



Promoting critical debate and accountability of human rights NGOs in the Arab-Israeli conflict

Published in cooperation with the Wechsler Family Foundation

13 Tel Hai St.
Jerusalem, Israel 92107
Phone: +972-2-561-9281
Fax: +972-2-561-9112
mail@ngo-monitor.org
www.ngo-monitor.org

**NGO Monitor's Submission to the International Development Committee
Inquiry on Development Assistance and the Occupied Palestinian
Territories:**

International Development Committee
7 Millbank
London
SW1P 3JA

Email: indcom@parliament.uk

NGO Monitor
Beit Milkin, 13 Tel Hai St
Jerusalem
92107, Israel
steinberg@ngo-monitor.org
www.ngo-monitor.org

October 12, 2006

NGO Monitor was founded to promote critical debate and accountability of organizations that claim to encourage universal human rights and provide humanitarian assistance in the Arab-Israeli conflict zone. Our objective is to publish detailed analyses and reports on the activities of the NGO community, for the benefit of policy makers, journalists, philanthropic organizations and the general public. NGO Monitor has over 9000 subscribers to its weekly reports and monthly digests, and averages over 700 daily unique visits on its website.

NGO Monitor (www.ngo-monitor.org) has compiled this report specifically for the International Development Committee Inquiry on Development Assistance and the Occupied Palestinian Territories, although all the information presented is available in different forms on the NGO Monitor website.

Summary of NGO Monitor's Submission:

Development NGOs are playing an increasingly visible and large-scale interventionist role in complex conflicts and humanitarian crises, such as that between Israel and the Palestinians. Some of these NGOs, while engaged in genuine projects to enhance civil society, use development aid to exacerbate conflict rather than work towards an environment of non-violence and co-existence. Such activity undermines their own goals and those of their funding agencies, including government departments.

This report examines how funds given to two DFID-funded organizations, Christian Aid and the Palestinian Negotiation Support Unit (NSU), and three EU-funded NGOs, the Palestinian Centre for Human Rights (PCHR), the East Jerusalem YMCA, and the Israeli Committee Against House Demolitions (ICAHD) for development projects that build a sustainable Palestinian society and promote a two-state solution, has been diverted towards incitement and radical political advocacy. Funds from the UK have been invested in projects that do not promote the policy goals of the Quartet and directly contradict the funding guidelines of both the UK and the EU.

There is an urgent need to reconsider the transparency and mechanisms of accountability between NGOs and DFID. NGOs have the potential to respond productively to the dual humanitarian crises; Palestinian poverty and hardship, and Israel's exposure to terrorism. Yet this must be done in a framework that does not tolerate misuse of funds for incitement and rejectionism.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	NGO MONITOR MISSION STATEMENT	1
II.	INTRODUCTION	2
III.	THE NGO “INFORMATION CHAIN”	3
IV.	GOVERNMENT FUNDING OF NGOS	5
	A. An Overview of UK DFID Development Assistance to the Palestinians.	5
	B. An Overview of EU Funding to Palestinian NGOs	8
V.	PALESTINIAN DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE: UNDERMINING THE POLICY	
	OBJECTIVES OF DFID AND THE EU.....	9
	A. Christian Aid	9
	B. Palestinian Negotiations Support Unit	12
	C. Palestinian Centre for Human Rights	14
	D. East Jerusalem YMCA	16
	E. Israeli Coalition Against House Demolitions	17
VI.	CONCLUSION	18

I. NGO MONITOR MISSION STATEMENT

1. The community of non-governmental organizations has become extremely powerful and influential, particularly with respect to human rights and development issues in the Arab-Israeli conflict. Their reports, protests and lobbying activities have a dominant impact in shaping global attitudes and terms of reference.

2. Until recently, however, these NGOs, which receive significant financial support from generous donors, philanthropic institutions, and government budgets, have not themselves been subject to independent and critical analysis. NGO Monitor, therefore, was founded to promote accountability, and advance a vigorous discussion on the reports and activities of humanitarian NGOs in the framework of the Arab-Israeli conflict.

3. Unlike democratically elected governments or publicly traded companies, no systematic framework exists for holding NGOs to rigorous standards of accountability for the statements and reports they produce. In some situations, established NGOs that claim to pursue "universal humanitarian goals" enjoy immunity from detailed scrutiny or criticism. In other cases, the assumption that their motives are moral, and politically, as well as ideologically neutral, inhibits critical review.

4. The vast resources at the disposal of these self-proclaimed humanitarian NGOs allows for large staffs who produce an immense volume of reports, press releases and media interviews, turning them into primary sources for journalists, researchers, and government policy makers. The amplifying effect of these public pronouncements has often framed the terms of public discourse and strongly influences the crafting of policy. NGOs are in a dominant position, providing the supply to meet the demand for quick and focused information on what Prof. Irwin Cotler has called "the new secular religion of human rights".

5. However, as NGO Monitor has documented, established humanitarian NGOs often produce reports and launch campaigns that stand in sharp contradiction to their own mission statements claiming to uphold universal human rights values. They regularly obscure or remove the context of terrorism, provide incomplete statistics and images, and disseminate gross distortions of the humanitarian and human rights dimension of the Arab-Israeli conflict.

6. Following the September 2001 UN Conference on Racism in Durban, South Africa, many humanitarian/human rights NGOs adopted a concerted strategy to undermine Israel's legitimacy. They adopted the "Durban Strategy", using the lexicon of human rights to equate Israel with apartheid South Africa, and incorporate inflammatory rhetoric into their reporting such as the terms

Some NGOs propagate a selective morality, that is in sharp contradiction to universal human rights values.

“apartheid,” “ethnic cleansing,” “ghettos,” “Bantustans,” and “racist crimes.” These NGOs have also initiated boycott, sanctions and divestment campaigns against Israel in order to internationally isolate it.

7. The aim of NGO Monitor is to challenge these distortions and inflammatory rhetoric by providing information and analysis. By doing so, NGO Monitor seeks to foster a comprehensive and intellectually honest debate on the critical issues surrounding the Arab-Israeli conflict.

II. INTRODUCTION

8. The frequent and large-scale intervention by development NGOs in complex humanitarian crises, especially those that revolve around intense ethno-national conflicts, such as between Israel and the Palestinians, poses serious ethical dilemmas. First, the comparatively small group of self-selected and unaccountable NGOs engaging in humanitarian aid relief, ‘monitoring’, conflict resolution, advocacy and funding, has major political ramifications. Secondly, the constant flow of public campaigns, press mobilization and mass e-mailings has played a major role in fashioning the contemporary discourse on human rights, with little scrutiny of sources and wider contexts. NGO activities, therefore, have created a reality where humanitarian activism generates counterproductive outcomes in terms of the developmental and policy goals it aims to achieve.

9. Many governmental bodies involved in these issues believe that NGOs, free from electoral and profit considerations, are unencumbered by narrow political or economic interests and thus are in a good position to promote civil society.

