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THE PROBLEM:

The question of Palestine is basically a problem of intrusion of a group of foreigners, largely Europeans, into the Arab land of Palestine, against the will of the Arab people, but with British and later American and Western support.

BASIC FACTS:

By the First World War, Palestine along with the rest of the Arab land was under the Ottoman Empire. In 1916 the Arabs revolted against the Ottoman Turks in cooperation with the British and the Allied powers. It was the aim of the Arabs to achieve their political freedom and independence after the war. Britain had promised to support this Arab goal. But while on the one hand Britain promised the Arabs, through the famous Hussein-McMahon correspondence, to support Arab independence, it entered into the Sykes-Picot accord with France to divide the Arab land. This accord was one of the secret agreements condemned by President Wilson in his Fourteen Points.¹

Further, Britain in 1917 promised in the words of the Balfour Declaration “the establishment in Palestine of a national home” for the Jews.²

At the time of this promise, the population of Palestine was 93% Moslems and Christians and 7% Jews. In 1922 the total population of Palestine was 752,048: the Jews numbered 83,790, the Christians and Moslems 660,641, with 7,617 others.³

The conflict in Palestine is not between the Arabs and the Jews as commonly considered. It is a conflict between the Arabs who have

¹For a detailed study of these events see George Antonius, The Arab Awakening, London, 1938, chs. vii, viii and ix.
²Of course the Balfour Declaration being a unilateral promise by Britain without Arab consent, was not binding upon the Arabs. Britain, nevertheless, was cognizant of Arab rights and hence the Declaration contained a very important qualifying clause which made the promise a limited and conditional one. After viewing with favor the establishment of a Jewish national home in Palestine, the Balfour Declaration goes on with the proviso “it being clearly understood that nothing shall be done which may prejudice the civil and religious rights” of the Arabs of Palestine or “the rights and political status” of the Jews in other countries.
³Incidently, it is interesting to note that in his one-sided best-seller Exodus, Leon Uris neglected to quote the proviso of the Balfour Declaration. See the full text of the Balfour Declaration in Palestine Government, A Survey of Palestine, 1945-46, vol. 1, chap. 11, p. 15.
lived in Palestine for a period of over 1,400 years and the Zionist Jews.

Zionism is a political movement which, capitalizing on religious and humanitarian sentiments, claims that Palestine belongs to the Jews. The Zionists internationale bases its claim on "historical" ground, with some other subordinate and secondary arguments.

In the forthcoming pages, these Zionist claims and arguments on the Palestine question will be enumerated, first without comment, and later analyzed in the light of their true logic.

ZIONIST ARGUMENTS:

1. Historical "rights." — The Zionists' major premise is that Palestine belongs to the Jews because some 2,000 years ago certain Jews used to live in Palestine. And as the Jews, according to the Zionists, have been living in exile during the last 2,000 years, they are entitled as a matter of historic "right" to go "back home."

2. Persecution. — A second argument advanced by the Zionists is that the Jews were persecuted and mistreated in Europe and were in a desperate need for a place of their own. Palestine was such a place.

3. Jewish "know-how" — A third argument advanced is that the Jews can improve the land in Palestine better than the Arabs. In this connection, the Zionists refer continuously to the backwardness of the Arabs and the Jewish achievement, and that the Jews can teach the Arabs.

Other arguments by the Zionists include: (4) that the Arabs agreed to the creation of the Jewish national home in Palestine as evidenced by the Faisal-Weizmann accord; (5) that as the Jewish population of Palestine increased as the result of Jewish immigration from Europe, so did the Arab population increase as the result of immigration of neighboring Arabs into Palestine; (6) that the Jews bought the land in Palestine; (7) that only Arab feudalists oppose Israel.

The Zionists also argue: (8) that the Arabs have disregarded U.N. Resolutions; (9) that in 1948 the Arabs started the war and attacked Israel; (10) that the Palestinian Arab refugees left Palestine of their own accord or due to instigation by Arab leaders; (11) that the Arab leaders are not resettling the refugees in order to use them as a political football; (12) that Israel is a bastion of democracy; and (13) that the Arabs practice a sort of anti-Semitism by discrimination against American Jews who are forbidden to enter Saudi-Arabia.
Then there is (14) the Zionists' "constructive" advice: let's forget about the past and go on from here.

And finally there is the argument (15) that "Israel is an accomplished fact . . . it is there."

ANALYSIS OF ZIONIST CLAIMS:

When the Zionist arguments are analyzed, clearly and logically, it becomes immediately apparent that they are based either on unacceptable assumptions, or on irrelevant facts, half-truths, and on events (such as Jewish persecution in Europe) which were the responsibility of others.

1. "Historical Rights" — The major Zionist premise that Palestine belongs to the Jews because certain Jews used to live in Palestine 2,000 years ago is based on a fatuous and totally fallacious assumption, which is naturally unacceptable to the Arabs.

To accept the "historic right" theory as the ground for the return of Palestine to the Jews means that we should accept similar arguments regarding other people and other lands. For example, to accept the Zionist argument that the Jews of today have a right to go to Palestine because it used to belong to them, means that we should accept the argument that Alaska belongs to the Russians, because it used to belong to them. Such an argument would change the whole map of the world and is obviously unreasonable and unacceptable: America would have to be given back to the Indians! Therefore, we cannot reasonably expect the Arabs to accept the Zionist argument that the Jews are going "home" regardless of its romantic appeal.

The Zionists' position foments not only Arab opposition and resentment but also the resentment of other peoples. For according to the logic of Zionism, Jews living outside Palestine live in foreign lands and in a state of exile. That is to say, according to Zionism, the Jews in America, England, Brazil, India and elsewhere are "Israelis residing in exile." This Zionist position would certainly raise the question of "double loyalty" of the Zionist Jews. Indeed, the question of double loyalty of the Zionist Jews has been raised by important Zionist leaders.

According to the great Zionist leader and the Prime Minister of Israel, Mr. David Ben Gurion, "When a Jew in America or South Africa speaks of 'our government' to his fellow Jew, he usually means the government of Israel, while the Jewish public in various countries view the Israeli ambassador as their own representative."

