Who is to be held responsible for the affront and discrimination suffered by Tarek Abu Taha?

The Lebanese Art of Blame Gamming

On May 3, 2020, Tarek Abu Taha, a young Palestinian man living in Lebanon and holding a travel document issued by the Lebanese authorities, tried to board an MEA evacuation plane in Dubai scheduled to fly to Beirut. He was discriminated against, being called a “thug” simply because he was Palestinian, and mistreated, being set aside for a long period of time before getting bounced from taking that flight to Lebanon – his “homeland” – as he wrote on his Facebook account.

The National Initiative Against Discrimination and Racism would like to salute Abu Taha’s courageous post about the incident, which prevented the act from passing unnoticed and added a level of culpability that transgressors usually do not have to deal with because most victims abstain from going public.\(^\text{(1)}\)

While the Initiative believes that denunciation of the incident is the least one can do, it maintains that denunciation is not enough. The only way to make sure that such an incident does not occur again is through accountability... someone, some institution

\(^\text{(1)}\) On May 5, Abu Taha posted a video on Facebook to clarify his original statement, saying he does not think Lebanese are racist nor does he agree with the aggressive reactions on social media that depict Lebanese as such. Additionally, he thanked the UAE authorities and MEA for their help, as he initially did, but also the director general of the Lebanese General Directorate of General Security.
needs to be held responsible for what happened... unless what happened is reduced to the rank of a random incident that is not worthy of investigation.

As a civil initiative it's not within the realm of our mandate or capacity to legally investigate who is to be held responsible. However, we are able to call for such an investigation and highlight its importance and pertinence as one looks at the rhetoric of the Lebanese authorities that accompanied this issue, which clearly aimed to avoid accountability for the degrading and discriminatory act faced by Abu Taha.

A WhatsApp message, signed by Lebanon’s embassy in the United Arab Emirates and sent on the eve of the May 3 flight, says, “Disallowing Palestinian refugees in Lebanon and domestic servants from boarding repatriation flights” is “in accordance with the May 1, 2020 circular of the Lebanese General Directorate of General Security.” Of course, this completely disregards the Council of Ministers’ decision about repatriations,
which included people with valid Lebanese residency permits as one of the eligible groups for the flights back.\(^{(2)}\)

A statement published on the day of the incident by the Lebanese-Palestinian Dialogue Committee says the body “is carrying out the necessary contacts on the highest levels to amend the decision of the 'National Disaster and Crisis Management Committee'\(^{(3)}\) to stop Palestinians living abroad with travel documents issued by the relevant Lebanese authorities from returning to Lebanon. The Committee believes that this discriminatory measure, which arose during the second round of repatriation flights, contradicts the first round’s procedures.” Checking the National Disaster and Crisis Management Committee’s statements, one cannot find any reference to “a

---


\(^{(3)}\) The "National Disaster and Crisis Management Unit" was formed under decision no. 41/2013, issued by the Council of Ministers on February 18, 2013. The decision stipulated the creation of a committee to coordinate efforts to address national disasters and crises of all sorts and allocated the committee’s chairmanship to the Secretary General of the Supreme Council for Defense.
decision to stop Palestinians living abroad with travel documents issued by the relevant Lebanese authorities from returning to Lebanon.” Even more importantly, the National Disaster and Crisis Management Committee is just one of nine official entities of the Coronavirus Follow-up Committee. Thus, the Lebanese-Palestinian Dialogue Committee displayed cowardice and avoided addressing the liable parties, opting instead to aim their statement at an entity on the margin of the issue at hand.

The day after the incident, and with it becoming a public opinion issue, the General Directorate of General Security published a statement on its Facebook account saying, “There has been information shared on social media about an officer from the General Directorate of General Security preventing a Palestinian refugee in Lebanon from returning aboard the plane that brought home Lebanese nationals from the Dubai airport yesterday. The General Directorate of General Security would like to clarify that it is carrying

---

(4) www.drm.pcm.gov.lb
out the decision of the Council of Ministers to only bring back Lebanese nationals for the time being, and non-Lebanese who have the right to enter Lebanon will be brought home at later stages.” While taking a look at the Council of Ministers’ decisions — at least those made public — one will not find backing for the circular of the General Directorate of General Security, which not only discriminates against Palestinians but also considers “domestic servants” to be of a standalone nationality — as if a Lebanese cannot be a domestic servant of another Lebanese.

And it was not over. As the “scandal” continued spreading over social media, more conventional media reported it, making the Lebanese authorities even more embarrassed... and even more confused in dealing with the repercussions of a decision for which no one wanted to be held responsible.

To further avoid accountability, the Supreme Defense Council issued a statement after its meeting on May 5 that stated: “After the director general of General Security discussed the issue of repatriating Lebanese nationals, the fact that preference and priority should be for Lebanese nationals was underscored.”(5) Any reader of the statement would be very naive not to notice the polysemous term “underscored”: Was an earlier decision underscored, a decision whose makers did not want the public to become aware of? Or was it a matter of foregone conclusion that did not need clarification?

Still, there was more. On May 11, Middle East Airlines

(MEA) issued the following statement: “Further to MEA’s statement... on May 10, 2020\(^6\) and to clarifications by the General Directorate of General Security,\(^7\) the company would like to state that if vacancies are available on its planes, Palestinian travelers, bearing travel documents for Palestinian refugees issued by the Lebanese authorities, will be allowed to come to Lebanon on board the repatriation flights...” Hence, MEA’s statement sent the decision and responsibility for it back to the starting point, leaving the question about who allows or disallows people to travel to Lebanon without a satisfactory answer.

By detailing Tarek Abu Taha’s case and after denouncing the act of discrimination he was subjected to, the National Initiative Against Discrimination and Racism considers the way Lebanon’s authorities, both civil and security, handled this case-scandal is part of the incident’s discriminatory character and further evidence of the Lebanese authorities’ “failure” to fulfill their duties.

Finally, the National Initiative Against Discrimination and Racism reiterates that accountability for allegedly minor violations is no less important than accountability for major ones. It also reiterates that it is time for Lebanese authorities to stop playing the blame game and take responsibility for their actions.

\(^6\) This statement included the amended schedule of MEA’s third round of repatriation trips between May 14 and 24, 2020.

\(^7\) We could not find these clarifications in any open source. Moreover, it is not standard protocol for state entities to use “clarifications” as means of communication, be it with other State agencies or non-State ones.