10. However, NGOs can also be in a position to undermine their own goals and those of their funding agencies, including government departments. Some of these NGOs, while engaged in genuine projects to enhance civil society, use development aid to exacerbate conflict rather than work towards an environment of non-violence and co-existence.

11. We present below several representative examples of organizations that have received substantial funding from either the UK or the EU for the goals of alleviating poverty and promoting civil society in the Palestinian Authority. These organizations, however, have undertaken activities that exploit the moral or political authority of their donors and undermine the policy goals their funding is supposed to achieve. These examples are by no means exclusive. We have organized this analysis around three sections:

- The "NGO Information Chain."
- An overview of UK and EU development assistance to Palestinians.

NGOs have become a primary source on development issues, assuming an almost unquestioned authority.

- Specific examples of UK- and EU-funded NGOs that undermine the policy goals of both the UK and the EU.

III. "THE NGO INFORMATION CHAIN"

12. International NGOs, like many news agencies, tend to concentrate on conflict areas where information is plentiful and readily accessible. In this "information chain" it is important to make a distinction between international and local NGOs. Many international NGOs are UK-based, such as [Amnesty International](#),¹ [Oxfam](#)² and [Save the Children Fund](#).³ Although they have small on-the-ground teams, most of their information is garnered from other sources, mainly local NGOs. The information is then packaged on their websites, in press releases and disseminated through reports. Examples of local NGOs in the Palestinian Authority (PA) include [Miftah](#),⁴ [Palestinian Center for Human Rights \(PCHR\)](#),⁵ [Physicians for Human Rights—Israel \(PHR-I\)](#),⁶ [B'tselem](#),⁷ [Al-Haq](#),⁸ [Adalah](#)⁹ and [LAW](#).¹⁰ The relationship between the two is a determining factor in how human rights issues are reported across the world.

13. Local NGOs have many advantages, especially in terms of acquiring primary information. However, their disadvantages include a tendency to advocate agendas that reflect only one side of the conflict. They run the risk of losing perspective. Mary Anderson terms this phenomenon, "mandate blinders,"¹¹ manifested when NGOs gloss over the competing interests of the Palestinian population to live normal lives and the moral right of Israel to defend itself.

14. International NGOs often fail to acknowledge the limitations of local NGOs and grant them inordinate influence, assuming that a "grassroots" perspective, *ipso facto* is accurate and reliable. The information may indeed be accurate, but it can also be misleading because (as often happens in conflict reporting) it reflects a narrow approach that ignores wider dimensions.

"mandate blinders" - when NGOs gloss over the competing interests of the Palestinian population to live normal lives, and the moral right of Israel to defend itself.

¹ See <http://www.ngo-monitor.org/archives/infofile.htm#amnesty>

² See <http://www.ngo-monitor.org/archives/infofile.htm#oxfam>

³ See <http://www.ngo-monitor.org/archives/infofile.htm#save>

⁴ See <http://www.ngo-monitor.org/archives/infofile.htm#miftah>

⁵ See <http://www.ngo-monitor.org/archives/infofile.htm#pchr>

⁶ See <http://www.ngo-monitor.org/archives/infofile.htm#physicians>

⁷ See <http://www.ngo-monitor.org/archives/infofile.htm#Betselem>

⁸ See <http://www.ngo-monitor.org/archives/infofile.htm#al-haq>

⁹ See <http://www.ngo-monitor.org/archives/infofile.htm#adalah>

¹⁰ See <http://www.ngo-monitor.org/archives/infofile.htm#law>

¹¹ Mary B. Anderson, "Humanitarian NGOs in Conflict Intervention", in *Managing Global Chaos*, eds. Chester Crocker, Fen Hampson and Pamela Aall, (Washington, D.C.: United States Institute of Peace Press, 1996) at 343-4

15. This situation is often reinforced by self-serving information networks, such as the [Palestinian NGO Network \(PNGO\)](#).¹² Local NGOs have an interest in the UK-based NGOs picking up on their material to increase their funding prospects. The larger and more established NGOs readily use this material because it is from "grassroots" sources. Even in cases where international NGOs send in their own teams, they usually lack the necessary language and access to work independently. Instead, they rely on local teams to show them around and to "find" the right people to "confirm" particular versions of events.

16. Another explanation for the close cooperation between local and international NGOs is fear that a more neutral political approach by international NGOs could result in alienation of Palestinian organizations. Blacklisting would lead to a halt to the flow of information, with implications for visibility, power, and funding.

17. There is a high degree of interdependence between local and international NGOs, which in the long term has a negative impact on the free flow of human rights reporting. Writing in the *New York Times Magazine*, David Rieff emphasized the absence of democratic legitimacy in the human rights movement. "Human rights workers sometimes talk of their movement as an emblem of grassroots democracy. Yet it is possible to view it as an undemocratic pressure group, accountable to no one but its own members and donors, that wields enormous power and influence."¹³

18. Mary Anderson points out how foreign aid workers can become unwittingly intertwined with the very forces that drive conflicts. Many of those engaged in aid work in the Palestinian territories include in their definition of aid blocking the path of tanks, using their bodies to prevent house demolitions and turning themselves into human shields. Foreign passports become a form of shield in the belief that no soldier will attack for fear of media and diplomatic repercussions. This has led to several tragic incidents.¹⁴

19. Many international NGOs are not aware of the full complexity of the humanitarian crisis in the Middle East and, as Rieff observed have become pawns of their own "human rights agendas."¹⁵ In many cases, therefore, NGOs become so committed to "predetermined conclusions" that fit their agendas that "[they] refuse[] to let the facts, as reported by objective sources, get in [their] way."¹⁶ Undemocratic NGOs are therefore contributing to a process promoting

¹² See <http://www.ngo-monitor.org/archives/infofile.htm#pngo>

¹³ Rieff, David "The Precarious Triumph of Human Rights", *New York Times Magazine*, August 8, 1999.

¹⁴ One example is the tragic death of Rachel Corrie, an American aid worker who placed herself in front of a bulldozer destroying the house of a known suicide bomber.

¹⁵ Rieff, *Bed for the Night*, Introduction.

¹⁶ Allan Dershowitz, "First Word: What is Human Rights Watch Watching?" *The Jerusalem Post*, August 24, 2006, available at <http://www.jpost.com/servlet/Satellite?apage=1&cid=1154525938961&pagename=JPost%2FJPA>

absolutist perspectives on events and norms of behavior with little accountability in their own activities or methodologies.

IV. GOVERNMENT FUNDING FOR NGOS

20. Governmental funding, such as that from DFID, plays a key role in supporting the activities of both local and international NGOs. Such funding empowers organizations to influence the course of conflict as they see fit, regardless of whether these activities are consistent with the objectives and policies of their donors. Unaccountable to anyone but themselves, such NGOs effectively become additional political actors within a state.