*See Israel Government Yearbook, (1953-54), p. 35.*
The Ben Gurion statement represents either the true position and attitude of the Zionist Jews, in which case the charge of double loyalty is a valid statement of fact, or else Ben Gurion's statement does not portray a true picture, and hence it is a wild statement and an attack upon the Jews in America and elsewhere. If the Ben Gurion statement is an attack upon the loyalty of American Jews, then certainly American Jewish leaders should denounce Ben Gurion and his attack upon their loyalty. To be sure there have been some disputes of a theological nature and some political disagreement with Ben Gurion, but on the whole the American Jews have subscribed to the basic political tenets of Zionism and thereby lend strength and validity to the Zionist claims concerning the double loyalty of the Zionist Jews.⁵

According to Dr. Nahum Goldman, an American citizen who recently declared his readiness to renounce his American citizenship to become an Israeli, the American Jews must have "courage to declare openly that they have a double loyalty . . . to the country in which they live and to the State of Israel."⁶

It stands to reason that the question of double loyalty advocated by the Zionists would jeopardize the position of the Jews in the Arab land. If the Jews in the Arab countries are "Israelis residing in exile," then certainly they are traitors to the Arabs and at best should be treated as "enemy aliens." Indeed some of the Jews who had lived in the Arab lands for centuries adhered to the Zionist philosophy and acted as Israelis. They provided the enemy with aid and comfort and as such they could not have been treated except as traitors. The Arabs had no alternative but to accord them the status of "enemy aliens" and expel them from the Arab land. Today the Zionists cry that the Arabs have expelled some of the Jews from the Arab states. But surely the Arabs could not be expected to retain a citizen who proclaims his loyalty to the enemy. Indeed the Arab action was only the logical fulfillment of Zionist premise that the Jews living outside Palestine are residing in exile. The Zionist could not have it both ways: on the one hand declaring that the Jews in the Arab countries and

⁵The only true and loud Jewish objections to Ben Gurion's and Zionists' remarks have come from the American Council for Judaism. The Council is a non-Zionist organization of Americans of Jewish faith and has continuously disagreed with basic Zionist philosophy, maintaining that the home of the Americans of Jewish faith is America and nowhere else.

⁶Quoted in the Jewish Newsletter, January 26, 1959, p. 1. The Jewish Newsletter is a non-Zionist, bi-weekly paper edited by William Zukerman, and its Editorial Advisory Board is made up of such prominent non-Zionists as Erich Fromm, David Riesman, Rabbi Morris S. Lazaron and others.
elsewhere are residing in foreign lands which they should abandon in order to go “home” to Israel, and on the other hand blaming the Arabs for recognizing the Zionist claim. The Arabs could not be blamed for permitting the exiles to depart from the Diaspora!

It is fortunate that not all the Jews believe in the riddle of Zionism, and today hundreds of thousands of Jews are living in the Arab lands with the same rights and duties as other citizens.

The Zionists maintain that their historic claim is based on Biblical grounds. Professor A. Guillaume, Professor Millar Burrows and many other Biblical scholars have pointed out that Genesis xii, 7, “unto thy seed will I give this land” and other Biblical quotations, referring to the children of Abraham, includes the Arabs, both Moslem and Christian, even perhaps before it includes Mr. David Ben Gurion. The fact is that the Arab Moslems and Christians are the descendants of the children of Abraham. This point is unfortunately not known except to a few people in the West. As the Arabs are the descendants of Abraham, it follows that the Biblical prophecy was fulfilled when Palestine was reverted to the “seeds of Abraham” and became an Arab land.7

Furthermore, the Arabs of Palestine are more entitled to their home than Ben Gurion, a Pole, whose ancestors might have been converted into Judaism from amongst some of the Slavic tribes several hundred years ago. One wonders whether Palestine is also the home of the ancestors of Elizabeth Taylor who was recently converted to Judaism!

But even if we assume that Ben Gurion and other Jews were the direct descendants of Abraham, still this does not entitle them to go to the home of the Arab “cousin” without the permission of the “cousin,” just as the Americans cannot go to England and Europe on the basis of the historic ties and European ancestry without British and European permission.

2. Jewish Persecution in Nazi Germany. — Jewish persecution in Europe was the fault and responsibility of Nazi Germany. The

7For a thorough analysis of the alleged Biblical prophecy regarding present day State of Israel, see Israel According to Holy Scriptures published by Igram Press Inc., Cedar Rapids, Iowa. This booklet contains a number of articles by several theologians and scholars including the Presbyterian Minister Reverend L. Humphry Walz; Dr. William F. Stinespring, Professor of Old Testament at Duke University; Dr. Elmer Berger, Executive Director of the American Council for Judaism; Dr. Frank Stagg, Professor of New Testament at the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary; the Theologian Dr. Ovid R. Sellers; and the Rt. Reverend Jonathan G. Sherman, Suffragan Bishop of the Episcopal Diocese of Long Island.
Western sense of guilt for what happened to the Jews in the West and at Western hands cannot be relieved by helping the poor Jews in the home of the poor Arabs. Generosity to the Jews, at the expense of innocent Arabs is morally reprehensible. The Arabs should not be expected to pay for the crimes of Hitler. Jewish persecution in Europe may vest the Jews with certain rights against Germany, but surely not against the Arabs.

3. Jewish “know-how.” — In their attempt to support their general position, the Zionists refer to the Jewish ability to improve the land, the Arab inability to do so. Whatever validity the claim regarding Jewish ability might have, it does not entitle the Jews to go to someone else’s home, against his will, to “improve” that home. Indeed a Zionist Jew from Europe with a doctoral degree in soil chemistry should be able to improve the land. But if the argument is accepted, then the Communists with their technical know-how will be entitled, as a matter of right, to go to other countries, against the will of the people, to “improve” those countries. The Zionist argument is indeed reminiscent of Hitler’s theory that Germany was entitled to occupy Poland because the Germans could improve Polish agriculture.

The talk that the Jews can teach the Arabs to develop their agriculture and industry is at best an insult to the Arabs. For as human beings we have intangible values which are even more important than economic progress. Just as the Poles would have preferred to improve their “backward” agriculture their own way, without Hitler’s intrusion and instruction, so the Arabs in their awakening would obviously prefer carrying on their development without Zionist intrusion.\(^8\)

The Zionists speak about having made paradise out of the desert land. Of course, when over two billion dollars are poured within a ten year period on a small portion of land, it should bring some changes and improvements. The credit, at least in part, should

---

\(^8\)The Zionists talk about the Arabs as if the Arabs were savages and barbarians. It should be remembered that during the Dark Ages in Europe, the Arabs had carried the torch of civilization and contributed to European and Western renaissance. See Sir Thomas Arnold (ed.) *The Legacy of Islam*, Oxford University Press, London, 1924, and Rom Landau, *Arab Contribution to Civilization*, American Academy of Asian Studies, San Francisco, 1958.

