility towards our just cause.

67. For many years now our people has been exposed to the ravages of war, destruction and dispersion. It has paid in the blood of its sons that which cannot ever be compensated. It has borne the burdens of occupation, dispersion, eviction and terror more uninterruptedly than any other people. And yet all this has made our people neither vindictive nor vengeful. Nor has it caused us to resort to the racism of our enemies. Nor have we lost the true method by which friend and foe are distinguished.

68. For we deplore all those crimes committed against the Jews; we also deplore all the real discrimination suffered by them because of their faith.

69. I am a rebel and freedom is my cause. I know well that many of you present here today once stood in exactly the same resistance position as I now occupy and from which I must fight. You once had to convert dreams into reality by your struggle. Therefore you must now share my dream. I think this is exactly why I can ask you now to help, as together we bring out our dream into a bright reality, our common dream for a peaceful future in Palestine's sacred land.

70. As he stood in an Israeli military court, the Jewish revolutionary, Ahud Adif, said: "I am no terrorist; I believe that a democratic State should exist on this land." Adif now

## Appendix B, The corpus, The English target text

languishes in a Zionist prison among his co-believers. To him and his colleagues I send my heartfelt good wishes.

71. And before those same courts there stands today a brave prince of the church, Bishop Capucci. Lifting his fingers to form the same victory sign used by our freedom-fighters, he said: "What I have done, I have done that all men may live on this land of peace in peace." This princely priest will doubtless share Adif's grim fate. To him we send our salutations and greetings.

72. Why therefore should I not dream and hope? For is not revolution the making real of dreams and hopes? So let us work together that my dream may be fulfilled, that I may return with my people out of exile, there in Palestine to live with this Jewish freedom-fighter and his partners, with this Arab priest and his brothers, in one democratic State where Christian, Jew and Muslim live in justice, equality and fraternity.

73. Is this not a noble dream worthy of my struggle alongside all lovers of freedom everywhere? For the most admirable dimension of this dream is that it is Palestinian, a dream from out of the land of peace, the land of martyrdom and heroism, and the land of history, too.

74. Let us remember that the Jews of Europe and the United States have been known to lead the struggles for secularism and the separation of Church and State. They have also been known to fight against discrimination on religious grounds. How can they then refuse this humane paradigm for the Holy Land? How then can they continue to support the most fanatic, discriminatory and closed of nations in its policy?

75. In my formal capacity as Chairman of the PLO and leader of the Palestinian revolution I proclaim before you that when we speak of our common hopes for the Palestine of

Appendix B, The corpus, The English target text

tomorrow we include in our perspective all Jews now living in Palestine who choose to live with us there in peace and without discrimination.

76. In my formal capacity as Chairman of the PLO and leader of the Palestinian revolution I call upon Jews to turn away one by one from the illusory promises made to them by Zionist ideology and Israeli leadership. They are offering Jews perpetual bloodshed, endless war and continuous thralldom.

77. We invite them to emerge from their moral isolation into a more open realm of free choice, far from their present leadership's efforts to implant in them a Masada complex.

78. We offer them the most generous solution, that we might live together in a framework of just peace in our democratic Palestine.

79. In my formal capacity as Chairman of the PLO I announce here that we do not wish one drop of either Arab or Jewish blood to be shed; neither do we delight in the continuation of killing, which would end once a just peace, based on our people's rights, hopes and aspirations had been finally established.

80. In my formal capacity as Chairman of the PLO and leader of the Palestinian revolution I appeal to you to accompany our people in its struggle to attain its right to self-determination. This right is consecrated in the United Nations Charter and has been repeatedly confirmed in resolutions adopted by this august body since the drafting of the Charter. I appeal to you, further, to aid our people's return to its homeland from an involuntary exile imposed upon it by force of arms, by tyranny, by oppression, so that we may regain our property, our land, and thereafter live in our national homeland, free and sovereign, enjoying all the privileges of nationhood. Only then can we pour all our resources into the mainstream of human civilization. Only then can Palestinian creativity

Appendix B, The corpus, The English target text

be concentrated on the service of humanity. Only then will our Jerusalem resume its historic role as a peaceful shrine for all religions.