21. Government aid, particularly from the EU and its constituent members, funds many highly political NGO campaigns. While governments are very careful about financial propriety and the need for an annual report, NGOs engaged in advocacy are not called upon to explain and justify their agendas, tactics, or political objectives or how their activities complement government policies. As a result, in areas in which the NGOs and their allies play a dominant role, as in the interaction between human rights/development issues and international politics, there is a risk that sensitive policy decisions are made without proper checks and balances.

22. This section provides a brief overview of DFID and EU development aid to the Palestinians. Section V examines five such organizations in depth and highlights the problems created when NGOs are the recipients of large amounts of development assistance with little oversight or public accountability. For further information on all EU and DFID funded NGOs, see www.ngo-monitor.org

A. An Overview of UK DFID Development Assistance to the Palestinians

23. The Department for International Development (DFID) distributes aid to the Palestinians in three ways: through direct assistance via Partnership Programme Agreements (PPAs); bilaterally to countries via Country Assistance Plans (CAPs); and through multilateral organizations such as the EU and the World Bank

24. DFID has financially significant [PPAs](#)¹⁷ with a number of British NGOs that operate in the Middle East, including [Oxfam](#)¹⁸ (£20m¹⁹ since 2001),

[rticle%2FShowFull](#). See also Joshua Muravchik, "Human Rights Watch vs. Human Rights," *The Weekly Standard*, September 11, 2006, Volume 011, Issue 48, available at, <http://www.weeklystandard.com/Content/Public/Articles/000/000/012/649efea.asp>, for a history of how an NGO's agenda can interfere with its reporting honestly on human rights issues.

¹⁷ <http://www.dfid.gov.uk/aboutdfid/dfidwork/ppas/partnerprogagreements.asp>

¹⁸ See <http://www.ngo-monitor.org/archives/infofile.htm#oxfam>

Some DFID-funded NGOs are linked to divestment campaigns and boycotts of Israel.

[Christian Aid](#)²⁰ (£13.6m²¹ 2001-2005 and £5m p.a. 2006-2009) and the [Overseas Development Institute \(ODI\)](#)²² (£0.8m²³ since 2004). These PPAs last an average of 3-5 years and “funding is unrestricted, which means that [DFID] do not require partners to account for the expenditure in their accounts. Neither do [they] ‘stipulate’ how the funds are spent or allocated by the partners in support of their strategic programmes”.

25. Although these PPAs and other programs under DFID are justified as promoting development and peace, the activities are not consistent with such claims. For example and as will be discussed in greater detail below, Christian Aid's activities related to the Palestinian-Israel conflict [have been shown](#) to be systematically political in nature, without visible impact on humanitarian and development goals. UK government funding for [Christian Aid](#) also filters through to radical Palestinian and anti-Israel partner NGOs, such as [LAW, Sabeel](#),²⁴ the [Palestinian Center for Human Rights \(PCHR\)](#), [Adalah](#), [Physicians for Human Rights - Israel](#), and the [Union of Palestinian Medical Relief Committees](#).²⁵ In 2005 DFID agreed to [a new PPA with Christian Aid](#) worth £5m per year for the next 3 years again with no restrictions on how the money will be spent.²⁶ The department has also renewed and increased its funding commitment with Oxfam, an NGO with a history of political attacks on Israel, and a supporter of extremist Palestinian NGOs such as [Badil](#).²⁷

26. PPAs with organizations that are active in promoting one-sided political agendas directly contradict DFID's goals of providing development assistance for poverty relief. Such assistance requires an internal focus on assisting Palestinian development rather than externally directed agendas based on demonization of Israel. Such NGOs ignore local Palestinian causes of poverty such as leadership corruption, and therefore further impede their capacity for self help. This negates a key aim of DFID which is to “[reduce how much \[a\] country relies on overseas aid](#).”²⁸

27. Through their support of radical Palestinian NGOs such as Sabeel, some DFID-funded NGOs are linked to divestment campaigns and boycotts of Israel. DFID is therefore helping to fuel attempts to isolate Israel internationally, an objective in direct opposition to [British Government](#) policy, which “believes that

¹⁹ <http://www.dfid.gov.uk/pubs/files/Oxfam-ppa.pdf> and <http://www.dfid.gov.uk/aboutdfid/dfidwork/ppas/oxfam-ppa-outside.asp>

²⁰ See <http://www.ngo-monitor.org/archives/infofile.htm#christai>

²¹ <http://www.dfid.gov.uk/pubs/files/ppa/christian-aid-ppa.pdf> and <http://www.dfid.gov.uk/aboutdfid/dfidwork/ppas/christianaid-ppa.asp>

²² See <http://www.ngo-monitor.org/editions/v4n03/www.ODI.org.uk>

²³ <http://www.dfid.gov.uk/pubs/files/overseasdevinstitute-ppa.pdf>

²⁴ See <http://www.ngo-monitor.org/archives/infofile.htm#sabeel>

²⁵ See <http://www.ngo-monitor.org/archives/infofile.htm#upmrc>

²⁶ <http://www.dfid.gov.uk/aboutdfid/dfidwork/ppas/christianaid-ppa.asp>

²⁷ See [http://www.ngo-](http://www.ngo-monitor.org/editions/v3n06/NGOPromotePalestinianPositionOnRefugeesPart2.htm)

[monitor.org/editions/v3n06/NGOPromotePalestinianPositionOnRefugeesPart2.htm](http://www.ngo-monitor.org/editions/v3n06/NGOPromotePalestinianPositionOnRefugeesPart2.htm)

²⁸ <http://www.dfid.gov.uk/aboutdfid>

"DFID PPA funding is unrestricted, which means that [DFID] do not require partners to account for the expenditure in their accounts."

... constructive engagement with Israel is the best approach to exert influence on it.”²⁹

28. DFID also funds Palestinian NGOs directly through its “[Country Assistance Plan](#)” (CAP).³⁰ The department’s total funding commitment to the Palestinians was raised from £25m to £40m in 2005/6, due to “the increasing poverty existent within Palestinian Society.” This included £1,201,904 for the highly politicized [Union of Palestinian Medical Relief Committees](#)³¹ and “a large amount ... to the Palestinian Negotiation Support Unit,” (see below).