As the result of long years of Ottoman rule and general decline of civilization in the Middle East, the Arabs suffered heavy setbacks causing the destruction of their civilization. By the First World War the Arabs began experiencing a new renaissance and during recent years have made some spectacular progress in the various fields. To demonstrate: In the field of education, the number of college students in Iraq, has increased from 61 students in 1921
go to America which has supplied the funds and to Western civilization which supplied the know-how.

4. Arab "agreement." — The Zionist maintain that the agreement between Faisal and Weizmann to create a Jewish national home in Palestine proves that the Arabs consented to the establishment of a Jewish state. However, they neglect to mention that neither Faisal nor Weizmann "represented a body sovereign in Palestine." Furthermore, they fail to recall the reservation made by Faisal to the effect that if the Arab demand for independence was not fulfilled the agreement with Weizmann would be "deemed void and of no account or validity." The Arab demand was not fulfilled and Arab land was divided under British and French Mandate.

Hence the Faisal-Weizmann accord, which had no validity in the first place because neither Faisal nor Weizmann had any competence to conclude a contract regarding a third party, has its invalidity compounded because of this reservation.

5. Population increase. — The argument that Arab population of Palestine increased at the same time which the Jewish population increased is an irrelevant argument. Furthermore, it is misleading not to mention that immigration, if any, by neighboring Arabs into Palestine was a feature of inter-regional immigration and migration which had existed in the Fertile Crescent for thousands of years. The fact is that the Arab population of Palestine increased as the result of natural increase just as Arab population in Iraq, Syria, and other Arab lands increased. The Jewish population increased, however, as the result of Jewish immigration into Palestine, either with British help and support or illegally, which in either case was against the Arab will and in violation of Arab rights.

6. Land "purchased." — The argument that the Jews bought the land in Palestine is 7% correct and 93% wrong. The Jews did indeed purchase some of the land and much was given to them as

---

to over 11,000 in 1959; in Libya the number of college graduates has increased from 14 individuals in 1952 to more than 5,000 in 1959; in four years between 1956-60, the number of students has doubled in Tunisia and Morocco; and this progress goes on in Jordan, Saudi Arabia, the Sudan, not to speak of Lebanon. In Egypt "the proportion of university graduates to the total population is eleven times as great as in Great Britain," reports the Royal Institute of International Affairs, The Middle East, London, 1954, p. 250. By the end of First World War there were very few Arabs with higher degrees; today, there are thousands of Arabs with Ph.D.s and the number of those with B.A. or M.A. runs into hundreds of thousands.

9See Royal Institute of International Affairs, Great Britain, op. cit. p. 11

grant-in-aid by the British authorities. However, according to the Survey of Palestine, by 1920 the Jews owned 2.5% of the land. By 1945 they had bought and otherwise acquired legal title to 3.56%. This made the total of Jewish land ownership 6.06%. From 1945 to 1948 the Jews bought according to the most generous estimates less than 1%, making the total of Jewish owned land by 1948 no more than 7% of Palestine.\(^{11}\) Considering the fact that nearly 13% of the land in Israel belongs to the 180,000 Arabs who are still in Israel, it follows that some 80% of the land under Israeli control was acquired by sheer brutal force of occupation from its rightful owners, the Palestine Arab refugees.

This point has been confirmed by the United Nations: According to the United Nations Conciliation Commission for Palestine, the total Arab land passed to Israel hands is 16,324 square kilometers. This is 80% of the total (20,850 square kilometers) land under Israeli control.\(^{12}\) The Zionist Jews have taken over the whole Arab cities of Jaffa, Acre, Lydda, Beit Shan, Magdal, Beersheba, in addition to 388 towns and villages, and large parts of 94 others. In this process the Zionists have confiscated over 10,000 shops, 120,000 dunums of orange groves, (4.05 dunums equals one acre), 40,000 dunums of vineyards, and at least 10,000 dunums of other orchards and nearly 95% of the olive groves.\(^{13}\)

7. "Feudalist" opposition. — The argument that only Arab feudalists oppose Israel is a charge belied by facts. For the greatest opposition to Zionism has come from the Arab people — farmers, businessmen, workers, students and so on. Arab intelligentsia, who know of their rights and refuse to be subjugated to humiliation and injustice, are vehemently opposed to the Zionist movement. Opposition to the Zionist intrusion in Palestine has been expressed spontaneously in all the countries of the Arab world. The widespread character and importance of this opposition throughout the Arab world has been recognized by statesmen in many non-Arab countries, and echoed by scholars and journalists in these countries, as well as by the Arabs living abroad. How is it possible that a few scattered

\(^{11}\)See the Survey of Palestine prepared and published by the British Government, 1946, p. 103 (paragraph 1) and p. 243 (paragraph 520).


feudalists have forced this widespread opposition to Israel upon multitudes of other human beings at home and abroad? This is an absurdity. The Zionist intrusion in Palestine is a grave injustice which is offensive to all Arabs by nature and which is expressed by all Arabs from choice. It is the Arab people who oppose and will continue to oppose Zionist encroachment upon their rights.

8. United Nations Role. — The Zionists argue that the Arabs opposed and disregarded the 1947 United Nations Partition Plan which created Israel.

It requires little imagination to visualize the American reaction to a United Nations scheme to partition Alaska (even when it was a territory), giving a small portion thereof to a group of White Russians, to whom Alaska originally belonged, or giving a small portion of California to the Indians. Surely America would oppose such a plan and disregard it, if it did not take steps to expell U.N. Headquarters from the continent and withdraw from the Organization.

The fact is that the U.N. is forbidden by its Charter (Article 2, paragraph 7) to intervene in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of the states, much less to partition territories against the will of their inhabitants. Of course, the U.N. may make recommendations. But these recommendations are not binding unless ratified by member states. Accordingly, the Partition Plan of 1947 was not binding at the time. But when on May 12, 1949, Israel and the Arab States consented to its implementation at Lausanne, it became legally binding on the parties. The agreement at Lausanne and its provisions will be discussed later.