81. I appeal to you to enable our people to establish national independent sovereignty over its own land.

82. Today I have come bearing an olive branch and a freedom-fighter's gun. Do not let the olive branch fall from my hand. I repeat: do not let the olive branch fall from my hand.

83. War flares up in Palestine, and yet it is in Palestine that peace will be born.

## Appendix C

### System Arabica

International Transcription	Arabic Letters
‘	ء
b	ب
t	ت
ṭ	ط
ḡ	ج
ḥ	ح
ḥ̣	خ
d	د
ḏ	ذ
r	ر
z	ز
s	س
š	ش

Appendix C , System Arabica

s	ص
d	ض
t	ط
z	ظ
ʿ	ع
g	غ
f	ف
q	ق
k	ك
l	ل
m	م
n	ن
h	ه
w	و
y	ي

ä	ى
a	َ الفتحة
u	ُ الضمة
i	ِ الكسرة
ā	"ا" المد
an	َّ التنوين
un	ٌ التنوين
in	ٍ التنوين
at	ة

## Abstract

Our study, whose problematics discusses the consistency of the hermeneutic approach to meaning restitution in diplomatic translation, aims at explaining some discrepancies in translating some of the key concepts and terms, from English into Arabic, in Yasser Arafat's 1974 "olive branch speech" at the United Nations. The nub of the subject consists in applying GADAMER's typology of understanding and STEINER's hermeneutic motion to provide some explanations to the translator's decisions which might elucidate how he could endanger understanding or conciliate prejudiced ideological position and power imperatives by mutual understanding. Structured on three chapters, this study will focus on confirming the hypotheses that are all about the strategies of the translator to conciliate between ideological, power and cultural by dint the differences that exist between Arabic and English. The conclusions that are reached after minute analysis proved that diplomatic translation has some particular features which make it very responsible and risky, indeed. The hermeneutic approach seems to be the most appropriate for such kind of translations, namely when dealing with translating or analysing translations thus produced.

## ملخص

لقد ارتأينا من خلال بحثنا المطروح هذا ضمن إشكالية مدى تناسق المقاربة التأويلية (الهرمطيقا) مع نقل المعنى من خلال الترجمة الدبلوماسية كما يتجلى ذلك في تحليل بعض النماذج في ترجمة إدوارد سعيد لبعض المفاهيم و المصطلحات الواردة في نصه المترجم إلى اللغة الإنجليزية لخطاب ياسر عرفات أمام الجمعية العامة للأمم المتحدة عام 1974. و يتمثل صلب موضوعنا في تطبيق منهج الفهم التأويلي لـ (جاداما) و الحركة التأويلية (الهرمطيقا) لـ (ستاينر) في محاولة منا لشرح القرار الترجمي و إمكانية الإخلال بعملية التفاهم باعتبارها نظرية تقوم على مبدأ إيصال المعنى بتأويل الرسم أو النص. ضف إلى ذلك فهم كيفية التوفيق بين الإنحياز الأيديولوجي و ضرورة الحفاظ على موقف القوة دون المساس بمبدأ الحوار القائم على التفاهم المتبادل. و سنعمل على تطبيق هذا المنهج لنستخلص بعض الصعوبات التي يواجهها المترجم أثناء أدائه لمهامه. بعد عرض نظري للمبادئ التي تقوم عليها هذه المقاربة و طرحنا للإشكالية في فصلين متكاملين قمنا بدراسة تحليلية للأمثلة المقتبسة من المدونة سالفة الذكر في الفصل الثالث. و خلاصنا في خاتمة هذا البحث إلي نتيجة مفادها أن هنالك عدة عوامل تعترض المترجم منها الموضوعية و الذاتية. أما الموضوعية منها نذكر ميزان القوى و القابلية المسبقة للتداول و المفاهمة، و أما الذاتية منها نذكر القناعات الإيديولوجية للمترجم التي تأثر في نقل الرسالة. لذلك نرى أنه على المترجم أن يحاول إيجاد سبيل إلى التفاهم المتبادل عبر المبادئ المشتركة الراسخة في ثقافتنا اللغتين.