29. The CAP budget also describes £400,000 given to “small community based projects,” which were found to include [support](#) for the radical Palestinian Network, PNGO and Palestinian Federation Women’s Action Committees,³² both of which promote boycott and divestment campaigns. Other disbursements from this fund included \$3,000 (£1,700) to the [Ramallah Centre for Human Rights Studies](#), an NGO that “aims at spreading the culture of human rights, democracy, equality and tolerance”³³, but uses its platform to accuse Israel of “[terrorist \[sic\] crimes](#),”³⁴ “kill[ing] hundreds of disarmed civilians and commit[ing] new massacres” and making children the “[sacrifice for the racial hatred](#).”³⁵

30. In its Country Assistance Plan for the Palestinian Authority, the DFID states: “We will maintain a poverty perspective in all we do, and will press the partners we fund to specifically target... the poorest Palestinians.” As the examples below will demonstrate, large amounts of this funding are not being used to combat poverty or facilitate internal development of Palestinian society. Instead, DFID funds are financing UK charities’ anti-Israel campaigning and are filtering through to radical Palestinian NGOs whose primary goals are to demonize Israel.³⁶

31. The third way DFID provides development aid to the Palestinians is through multilateral organizations and programmes. The European Community’s Development Programme received the largest amount of [DFID multilateral assistance](#) (£898m), followed by the World Bank (£206m) and the United

²⁹ <http://www.parliament.the-stationery-office.co.uk/pa/cm200304/cmselect/cmintdev/487/487.pdf>

³⁰ <http://www.dfid.gov.uk/pubs/files/cappalestine.pdf>

³¹ See <http://www.ngo-monitor.org/archives/infofile.htm#upmrc>

³² <http://www.ngo-monitor.org/editions/v4n05/DFIDUpdate.htm>

³³ http://www.rchrs.org/about_en.html

³⁴ <http://www.rchrs.org/press/invasion.html>

³⁵ <http://www.rchrs.org/press/naqba.html>

³⁶ The Israeli group, Peace Now, is beyond the remit of NGO Monitor as it is an openly political NGO. However DFID’s considerable support of this NGO (£214,343 between 2003 and 2007) represents a highly contentious funding decision – Peace Now plays a clear role in internal Israeli politics, and some of its leaders are also party officials. This funding therefore means that the UK is an active player in domestic Israeli politics. www.ngo-monitor.org/images/dfid_funding.pdf

"DFID funds are .. filtering through to radical Palestinian NGOs whose primary goals are to demonize Israel."

Nations (£194m).³⁷ Total DFID contributions to the EU's [development programmes](#) in 2004/5 were £898,239,000.³⁸ A further £272,250,000 was provided to EU development programmes by other government departments. The following section outlines EU financial assistance to Palestinian NGOs in greater detail.

B. An Overview of EU Funding to Palestinian NGOs

32. In 2005, [European Union \(EU\) external aid totaled €10.4 billion](#).³⁹ Of this, €7.5 billion was disbursed through the [Europe Aid Cooperation Office \(AIDCO\)](#), an office of the European Commission.⁴⁰ In 2005, [the EU gave €279 million to the Palestinian Authority](#),⁴¹ making it the largest single contributor of international aid to the Palestinians.⁴² A significant proportion of this money is channeled through NGOs, humanitarian aid and development organizations as well as to groups claiming to promote human rights.

33. EU funding for Palestinian NGOs must meet certain guidelines, as specified in the [National Financing Plan 2004 for the West Bank and Gaza](#).⁴³ This document states that the EU should support “local and international civil society initiatives which promote peace, tolerance and non-violence” and “ideas...for achieving the two-state solution.” It goes on to state that the program aims to promote initiatives which entail “less politicized, more practical activities which will promote communication and understanding.” These guidelines are breached by the EU's support of a number of highly politicized Palestinian NGOs.

34. There are several different EU bodies involved in disbursing development funds and the processes involved in funding the NGOs are difficult to trace. One of the principal EU bodies responsible for financing Israeli and Palestinian NGOs is the European Initiative for Democracy and Human Rights (EIDHR). EIDHR is an important branch of AIDCO and aims to “promote and support human rights and democracy.” In 2004, EIDHR [had a budget of €125 million](#).⁴⁴ The other main source of EU funding to NGOs in the region is the Partnership for Peace Programme (PfPP). The EU Technical Assistance Office for the West Bank and Gaza Strip states that [in 2004 the PfPP received €7.5million](#).⁴⁵

35. Among others, the EU funds the following radical Palestinian NGOs that allegedly work on promoting development of Palestinian Civil Society but rather

³⁷ <http://www.dfid.gov.uk/pubs/files/sid2005/key-stats.pdf>

³⁸ <http://www.dfid.gov.uk/pubs/files/sid2005/table-16.pdf>

³⁹ http://ec.europa.eu/comm/europeaid/promotion3/know/knowlist_en.htm

⁴⁰ http://ec.europa.eu/comm/europeaid/index_en.htm

⁴¹ http://ec.europa.eu/comm/external_relations/gaza/intro/index.htm#2.3

⁴² http://ec.europa.eu/comm/external_relations/mepp/index.htm

⁴³ http://www.delwbg.ec.europa.eu/en/cooperatio_development/plan2004.pdf

⁴⁴ http://ec.europa.eu/comm/europeaid/projects/eidhr/eidhr_en.htm

⁴⁵ http://www.delwbg.ec.europa.eu/en/cooperatio_development/aid2004.htm

In 2005, the EU gave €279 million to the Palestinian Authority, making it the largest single contributor of international aid to the Palestinians.

promote highly politicized anti-Israel agendas that in turn exacerbates the Israeli-Palestinian conflict: the [Euro-Mediterranean Human Rights Network](#) (EMHRN),⁴⁶ MIFTAH, PCHR, the [Israeli Committee Against House Demolitions](#) (ICHAD),⁴⁷ the [East Jerusalem YMCA](#),⁴⁸ [Adalah](#), and the [Treatment and Rehabilitation Center for Victims of Torture](#).⁴⁹

V. PALESTINIAN DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE: UNDERMINING THE POLICY OBJECTIVES OF DFID AND THE EU

36. This section examines how money given to two DFID-funded organizations, Christian Aid and the Palestinian Negotiation Support Unit (NSU), and three EU-funded NGOs, the PCHR, the East Jerusalem YMCA, and ICAHD, is being spent. The funds are ostensibly to work on development projects that build a sustainable Palestinian society and promote a two-state solution, but have been diverted towards incitement and political campaigning of rejectionist positions. Such projects do not promote the goals of the Quartet and directly contradict the funding guidelines of both the UK and the EU. These examples are representative and by no means exclusive.

A. Christian Aid

37. As mentioned in section IV, Christian Aid has received £18.6m from DFID since 2001. Christian Aid's stated [purpose](#) is "to expose the scandal of poverty, to help in practical ways to root it out from the world, and to challenge and change the systems which favour the rich and powerful over the poor and marginalized."⁵⁰ Christian Aid seeks "to build a global movement which can change the course of history."⁵¹ In carrying out its revolutionary objectives, Christian Aid's public campaigns often ignore the complexity and sensitivity of the Arab-Israeli conflict and the core causes of poverty in the Middle East, while promoting anti-Israel propaganda. Christian Aid does perform some humanitarian projects on behalf of the Palestinian people and has provided employment, training and assistance to many. Its humanitarian work, however, is entirely undermined by its highly distorted and politicized anti-Israeli activities which directly contradict the policy goals of the DFID and the British Government. NGO Monitor has [documented](#)⁵² Christian Aid's consistent political agenda and the extremist activities of its partner NGOs, and provides several examples here:

⁴⁶ See http://www.ngo-monitor.org/archives/infofile/emhrn_091006.html; <http://www.ngo-monitor.org/archives/infofile.htm#euro>

⁴⁷ See <http://www.ngo-monitor.org/archives/infofile.htm#icahd>

⁴⁸ See <http://www.ngo-monitor.org/archives/infofile.htm#ymca>

⁴⁹ <http://www.trc-pal.org/etemplate.php?id=21>

⁵⁰ <http://www.christian-aid.org.uk/aboutca/who/value.htm>

⁵¹ *Id.*

⁵² <http://www.ngo-monitor.org/archives/infofile.htm#christaid>

Christian Aid's public campaigns often ignore the complexity and sensitivity of the conflict and the core causes of poverty in the Middle East, while promoting anti-Israel propaganda.