The Zionists reference to the United Nations would indeed bewilder the informed observer. Which United Nations do the Zionist talk about? Is it the United Nations whose resolution is favorable to the Zionists' arguments, or the United Nations whose resolutions the Zionists have disregarded for more than a decade. The Arabs have been insisting that the United Nations resolutions should be implemented in order to establish peace in the Middle East, and the Zionists have consistently defied the said resolutions.

There are some ninety\(^{14}\) occasions during which the United Na-

\(^{14}\)The United Nations resolutions on Palestine were compiled in February, 1957. At that time there were 74 resolutions dealing with that question. Only one, concerning the passage of Israeli ships through the Suez Canal was disregarded by the Arabs and the rest — 73 — were defied by Israel or were unanimous U.N. condemnation of Israel. For the dates and the U.N. organ which passed the resolutions see Fayez A. Sayegh *Strife in the Holy Land*, Arab Information Center, New York, 1957.

The Arab refusal to permit Israeli ships through the Suez Canal is based on
tions has dealt with the Palestine problem and made resolutions accordingly. One resolution, adopted only once and failing adoption later, instructed Egypt to permit Israeli ships to go through the Suez Canal. This was disregarded by Egypt. The other resolutions have been disobeyed by Israel. Peace will come to the area if Israel abides by United Nations decisions.

9. & 10. Responsibility for war, and flight of refugees. — The Zionists argue that in 1948 the Arabs attacked Israel and that Palestine Arabs left of their own accord.

To start from the events of 1948 and forget the events which led to that date assumes that history lives in a vacuum and that historical events are isolated from each other. The fact is that the first attack on Arab rights began when the Zionist Jews intruded in Palestine at least as early as 1917. Zionist intrusion in Palestine was in itself an attack on Arab rights.

When Dr. Chaim Weizmann, the Zionist leader and later the first President of Israel, was asked about his conception of the “national home” phrase of the Balfour Declaration, he said that the Zionists understood by the national home in Palestine a right to make Palestine “as Jewish as England is English.”

If Palestine was to become as Jewish as England was English, then the 93% Arabs, both Moslems and Christians, of Palestine, were condemned by the Zionists from the very beginning to become minority in their home. It was natural then that the Arabs of Palestine would resent the terms of the Balfour Declaration, and British pseudo-humanitarianism and over-generosity at the expense of the Arabs. And it was natural that they would resent becoming a minority in their home and against their own will. As the result of Arab resentment, violence erupted in Palestine in 1922, 1926, 1928, 1933 and 1936. The Zionists, discovering that the Arabs rejected becoming a minority in their home, adopted a new slogan towards the Arabs that “the only good Arab is a dead Arab.”

As it was impossible for the 7% Jews of Palestine to become, even through Jewish immigration, a majority, (especially in the light of the rapid natural increase of the Arab population), the Zionists

the principle of self-defense which is recognized under general and particular international law. If the U.S. were at war with the Soviet Union, America would not permit Soviet ships through the Panama Canal or the Potomac even if Potomac was considered part of the high seas. The Arab right to prohibit passage to the vessels of their enemy is recognized in Article X of the Constantinople Convention of 1888. For a study of the status of the Suez Canal see Minos Generales “Suez: National Sovereignty and International Waterways” World Affairs Quarterly, July 1958, pp. 177-190.
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had to resort to other means to make the Arab majority a minority. These other means included the destruction of many Arab villages and the wholesale murder of Arab men, children and women, causing a panic amongst the Arab population to flee the land.

In his *Revolt*, Menahim Begin, the Eichmann of Zionism and the head of the second largest party in Israel, declares that his attacks on the Arab villages caused the great panic among Palestine Arabs leading to their exodus. Indeed many Arab villages fell to the Zionists—long before the so-called Arab attack on Israel on May 15, 1948. The *New York Times* reports the fall of the following Arab villages and towns to the Zionists hands:

Gazaza, December 21, 1947; Sa’sa’, February 16, 1948; Haifa, February 21, 1948; Bir Adas, March 6, 1948; Deir Yaseen, April 10, 1948; Tiberias, April 20, 1948; Jerusalem, April 25, 1948; Jaffa, April 26, 1948; Acre, April 27, 1948; Safad, May 7, 1948, and so on.

The Zionists’ attack, occupation and destruction of Arab villages and towns caused the flight of Palestine Arabs. Toynbee declares that the Zionist Jews “evicted” the Arabs of Palestine from their home.16

---


After a thorough examination of the 1948 Arab press and the B.B.C.—monitored transcripts of broadcasts from Arab capitals and secret Arab radio stations, Professor Walid Khalidi of the American University of Beirut concludes that the Palestine Arabs were urged and ordered by Arab leaders and governments not to leave Palestine and were ordered to stay. Zionists radios, dramatizing the massacre of Arab villagers in Deir Yaseen and elsewhere, warned that the same fate would befall other villagers if they were not evacuated within a definite time. See Walid Khalidi’s “Why Did the Palestinians Leave?” *Middle East Forum*, July (Summer) 1959, p. 22 ff.


On the question of the Arab refugees and Zionist arguments Erich Fromm writes:

“It is often said that the Arabs fled, that they left the country voluntarily, and that they therefore bear the responsibility for losing their property and their land. It is true that in history there are some instances—in Rome and in France during the revolution—when enemies of the state were proscribed and their property confiscated. But in general international law, the principle holds true that no citizen loses his property or his rights of citizenship; and the citizenship right is *de facto* a right to which the Arabs in Israel have much more legitimacy than the Jews. Just because the Arabs fled? Since when is that punishable by confiscation of property and by being barred from returning to the land on which a people’s forefathers have lived for generations? Thus, the claim of the Jews to the land of Israel cannot be a realistic political claim. If all nations would suddenly claim territories in which their forefathers had lived two thousand years ago, this world would be a madhouse.” See “The Problem of Power in Israel,” *Jewish Newsletter*, Vol. XIV, No. 10, May 19, 1958, p. 2.
Toynbee's observation is confirmed by no less an authority than David Ben Gurion. He writes:

