

secondary and tertiary. The primary boycott prohibits importing Israeli products into Arab countries and exporting Arab products to Israel. This kind of boycott, akin to a trade embargo, has parallels elsewhere in the world. The secondary boycott is directed against firms, in Canada or elsewhere, which are considered by the boycotting authorities to be helping Israel in various loosely defined ways. Such a firm may be blacklisted and thereby prevented from doing business in those Arab countries which observe the boycott. The tertiary boycott is designed to increase the adverse consequences of being blacklisted and of aiding Israel. It may involve, for example, an undertaking not to deal with blacklisted firms in one's own country or others as a condition of doing business in an Arab country.

Arab governments insist that the boycott is not racist; and that it is directed, not against Jews, but against a country, Israel, with which they have been in a state of war for some 30 years. They assert that the boycott is a legitimate economic means of putting pressure upon Israel to recognize Palestinian rights and withdraw from occupied territories.

Some forms of the boycott, in particular aspects of the tertiary boycott, have been strongly criticized in both North America and Western Europe, especially in recent years, on the grounds that they impose unacceptable restrictions on the freedom of businesses to deal with those whom they wish, and on the ground that they constitute racial and religious discrimination. Of the OECD countries, which include the major trading countries of the western world and Japan, only the United States has adopted legislation restricting compliance with boycotts. This legislation provides sanctions including fines and imprisonment for compliance with a range of defined foreign boycott practices. While France has legislation which might appear to restrict compliance with boycotts, in practice French firms are permitted to accept clauses if they so choose.

Restrictions on complying with the boycott have been discussed elsewhere in Western Europe, but none has been adopted by any government there. In Britain the government has said it deplores all boycotts that lack international support and authority but believes that it is for each individual firm to decide in the light of its own commercial interest what its attitude would be. In 1978 a Committee of the House of Lords conducted hearings on an anti-boycott bill and recommended it should not proceed.

In 1976 Canada introduced guidelines on compliance with boycotts. The policy denies federal government services in aid of any transaction in which unacceptable boycott clauses are included. The assumption behind this policy was that it would be an effective deterrent