- Christian Aid regularly erases context in order to demonize Israel’s responses to terror. In October 2003, Christian Aid produced a [fundraising film](#) entitled “Peace Under Siege” claiming to depict the “roots of Palestinian poverty.” In practice, the 20-minute documentary condemned Israeli military operations while giving only a four-second general introduction on suicide bombings.⁵³ “Facts on the ground: The end of the two-state solution?” places [full blame](#) on Israel for the deterioration of the Palestinian economy while giving scant attention to the impact of Palestinian violence, terrorism, and corruption.⁵⁴
- Christian Aid has employed anti-Semitic imagery in its campaigns on behalf of the Palestinians. In its Christmas 2004 [appeal](#) “Child of Bethlehem”,⁵⁵ Christian Aid concentrated on the story of a seven-year old Palestinian girl living in Bethlehem who was “hit in the eye by shrapnel from a bullet fired by Israeli soldiers.” Using the links between the town of Bethlehem and Christianity during the Christmas period, Christian Aid connected the suffering of Palestinian Christian children with that of Jesus, who was born in Bethlehem, and to centuries of anti-Semitism and blood libels against the Jewish people.
- Christian Aid promotes boycott and divestment campaigns via its partner NGOs and officials. Christian Aid’s Chair [Bishop Gladwin](#) has been extremely vocal in promoting calls for divestment, and was a key proponent of the Church of England Synod’s vote for ["morally responsible investment \(MRI\)"](#) on February 6, 2006.⁵⁶ Gladwin’s positions in Christian Aid, on the Synod and as patron of UK friends of [Sabeel](#) seem to make him the conduit of radical NGO pressure on the Anglican Church. Sabeel is the extremist Palestinian NGO that is leading the international campaign for MRI, and is also one of Christian Aid’s [partner NGOs](#). Sabeel’s divestment campaign in the US Presbyterian Church was rejected in a June 2006 vote that repealed its [2004 resolution](#). However, Christian Aid’s close cooperation with Sabeel has continued.
- Christian Aid supports radical Palestinian NGOs. In addition to its patronage of Sabeel, Christian Aid also lists the following NGO ["partners"](#) on its website:⁵⁷ [Adalah](#), Alternative Information Center (AIC), [B’Tselem](#), [EAPPI](#), [ICAHD](#), [Ittijah](#), [PARC](#), [PCHR](#), [PHR-I](#), [Sabeel](#), [UPMRC](#), [YMCA](#) East Jerusalem and others. The relationship between these NGOs and Christian Aid is unclear, although both the [Alternative Information Center](#) and [PCHR](#) include Christian Aid as a donor in their financial statements. The vast majority of these NGOs promote the Durban Strategy of accusing Israel of “apartheid,” “ethnic cleansing,” and “crimes against humanity,” while at the same time engaging in campaigns

Christian Aid's Chair Bishop Gladwin has been extremely vocal in promoting calls for divestment.

⁵³ <http://www.ngo-monitor.org/editions/v2n03/v2n03-2.htm>

⁵⁴ <http://www.ngo-monitor.org/editions/v3n02/ResponsetoChristianAidReport.htm>

⁵⁵ http://www.christianaid.org.uk/christmas/worship_resources/chmag.htm

⁵⁶ <http://www.timesonline.co.uk/article/0,,2-2028504,00.html>

⁵⁷ <http://www.christian-aid.org.uk/world/partlinks.htm#meecca>

to isolate Israel internationally. NGO Monitor has documented in detail the radical bias and politicized approach of a number of these NGOs.

38. Despite [promises](#) to the UK Chief Rabbi of a new direction in its work on the Israeli-Palestinian conflict,⁵⁸ there has been little evidence of change in Christian's Aid's approach or abuse of its charitable status to promote a radical political agenda. While the volume of anti-Israel material going far beyond legitimate criticism decreased in 2005, publications continue to portray an extreme one-sided view that ignores Palestinian corruption and terrorism, and demonizes Israel. The links between Hamas, which took power following elections in January, and terrorism, are largely erased, as is Hamas' commitment to the destruction of Israel. At the same time, Christian Aid continues to cooperate with the discredited NGO Sabeel and other groups, which promote divestment and boycotts of Israel:

- In February 2006, Christian Aid issued a press release regarding one of its projects in the region - a handicraft cooperative. Its title, "[We even left our key in the door,](#)" and the first 3 of 11 paragraphs of the release repeat Palestinian refugee claims. The Palestinian interviewed in this report describes the 1948 Israeli army as "the occupiers," ignoring the historical record and rejecting the legitimacy of the Jewish State even within pre-1967 borders.⁵⁹ This Palestinian narrative is a central element in the continuation of the conflict, and Christian Aid's promotion of such rhetoric therefore contributes to the ongoing dispute.
- In May 2006, Christian Aid produced a briefing paper for submission to the UK parliament, and a press release opposing the EU and UK decision to freeze funding to the Hamas-led PA. The [release stated](#)⁶⁰ that "Christian Aid squarely accuses the Israeli government of a policy of collective punishment against Palestinian civilians, which is illegal under international law and grossly immoral by any measure of decent, humane behaviour." Christian Aid made no mention that aid was cut off because of Hamas' central role in terror, and its refusal to accept the demands of the Quartet to renounce violence, to recognize Israel, and to recognize Israeli-Palestinian agreements.
- Christian Aid's June 28, 2006, news report entitled "[Gaza invasion targets civilian infrastructure](#)",⁶¹ was published after the June 25 cross-border attack that killed two Israeli soldiers and led to the kidnapping of a third. Christian Aid condemned Israel's "military

⁵⁸ <http://www.ngo-monitor.org/archives/news/SacksToVet.htm>

⁵⁹ <http://www.christianaid.org.uk/world/where/meeca/partners/0603iopt.htm>

⁶⁰ <http://www.christianaid.org.uk/news/media/pressrel/060509p1.htm>

⁶¹ <http://www.christian-aid.org.uk/news/stories/060628s.htm>

Promotion of the Palestinian narrative is a central element in the continuation of the conflict.

invasion and siege on a civilian population," making no mention of terrorism (except in a subtitle referring to "militants") and blaming the "humanitarian crisis" entirely on Israel. In the report, William Bell, Christian Aid's senior policy officer responsible for Israel and the Palestinian territories, states "the message to the civilian population of Gaza could not be clearer - collective punishment is part of Israel's military strategy." The term "collective punishment" reflects demonization of Israel, and the report made no mention of the barrage of Qassam rockets that were terrorizing Israeli communities prior to the Hamas incursion.