"Until the British left [May 15, 1948], no Jewish settlement, however remote, was entered or seized by the Arabs, while the Haganah . . . captured many Arab positions and liberated Tiberias and Haifa, Jaffa and Safad."17

And again:

"The Haganah did its job: until a day or two before the Arab invasion not a settlement was lost, no road cut, although movement was seriously dislocated despite express assurances of the British to keep the roads safe so long as they remained. Arabs started fleeing from the cities almost as soon as disturbances began in the early days of December. As fighting spread, the exodus was joined by Beduin and fellaheen, but not the remotest Jewish homestead was abandoned and nothing a tottering administration could unkindly do stopped us from reaching our goal on May 14, 1948, in a State made larger and Jewish by the Haganah."18

The intrusion of the Zionist Jews into Palestine being an encroachment on Arab rights, the creation and expansion of Israeli state was an act of injustice and aggression inflicted by brutal force upon the Arabs. Of course, the Arabs share part of the responsibility: their fault was that they were weak; if they had been strong, they would never have let a single Zionist intruder step ashore in Palestine. The fact that the Arabs were not strong led to the occupation of Palestine by the Zionist Jews and the displacement of a million Palestinian Arabs.19

19The Zionists talk about "seven Arab armies" attacking the infant little Israel, and the miraculous ability of some 650,000 Jews to defeat some 40-000,000 Arabs. What the Zionists fail to compare is the actual fighting forces of the two parties. Syria and Lebanon had achieved their independence in 1946 and by 1948 their armies consisted of some 7,500 and 3,500 men respectively. The corrupt regime in Egypt was able to mobilize 10,000 men and Iraq could count on 21,000 men, while Saudi Arabia was able to provide only two battalions. Jordan's Arab Legion consisted of 6,000 well-trained men who, however, lacked adequate ammunition. The total Arab force was at best around 47,500. On the other hand, the Israelis had a mobilized well-trained and equipped force of some 80,000 men consisting of the Haganah, Irgun and the Stern groups. The Israeli army had about 20,000 men with combat experience during World War II, and some 300 British-trained or British Officers who were Zionist Jews and renounced their British citizenship at the last moment. Many American Jewish Officers also renounced American citizenship and placed their American training at the disposal of Israel. The case of Col. David (Mickey) Marcus is only one. Col. Marcus who fell in action in 1948 while commanding the Jerusalem
Today the Zionists and Israelis talk continuously about their desire for peace. This recalls the remarks of von Clausewitz: The aggressor is always a lover of peace; he would like to enter our homes unopposed.

11. Refugee resettlement. — The Zionist argument that Arab leaders do not resettle Arab refugees elsewhere in Arab land in order to use them as a political football assumes that Palestine Arab refugees are inanimate objects who can be removed and resettled at the will of others (in this case the Arab leaders). It is not the Arab leaders who decide on behalf of the refugees, but the refugees themselves who decide about their own future. The decision of the refugees has so far been that they want to go to their home from which they were evicted by the Zionists. In this decision the refugees have the moral and legal rights with full backing of the United Nations which has recognized their right to return to their home.

Regarding the suggestion that the refugees should be resettled elsewhere, Ambassador Henry Labouisse, former Director of United Nations Relief and Works Agency, says that

"the refugees do not want to move further away. They want to return to their homes. The great majority do not even want to establish themselves as permanent residents of the countries in which they are now. They are afraid that by doing so, they might prejudice their rights to be eventually repatriated."

If the refugees themselves refuse "to move further away," then the talk that Arab leaders do not resettle them elsewhere is double-talk and an attempt to eliminate Israeli guilt in order to place the blame on Arab leaders, which is a usual Zionist technique. The Arab

---

Front of Israeli army, was "a West Point graduate, one-time U.S. Attorney, Correction Commissioner of New York, World War II fighting officer, Presidential Advisor at many international conferences." He "left a thriving New York law practice to help organize the army of the new State of Israel in 1948." See Israel Digest, June 1957, p. 6. For an analysis of the 1948 Arab-Israeli war and the armed strength of the parties, see Edgar O'Ballance, The Arab-Israeli War, Fredrick A. Praeger, N.Y. 1958, pp. 70-83. For a brief analysis see Erich W. Béthmann, Decisive Years in Palestine, 1918-1948, American Friends of the Middle East, N.Y., 1957, pp. 39-53.

In addition to the well-equipped army, the Israelis had the financial and political support of the two mightiest powers on earth, America and the Soviet Union.

When these facts are taken into consideration, one will find that the "poor," "little," "tiny," "infant," Israel was powerful, strong and supported by strong powers. The Zionists reference to the "poor, little Israel" is only for the purpose of appealing to the emotions of good-hearted people who are unfamiliar with the facts and historical events.

leaders have acted on behalf of the refugees to defend their cause and to bring their case before the United Nations, giving them assistance and support. Dr. John H. Davis, the present Director of UNRWA, wrote in his annual report of 30 June 1960:

"The host countries do much to help the refugees — both by direct assistance and by helping UNRWA. Currently they expend in excess of $5 million per year in providing land, water, security, medical assistance, education, and miscellaneous services. . . . In addition, they bear all of the economic, social, and political inconveniences and repercussions of having the refugees within their borders. Most important of all, they have given them refuge within their countries. The host countries bear these burdens with patience and courage and have demonstrated deep fraternal sympathy for the refugees."

On January 18, 1961, Dr. Davis declared that there was a "widespread lack of understanding" of the Arab refugee situation due to some basic misconceptions of the problem. These misconceptions include the charge that "the Arab host governments have mistreated the refugees by neglecting them and even 'holding them as hostages in their struggle with Israel'," and that "the refugee problem could and would have been settled long ago except for the conniving of unprincipled Arab politicians who have sought to hold the refugees idle and who do not reflect popular opinion." Refuting these charges against the Arabs, Dr. Davis explained that "it is the basic feeling of the peoples on both sides of the Palestine issue, rather than 'politicians' whims,' that have prevented and still prevent political solution to the Palestine problem."21

These misconceptions against the Arabs have been perpetuated by unprincipled Zionists who benefit from misrepresenting the Arabs.