- Christian Aid's publications during the 2006 Lebanon War almost entirely focused on suffering by the Lebanese and rarely mentioned the thousands of Katyusha attacks launched against Israeli citizens. Its "[September Worship Package](#),"⁶² for instance, includes pictures showing damage in Lebanon and Gaza from Israeli military strikes, but shows no images of the war's impact on Israel. The September "Reflection" and magazine article make no mention of the thousands of Hezbollah rockets that fell on Israel or the hundreds of thousands of Israelis displaced by the conflict.

The NSU has focused its energies on advocacy activities that further the division between the Palestinians and the Israelis.

39. The aim of Christian Aid's campaigns and publications is to reinforce the image of Israel as the aggressor and the Palestinians as defenseless victims, while ignoring Palestinian terror, violence and corruption, and manipulating the language of international law to demonize Israel.

B. Palestinian Negotiations Support Unit

40. DFID's funding of the Palestinian Negotiation Support Unit (NSU) is also highly problematic. DFID's [stated mission](#) is to "support[] long-term programmes to help tackle the underlying causes of poverty."⁶³ The [NSU](#), however, is a political framework established in 1998 to "provide highly professional legal, policy and communications advice to the PLO Negotiations Affairs Department and Palestinian negotiators in preparation for, and during Permanent Status negotiations with Israel."⁶⁴ Since the cessation of formal peace talks, the NSU has focused its energies on advocacy activities that further the division between the Palestinians and the Israelis: The NSU Communications Department "aims to explain and increase support for the Palestinian positions on permanent status issues and interim initiatives, [and] to mobilize local and international civil society organizations to undertake advocacy on behalf of those

⁶² <http://www.christian-aid.org.uk/worship/609middleeast/index.htm>

⁶³ <http://www.dfid.gov.uk/aboutdfid/missionstatement.asp>

⁶⁴ http://www.nad-plo.org/inner.php?view=nav_about-us Once DFID funding was approved, the governments of Norway, Denmark, Sweden, and the Netherlands also provided funding.

positions . . .”⁶⁵ The NSU was instrumental in bringing the issue of the security barrier to the International Court of Justice at The Hague and is an integral part of Palestinian propaganda.⁶⁶ The extreme bias and vilification of Israel [on the NSU website](#) demonstrates that DFID funds (£1.5m 2004/05) intended for development projects to eradicate poverty are being spent on spreading inflammatory rhetoric.⁶⁷

- The NSU’s “[fact sheets](#)”⁶⁸ utilize the demonization rhetoric of the Durban strategy to present its positions. Jewish settlements are categorically referred to as “colonies.” Rather than constructively discussing the Israeli settlements and the Palestinian position in negotiations, the NSU utilizes its resources to assert that these settlements constitute “war crimes.” Israeli checkpoints designed to prevent Palestinian terror attacks are said to “highlight Israeli Apartheid” and Palestinians are said to be “caged” in “isolated ghettos” or “open-air prisons” in the West Bank.
- The NSU drastically misrepresents the history of the Palestinian-Israeli conflict. For instance, in a discussion on the status of Jerusalem, the group [states](#) that in 1948, “Israel ignored the [UN] Partition Plan and invaded and occupied 84% of Jerusalem.”⁶⁹ A [map](#) posted on the NSU site to reflect the division of territory after the 1948 War is entitled “1949 Land Grab for the Jewish State.”⁷⁰ This map demarks Israeli land after the war that was not part of the UN Partition Plan as “Proposed Arab State Territory Grabbed by Israel.” These statements are gross revisions of history – they ignore Arab [rejection](#) of the 1947 UN Partition Plan and the massive military invasion that followed.
- In its [section](#) on “Frequently Asked Questions” regarding the “Israeli Wall”, the NSU ignores Israel’s security concerns in building the “separation barrier,” and instead claims, “Israel’s strategy continues to be to take as much Palestinian land as possible while militarily encaging as many Palestinians as possible, all in an attempt to continue Israel’s colonization and theft of Palestinian territory.”⁷¹

*The NSU
drastically
misrepresents
the history of
the
Palestinian-
Israeli
conflict.*

⁶⁵ *Id.*

⁶⁶ Daniel Schwammenthal, "[The PLO's European Paymasters](#)", *Wall Street Journal Europe*, 2 March 2004, A12

⁶⁷ According to the NSU website, funding from DFID was scheduled to end in August 2006 at which time funding renewal will be addressed.

⁶⁸ <http://www.nad-plo.org/listing.php?view=facts>

⁶⁹ http://www.nad-plo.org/inner.php?view=facts_jerusalem_f9p

⁷⁰ <http://www.nad-plo.org/maps/borders/pdf/1949.pdf>

⁷¹ http://www.nad-plo.org/inner.php?view=facts_wall_isf

- In its “[fact sheet](#)” on alleged violations of the Oslo Agreements by Israel and in discussing Israeli military actions, the NSU makes no mention of suicide bombers, Qassam rocket attacks, shootings, kidnappings, or other acts of violence perpetrated by Palestinians.⁷²

41. The NSU received DFID funds to advocate a “two-state solution” based on peace and co-existence. Instead, the NSU promotes inflammatory rhetoric meant to demonize Israel. Such demonization is not enhancing Palestinian civil society, nor is it preparing the Palestinians for living peaceably with Israelis.

C. PCHR

42. This EU-funded NGO was founded in 1995 by Palestinian lawyers and human rights activists, and is now headed by Raji Sourani. It holds Special Consultative Status with the [Economic and Social Council](#) (ECOSOC) of the United Nations and is an affiliate of the [International Commission of Jurists](#)⁷³ (in May 2006 [Sourani was elected to the ICJ executive](#)),⁷⁴ the [Fédération Internationale des Ligues des Droits de l'Homme](#) (FIDH),⁷⁵ and the [Euro-Mediterranean Human Rights Network](#). These forums provide PCHR with international legitimacy and exposure and Sourani often uses these forums to denounce Israeli policies of “[torture, annexation of Jerusalem, ethnic cleansing, assassinations, house demolitions, and the Annexation Wall as war crimes](#).”⁷⁶ According to its [Annual Financial Report](#) for 2004, the most current financial information available from the PCHR, it received nearly two million dollars from international donors including [Oxfam Novib](#) (Netherlands), the [European Commission](#), [International Commission of Jurists](#) (Sweden), [Christian Aid](#) (UK), and others.⁷⁷

43. PCHR does devote resources on its web site to documenting human rights abuses within the PA. A special report “[Front Line Palestine](#),” though focused on alleged human rights abuses committed by Israel, also documents “the appalling human rights record of the Palestinian National Authority,” including abuses committed against journalists and women.⁷⁸ PCHR’s website contains sections on the [PLC Election January](#) 2006, which documents Palestinian attempts to achieve democratic rule;⁷⁹ and [Security Chaos and Misuse of Weapons](#), which frequently comments on the intra-Palestinian violence.⁸⁰ Unfortunately, PCHR

⁷² http://www.nad-plo.org/inner.php?view=nego_nego_f16p

⁷³ See <http://www.ngo-monitor.org/archives/infofile.htm#jurists>

⁷⁴ <http://www.pchrgaza.org/files/PressR/English/2006/news/20-2006.htm>

⁷⁵ http://www.ngo-monitor.org/archives/infofile/fidh_280906.html

⁷⁶ <http://www.pchrgaza.org/files/PressR/English/2006/news/20-2006.htm>

⁷⁷ http://www.pchrgaza.org/files/Reports/English/pdf_annual/pchr_fs_2004-Englisn.pdf

⁷⁸ http://www.pchrgaza.org/files/Reports/English/pdf_spec/Palestine%20Report.pdf

⁷⁹ <http://www.pchrgaza.org/Library/election2006.htm>

⁸⁰ <http://www.pchrgaza.org/files/weapon/english/weapon.htm>

PCHR has made no call for Palestinian armed groups to reject violence in external disputes and to avoid harming Israeli civilians.

has made no similar call for Palestinian armed groups to reject violence in external disputes and to avoid harming Israeli civilians.

44. While PCHR's considerable activities documenting human rights abuses under the PA are commendable, this NGO undermines the goals of the UK and the EU by ignoring the context of terrorism and promoting the Durban Strategy. The following examples are illustrative:

- PCHR frequently uses politically charged language and selectively applies human rights concepts to demonize Israel and promote a rejectionist narrative. In its "[Welcome to Gaza](#)" fact sheet, PCHR accuses Israel of committing "war crimes," "ethnic cleansing" of Palestinians, and "apartheid." The fact sheet states that Israel has a "policy of assassinating Palestinian civilians."⁸¹ It describes "the massive destruction in Jenin and Nablus during Israel's April 2002 military offensive in the West Bank" but erases the context, the 2002 Passover bombing in Netanya. In the fact sheet, PCHR employs legal terminology to condemn Israel, such as: "the extensive, unlawful and wanton destruction or expropriation of property not justified by military necessity is a war crime under the Fourth Geneva Convention," while discrediting all Israeli claims of military necessity.
- In a [June 28, 2006 press release](#), PCHR refers to the "military operation conducted by the Palestinian resistance" in which Palestinians attacked Kerem Shalom crossing and abducted an Israeli soldier.⁸² The press release calls on the international community to pressure Israel to open Gaza crossings, but does not condemn the illegal abduction, call for the soldier's release, or call for him to be treated humanely as required by the Geneva Convention. In an additional example of PCHR's biased perspective, a [June 2006 press release](#) about the Gaza beach deaths of a Palestinian family relies on [controversial media footage](#) and states that "the crime had been perpetrated with a premeditated intent to kill."⁸³ (The IDF has produced [extensive evidence](#)⁸⁴ that it was not responsible for this incident, and the cause remains unclear.).
- PCHR does not attempt to address the human rights implications of Palestinian terrorism. Indeed it frequently refers to Palestinian terrorists as "[activists](#)"⁸⁵ or as "[members of the resistance](#)."⁸⁶

PCHR frequently uses politically charged language and selectively applies human rights concepts to demonize Israel and promote a rejectionist narrative.

⁸¹ [http://www.pchrgaza.org/facts_copy\(1\).htm](http://www.pchrgaza.org/facts_copy(1).htm)

⁸² <http://www.pchrgaza.org/files/PressR/English/2006/62-2006.htm>

⁸³ <http://www.pchrgaza.org/files/PressR/English/2006/56-2006.htm>

⁸⁴ <http://www1.idf.il/DOVER/site/mainpage.asp?clr=1&sl=EN&id=7&docid=53169>

⁸⁵ <http://www.pchrgaza.org/files/PressR/English/2006/56-2006.htm>

⁸⁶ <http://www.pchrgaza.org/Interventions/Security%20th%20Wall.pdf>

- PCHR engages in political activity based on the [Durban strategy](#) of delegitimizing and isolating Israel through boycotts and sanctions. In a February 2002 [statement to the UN Human Rights Commission](#), PCHR called on the international community to commit to "the imposition of comprehensive arms, oil, economic and trade sanctions and embargoes (with the exception of medical food and other humanitarian supplies), the downgrading or suspension of diplomatic relations," and asked the UN "to exclude Israel from all UN-sponsored conferences and organizations."⁸⁷
- PCHR participated in a [May 2006 international conference](#) calling for "an unprecedented mobilization of the international movement of solidarity with the Palestinian people" through "sanctions . . . to pressure the state of Israel."⁸⁸

D. East Jerusalem YMCA

45. In 2005, the Europe Aid Cooperation Office (AIDCO) provided €500,000 to the [East Jerusalem YMCA](#)⁸⁹ for its [Vocational Training Program](#).⁹⁰ This program provides education in various fields including construction, plumbing, auto-mechanics and computing among others. Money is fungible however, and AIDCO's support of this program lends legitimacy and publicity to this extremely politicized NGO as a whole. In addition to its educational programs, this branch of the YMCA [promotes the Boycott, Divestment, Sanctions Campaign against Israel](#)⁹¹ and has also [signed a petition calling for an academic boycott of Israel](#).⁹² The East Jerusalem YMCA is also [a member of the Middle East NGO umbrella network MENGOS](#) which publishes politicized attacks against Israel on its website.⁹³

46. Another of East Jerusalem YMCA's major programs is its [Advocacy program](#).⁹⁴ This program conducts a number of campaigns including the "[Free Palestine Campaign](#)," which aims, on an international level, to "raise awareness among organizations and individuals concerning the injustice and oppression to which Palestinians are subjected"⁹⁵ An "explanation" of the campaign's "[theological roots](#)" employs classic anti-Semitic imagery. The program's description says that "Jesus was crucified with the people who were branded as

⁸⁷ <http://domino.un.org/unispal.NSF/2ee9468747556b2d85256cf60060d2a6/cef82f78e9157ab985256b89006c046a!OpenDocument>

⁸⁸ http://www.urgencepalestine.ch/Activites/conference2006_en.html

⁸⁹ See <http://www.ngo-monitor.org/archives/infofile.htm#ymca>

⁹⁰ Document provided to NGO Monitor by the EC Technical Assistance Office for the West Bank and Gaza Strip

⁹¹ <http://www.jai-pal.org/content.php?page=173>

⁹² <http://www.al-awda.org/academicboycott.html>

⁹³ See <http://www.ngo-monitor.org/archives/infofile.htm#mengos>

⁹⁴ <http://www.ej-ymca.org/site/Display-Cat.cfm?CatId=16&Main=2>

⁹⁵ <http://www.ej-ymca.org/site/Display-Sub.cfm?SubID=7>

East Jerusalem YMCA's Advocacy program claims that "Jesus was crucified with the people who were branded as 'terrorists' by the authorities of his time...The Palestinians are currently crucified..."