12. "Bastion of Democracy. . . ." — The Zionist claim that Israel is a bastion of democracy is a strange claim indeed. As a "Jewish" state, Israel is a state which is based either on "religion" or "race." The concept of a Jewish State, Moslem State, or Christian State belongs to the sixteenth century. Such states may be described as theocratic, but certainly not a democracy. The Second World War was waged to defeat Fascism, the political philosophy of which was based on the superiority of the Aryan race. Israel today seems to be

based on the superiority of the Jewish "race" or "religion" and the claim to a chosen people status. While the trend in the Arab states is toward separation of Church and State as evidenced by the Constitution of the United Arab Republic, the Jewish state of Israel has proven again and again to be the Bastion of Theocracy in the Middle East.\(^{22}\)

To support their claim that Israel is a democracy, the Zionists point to the fact that in the Israeli Parliament there are some Arab representatives. This fact proves nothing if it does not indicate that Arabs in Israel have a voice in their own governing.

The true plight of the Arab minority in Israel was brought to light in the United Nations Fifteenth Session during the discussion in the Third Committee on October 10, 1960, revealing the general state of discrimination in which these people live. The complaints of the Arab community living in Israel forwarded to the President of the United Nations General Assembly provide further evidence of the persecution of the Arabs in Israel. Suffice it to mention the legislation passed by the Israeli Parliament according to which the Arabs in Israel are considered to be second-class citizens. Their movement is restricted. They are discriminated against in employment and in education. They find difficulty in obtaining law enforcement and legal protection. One can not say that Israel is a "democracy" on the basis of its having a parliamentary system, when a sizable portion — some 10% of its citizens — is discriminated against by law as well as in practice.

13. Arab "anti-Semitism" and discrimination against the Jews—The Zionists' cry that Saudi Arabia discriminates against American Jewish citizens is like an argument in which the effect is presented as the cause. According to the Israeli "Law of Return" and "Nationality Law," American Jews, but not American Christians or of other religions or racial background, are given the facilities to go to Israel and become automatically Israeli citizens. This Israeli legislation is based on the Zionist doctrine that the Jews outside Palestine/Israel are residing in foreign lands: i.e. the American Jews are Israelis residing in exile and are potential Israeli citizens. Because of this Israeli assumption and law, (which has not been repudiated by Zionist Jews but has been tacitly approved by them through their actions on behalf of Israel which speak loudly of their consent to,

and approval of, the Israeli assumption) the Arabs are forced to consider the so-called “American” Jews as potential Israelis and enemies. If the Arabs discriminate against “American Jews” it is because Israel discriminates against “American Christians.” By conferring upon American Jews certain rights and privileges, Israel is discriminating against the rest of the American people. The Arabs are not barring or discriminating against Americans; the Arabs are barring potential Israeli citizens and enemy aliens from going to Arab lands. The Zionists cannot have it both ways: They accept receiving special privileges from Israel, putting them above other Americans, and protest against disabilities which follow from that privileged position. Only if the American Jews repudiate and denounce Zionist assumption and Israeli laws which have conferred upon them special rights, can they logically protest against Arab legislation which gives special rights to the Americans other than the Zionist Jews. Indeed, there are many Americans of Jewish faith who have objected to Zionist assertions, and these have been welcomed in all Arab lands.

14. Forgetting the past. — The constructive advice generously offered by the Zionists — “let’s forget about the past and start from here” — is another example of double-talk. For while the entire Zionist claim to Palestine was based upon historical ground — namely, that Palestine belongs to the Jews because in the remote past over 2,000 years ago certain Jews had conquered Palestine and that the Jews have not forgotten Palestine over the past 2,000 years — they turn to the Arabs and ask them to forget about their land, from which they were evicted only recently. If the Zionists have not forgotten about Palestine despite 2,000 years, then it stands to reason that the Arabs cannot forget about their home in which they were born and raised.

The Zionists argue that you cannot turn the clock of history and permit Arab refugees to go to their home. Alas! It was the Zionists who found in the 2,000-years-ago-story a logical ground to turn the clock of history 2,000 years. There are, then, according to the Zionists, two standards for Zionist and Arab rights and behavior: The Zionists can turn back the clock of history, 2,000 years, whereas the Arabs should not attempt to turn it back ten years.

The advice, “let’s forget about the ‘past’ ” means in reality that the Arabs should forget about their rights. This the Arabs will not do.

15. Israel exists. — Finally there is the Zionists argument that “Israel is there,” and that the Arabs should recognize it. This argu-
ment ignores the grave moral issue created by the Zionists as the result of their intrusion into Palestine against the will of the Arabs, and the countless injustices done to the Arabs in this process.

In Machiavellian terms, it means that “Israel is here by force” and must be accepted.

When an argument is based on force, it invites no further argument to settle the question; it invites instead another force.

Indeed the argument that “Israel is there” is a double-edged weapon. It implies that because it is there, no argument should be raised — and likewise when it is not there, no further argument is needed.

Such argument is never conducive to reconciliation and peaceful solution. Those interested genuinely in peace never argue on the basis of fait accompli, for it is only a defiance, and an invitation to force.

WHY DID AMERICA AND THE WEST SUPPORT ZIONISM?

There are several reasons for Western support of Zionism.

There is a vague, unclear, and hazy notion in the Western mind that somehow the Jews are a people apart, belonging to a different land. This notion has been strengthened by the Zionist attitude, behavior and ideology.

Hence the idea of “let the Jews go somewhere else and have their own country” does not appear, on the surface, to be strange or morally wrong. The Zionists, of course, profit by such an idea.

The above general, vague notion receives further support from two groups, who for different reasons have helped Zionism at the expense of the Arabs.

The first group is composed of the anti-Semitics, who in their attempt to “get rid of the Jews” lend their support to the Zionist slogan of “let the Jews go home.”

The second group is composed of the progressives and liberals who have developed a sense of guilt for what happened to the Jews in the West and at Western hands. In their attempt to relieve their sense of guilt, they are willing to help the poor Jews find homes and establish a state — provided, however, that the Jewish State shall be established not in Missouri nor in California, but in the far-away land of Palestine. These “liberals” would retort that the Jews have not demanded a state in Missouri or California. But assuming that
there was such a Jewish demand, would Americans ever permit the creation of a separate, sovereign, Jewish State anywhere in the United States?