“terrorists” by the authorities of his time. The Palestinians are currently crucified, humiliated, and denied their human rights and dignity.”⁹⁶ The promotion of such imagery contradicts the YMCA’s alleged [commitment](#) to “universal values of human dignity, peace, and justice.”⁹⁷

47. The [Joint Advocacy Initiative](#) (JAI) is another program of the East Jerusalem YMCA that undertakes political activities against Israel.⁹⁸ It [helps coordinate a weekly demonstration](#) in the West Bank town of Al Khader and distributes t-shirts with the message “Isolate the Israeli Apartheid.” The JAI publishes a [weekly e-newsletter](#) and a [bi-annual magazine](#). JAI coordinates an annual tour for international YMCA branches called “[Journey for Justice](#).” A highly contentious research paper was published by the JAI entitled “[Palestinian Christians in Struggle](#)” which claims that “the decline of this [Christian] population [in Israel and the Palestinian Authority] is a highly political phenomenon in that the Israeli state considers Palestinian Christians to be a threat to their continued occupation of Palestine.” There was no mention of the extensive [persecution](#) faced by Palestinian Christians by their Muslim counterparts.⁹⁹

48. The East Jerusalem YMCA’s vocational training program does not override the highly negative political messages promoted by this group’s other activities, that promote conflict, demonize Israel, and contradict the policy goals of the EU. The EU and other funders should find other non-political organizations that use this support strictly for development and civil society, in a manner consistent with the EU’s stated objectives.

E. ICAHD

49. Under the Partnership for Peace Programme, [the EU gave the Israeli Committee Against House Demolitions \(ICAHD\) €472,000](#) in 2005.¹⁰⁰ [ICAHD](#) states that its goal is “to oppose and resist Israeli demolition of Palestinian houses in the Occupied Territories” but is an extremely politicized lobbying group whose activities extend far beyond issues of housing.

50. [ICHAD campaigns](#) for boycott divestment and sanctions against Israel and has consistently labeled Israel an “[apartheid](#)” state.¹⁰¹ In a [June 2004 statement](#), Jeff Halper, ICAHD’s Director, expressed sympathy for terrorists. He asserted that “the Palestinians’ need to resort to terrorism raises questions of fundamental fairness. One cannot expect a people to suffer oppression forever, to

⁹⁶ <http://www.ej-ymca.org/site/Display-Sub.cfm?SubID=7#TheologicalRoots>

⁹⁷ <http://www.ej-ymca.org/site/Display-Cat.cfm?CatId=1&main=1>

⁹⁸ <http://www.jai-pal.org/content.php?page=173>

⁹⁹ See Justice Reid Weiner, Human Rights of Christians in Palestinian Society, Jerusalem Centre for Public Affairs, 2005, www.jcpa.org/text/Christian-Persecution-Weiner.pdf

¹⁰⁰ <http://www.eu-del.org.il/english/Award%20notification%20for%20website.doc>

¹⁰¹ <http://www.ngo->

[monitor.org/editions/v3n07/EUFundingforICAHDPromotingAntiIsraelAgenda.htm](http://www.ngo-monitor.org/editions/v3n07/EUFundingforICAHDPromotingAntiIsraelAgenda.htm)

ICAHD uses EU funds to label Israel an "apartheid state" and express sympathy for terrorists.

abrogate their own human rights in favor of those of others.”¹⁰² ICAHD has also voiced its support for a [one-state solution](#).¹⁰³ [Halper said in a paper](#) given at the “United Nations International Conference on Civil Society in Support of the Palestinian People” in New York in September, 2003, that “the stage is thus set for the next phase of the struggle for a just resolution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict: an international campaign for a single state.”¹⁰⁴ The EU’s financial support for this NGO actively undermines its own foreign policy objectives as well as violating its NGO [funding guidelines](#), which mandate that EU funding must support “achieving the two-state solution in accordance with the Road Map.”¹⁰⁵

VI. CONCLUSION

51. *Prime facie*, the interventions of human rights and humanitarian NGOs help establish common ground and facilitate dialogue. However, in contrast to their apolitical declarations, there is an increasing phenomenon of exploiting international development assistance to serve strongly political interests. This has generated negative outcomes and has even served to contribute to violence.

52. Using their enormous power and influence, NGOs are able to impose narrow perceptions and ideologies on the international diplomatic and journalistic communities, particularly with respect to their interpretations of international law. Instead of the conflict resolution process that humanitarian relief NGOs claim to be supplying, they often become parties to the disputes, and actually exacerbate tension and violence.

53. Governments fund such NGOs due to a mixture of lack of accountability and a "halo effect" that human rights NGOs have managed to erect around themselves that obscures the insidious phenomenon of the politicization of humanitarian relief. Local NGOs influence international partners, who in turn inform the attitudes of their donors, including government agencies.

54. In summarizing a major conference on the role of NGOs held by the US Institute for Peace in December 1994, Pamela Aall notes that the international community has ceded a great deal of power and authority to NGOs in restoring civil society and building peace during and after conflict. However, she also warns that this power can be used to affect the course of the conflicts themselves. As a result, "their work in relief and development affects not only the social and

NGOs are able to impose narrow perceptions and ideologies ... particularly with respect to their interpretations of international law.

¹⁰² *Id.*

¹⁰³ <http://www.icahd.org/eng/articles.asp?menu=6&submenu=2&article=132>

¹⁰⁴ <http://www.mediaisland.org/modules.php?op=modload&name=News&file=article&sid=57&mode=thread&order=0&thold=0>

¹⁰⁵ http://www.delwbg.ec.europa.eu/en/cooperatio_development/plan2004.pdf

There is an urgent need to reconsider the relationship between NGOs and government in terms of stricter funding accountability and more scrutiny.

economic well-being of their target groups, but also the larger political situation."¹⁰⁶

55. As a result, there is an urgent need to reconsider the relationship between NGOs and government in terms of stricter funding accountability and more scrutiny in what type of organizations receive support. In the Middle East, NGOs have the opportunity to play a useful role responding to the dual humanitarian crises; Palestinian poverty and hardship, and Israel's exposure to terrorism. Until now, they have failed on both counts, but if NGOs invested their resources in a truly apolitical way, providing transparency and accountability, perhaps they could have a positive impact. Until these conditions are created, the NGO community, including governments and other sources of funding, should acknowledge the limitations of their work, by increasing their frame of reference to all the factors in conflict, or be more open about their partisan agendas.

Professor Gerald Steinberg, Editor, and Anne Herzberg, Director of Research/Legal Advisor,

NGO Monitor

October 2006

¹⁰⁶ Pamela Aall, "Nongovernmental Organizations and Peacemaking," in *Managing Global Chaos*, eds. Chester Crocker, Fen Hampson and Pamela Aall, (Washington, D.C.: United States Institute of Peace Press, 1996) at 436.