The Zionist claim to "historic right" in Palestine has already been examined and found invalid. The "liberals" who have been helping the poor European Jews in the home of the poor Palestinian Arabs must be either ignorant of Arab rights and the invalidity of the "historic claim," and hence misled, or else the "liberals' " support of Zionism is the result of hidden anti-Semitism and a latent desire to "get rid of the Jews," sugar cloaked in the guise of humanitarianism.

But whatever the motives, the anti-Semetics and the so-called liberals and humanitarians have done the Arabs a great wrong as the result of their direct or indirect, intentional or unintentional, support of Zionism.

Then there is another reason for the Western support of Zionism which has nothing to do with anti-Semitism or with humanitarianism, pseudo or otherwise. This third reason finds its origin in cold, calculated power politics.

After referring to the fact that Secretary of the Navy James Forrestal and the Joint Chiefs of Staff had advised against his Palestine policy in 1947, former President Truman says in his Memoirs, vol. II, p. 162:

"The Department of State's specialists on the Near East were, almost without exception, unfriendly to the idea of a Jewish state. Their thinking went along this line: . . . if the Arabs are antagonized, (as the result of American support to create a Jewish State in Palestine), they (the Arabs) will go over into the Soviet camp."

But Truman did not heed to this advice because of the mounting Jewish pressure on the White House to create a Jewish State in Palestine. He writes:

"I do not think I ever had as much pressure and propaganda aimed at the White House as I had in this instance . . . actuated by political motives and engaging in political threats . . ." Ibid., p. 158.

In 1947 and 1948 Secretary of the Navy James Forrestal attempted to decrease Zionist pressure on the United States Government by his endeavors to secure the agreement of the Democratic and Republican party leaders to keep the question of Palestine outside the field of domestic politics. His efforts were in vain because in the opinion of the Democratic Party politicians "the Democratic
Party would be bound to lose and the Republicans gain by such an agreement" and the Republican politicians feared that the Republicans might lose. In indignation, Forrestal remarked “I think it is about time that somebody should pay some consideration to whether we might not lose the United States.”

In a recent study published by United States Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, the whole issue is put in a nutshell. “The crux of the problem was summed up by President Truman when he said: ‘I am sorry, gentlemen, but I have to answer hundreds of thousands who are anxious for the success of Zionism; I do not have hundreds of thousands of Arabs among my constituents’.”

In the same study one American diplomat observed that “it was an error for us to support in any way the establishment of an independent Jewish State in Palestine.” Further it is stated that “the foundation of Israel in an Arab country and our subsequent military, financial and political support of that State is an outstanding example of the way in which in a democracy the interests of our country are, and perhaps must be, sacrificed to the interests, or supposed interests, of a determined minority.”

Thus the minority of the Zionist Jews in America have been able, through well-organized and well-financed campaigns and drives, to direct the American policy towards the Middle East in support of Zionism and to the detriment of American prestige in the Arab lands. The Zionist Jews have been able to put the pressure on the American government because the majority of the American people have been either uninformed or politically passive, leaving the door wide open for the politically active minority of Zionist Jews to rule the majority. According to some estimates, the Zionist Jews in America have written, during the first ten years since the creation of Israel, over 50,000,000 (fifty million) letters to the White House and the State Department on behalf of Israeli interest. How many letters have the 175,000,000 Americans written on behalf of American interests?

25Loc. cit.
26Loc. cit.
SOLUTION:

The American people, interested in peace and prosperity, are naturally interested in the “solution” of the Palestine problem. However, the first step toward the solution of any problem is to know what exactly is the problem. As the result of great Zionist influence in the press, radio and television, the American people have been denied the right to hear the Arab case on Palestine. Only a handful of Americans have heard the Arab side and they are invariably sympathetic with the Arab position and many American Jews are among this group!

To know the problem, let's put the shoe on the other foot: If the Americans can accept the establishment of a separate sovereign Jewish state in the wasteland of California or elsewhere in America, against their will, assuming that the Jews originally came from California; that the Jews were persecuted in Germany and elsewhere; that the Jews can make paradise out of the wastelands of California; that the United Nations had decided to give California, or a part thereof, to the Jews; that the Jews have the highest democratic society and that they can help and teach the Americans — if the Americans can ever accept these arguments, then they should expect the Arabs to accept the same. Hence, any concession or reconciliation made by the Arabs to accept the Jewish State in their midst will be very generous and magnanimous indeed.

The Arabs have informed the United Nations as early as May 12, 1949, that the Palestine problem must be solved within the framework of the United Nations’ resolutions concerning Palestine. Israel, too, consented to the implementation of the United Nations resolutions when she signed the Protocol of Lausanne on the same day.27

But since then, Israel has defied or procrastinated the implementation of the resolutions and the Arabs have insisted that the resolutions should be implemented to bring peace to the Holy Land.

Briefly, the resolutions deal with three questions:

(1) that Jerusalem shall be internationalized;
(2) that the land occupied by Israel in excess of the Partition Plan be returned to the Arabs; and
(3) that Israel shall recognize the right of the Arab refugees to go home and to compensate those who refuse to return.

With regard to the Arab refugees, the United Nations General Assembly had resolved on December 11, 1948:

“that refugees wishing to return to their homes and live at peace with their neighbors should be permitted to do so at the earliest practicable date, and that compensation should be paid for the property of those choosing not to return and for loss of or damage to property.” (Resolution 194 (III), paragraph 11).

The General Assembly has affirmed the right of the refugees during every session by affirming and re-affirming its previous resolutions. During the 14th Session in 1959, the Assembly adopted Resolution 1456 (XIV) requesting the Palestine Conciliation Commission “to make further efforts to secure the implementation of paragraph 11 of General Assembly Resolution 194 (III)”, which is quoted above.

The implementation of each of the United Nations resolutions is of great importance if peace is to come to the Middle East. However, of particular importance and urgency is the question of the Palestine Arab refugees and their right to repatriation. It stands to reason that if Zionist Jews have not forgotten Palestine, as they claim, over the last 2,000 years, then the Arab refugees, who were born and raised in Palestine, and have their homes and property in Palestine, cannot forget about their homes after 10 years. Hence, if the Jews have any claim to Palestine, the Arabs have valid rights to that land, and if the Arabs should not object to the Zionist Jewish claim, the Zionist Israelis should not defy Arab rights. Briefly, if the Arabs should not expel the Zionist intruders, then the Zionists should not drive the Arabs out of their homes. Therefore, it is reasonable to assume that if the Palestine Arabs are not permitted to go home, peacefully today, there can be no peace in the Middle East. Erich Fromm, the famed author of *Escape from Freedom* and other works, writes concerning the Arab refugees and Israeli responsibility:

“I believe that, politically speaking, there is only one solution for Israel, namely, the unilateral acknowledgment of the obligation of the State toward the Arabs — not to use it as a bargaining point, but to acknowledge the complete moral obligation of the Israeli State to its former inhabitants of Palestine.”28


“It has long been obvious that the initiative for any settlement of the Arab refugee problem must come from Israel. The United Nations has held so for a decade, insisting that no solution is in sight unless the refugees are giv-
As war is outlawed under the Charter of the United Nations except in self-defense, Israel can expect no less than perpetual economic boycott and eternal hostility and instability, if she fails to recognize her obligations to the Arab refugees and refuses to implement United Nations resolutions. In the contest between Israel and the Arabs, time is on the side of the Arabs. The Arabs have lived without an Israel; it is doubtful whether Israel can live for a long time in the Middle East without the Arabs.

On the other hand, if Israel recognizes the right of the refugees to return home and compensates those who refuse, in accordance with the United Nations resolutions, and further if she treats the Arabs who will return as first-class citizens and accepts the United Nations demand for the internationalization of Jerusalem and return of the land occupied by force to the Arabs, peace will come to the Holy Land.  

"... we have a particular responsibility for the Arab refugees in Palestine. We aided and abetted the Zionists and Israelis who drove nearly a million Arabs from their homes and replaced them on the land with a million Jewish immigrants. Twelve years later, these Arabs are still languishing in refugee camps. Although the Arabs had lived in this territory for over thirteen hundred years, much of the American press and many leading Americans defended and praised this atrocity. Our government encouraged and applauded it... There can be no peace in the Near East until justice has been done the Arab refugees. We Americans, whether Christian or Jewish, can have no true peace of conscience until we have undone the wrong in which we collaborated. It won’t be easy to accomplish this, but it is a task that cannot be left undone."  


In an interview with Mr. Harry Ellis of the Christian Science Monitor and Wilton Wynn of the Associated Press, President Gamal Abdel Nasser of United Arab Republic declared on October 8, 1959:  

"... we are ready to accept the United Nations resolutions provided that Israel respect them and implements them.

Questions: You mean all the United Nations resolutions concerning Palestine?

Answer: Naturally. The resolutions concerning Palestine are an indivisible entity — the right of the refugees to return to their homeland, their right to their properties, compensation for their properties and their right to the Palestine territory cannot be divided.

The problem is a simple and an easy one... We are asking for the rights of the Palestine people... Israel rejects the restoration of these rights. We are asking for compliance with the United Nations resolutions concerning Palestine and Israel refuses to comply with them. Israel then asks for the right to use the Suez Canal while ignoring her own obligations on the one hand, and the rights of others on the other hand. Can the United Nations resolutions be imposed on one side and not on the other?" See full text of the interview in "An Interview with President Gamal Abdel Nasser," published by the Press Department, Embassy of U.A.R. in Washington, D.C. (n.d.).
Ultimate peace will depend upon the treatment by the Zionist Jews of the Arabs in Israel. If the Arabs of Israel are well treated, then the cause of distress by the Arab world will be less. Tension will subside and gradual peace will come to the area.

The Zionists will argue that the return of the refugees will disturb Israeli life and will be dangerous to Israeli security. This is the least risk which Israel must assume in fulfillment of her international obligations and in the interest of her own future.

In the light of the repeated United Nations demands upon Israel to recognize Arab rights, Israel has responded by offering to "discuss" the problem but never to comply with the instructions and the United Nations rulings. This is like a party to a dispute, against whom the jury has rendered its verdict, offering his willingness to discuss, instead of implementing the decision. This is lawlessness, not a civilized behavior.

Of course, the Israeli position will not be changed because of valid arguments based on law, morality and justice. Israel has defied Arab rights and discarded the resolutions of the United Nations because she is strong. And she is strong because she can depend on American support and American finances.

Since its establishment thirteen years ago, Israel has received over two and a half billion American dollars. According to a memorandum presented by the State Department to the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations "from the creation of Israel through the fiscal year 1959, the total U.S. Government assistance to Israel amounted to $670 million."

When the 1961 Israeli Bond drive was opened in Miami, Florida, it was announced that the sale of bonds since it began ten years earlier had totalled $494,556,750 and it was expected to reach $500,000,000 on the thirteenth anniversary of Israel, April 20, 1961. This would make the average sale of 50 million dollars per year or nearly one million dollars per week.

Between 1954-1958 Germany "allocated IL. 98,220,870 for projects within Israel." At the rate of exchange of $4.01 per Israeli pound, the total German aid was more than $400,000,000. Between

---


31 American Jewish Year Book, 1961, p. 123. With U.S. pressure, direction and inducement, the West German Government signed in September 1952 an agreement to pay Israel $822 million within 14 years as reparation for the damages inflicted upon the Jews by the Nazis.
1958-1959 German payment yielded $87 million.\textsuperscript{32} Accordingly, under a most conservative estimate, German payments by 1961 would exceed $500 million.

Another source of Israeli revenue has been the private donations of American Jews and Jewish organizations. Between 1948 and 1956 “over $900 million was remitted to Israel by Jewish organizations” in the form of “philanthropic funds.”\textsuperscript{33} The United Jewish Appeal aims in 1961 to collect $72 million. This exceeds its 1960 goal by $10 million. Estimated conservatively, the United Jewish Appeal and other philanthropic Jewish organizations have thus far contributed to Israel over $1,000,000,000.

But the Zionist Jews contribute generously to Israel at least in part because their contribution is tax exempt. If the tax exempt provision is removed from the contribution to the United Jewish Appeal and other Zionist organizations, the Israeli fund reserve will decrease and with it the Israeli arrogancy.

If American financial aid to Israel is discontinued, or even if there is a threat that it might be discontinued, Israel will become willing to accept United Nations resolutions and recognize Arab rights, leading eventually to peace in the Middle East.

The road to peace in the Middle East is via Washington, D.C.

\textsuperscript{32}\textit{Ibid.} p. 65.
\textsuperscript{33}\textit{American Jewish Year Book}, 1958, p. 146.
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