

palestine

*'Free Palestine' is grateful to Dr.
Yusef Sayegh for having compiled
the material in this booklet.*

INTRODUCTION

ISRAEL is a country which came into being by making another country cease to be: Israel is the replacement of a Middle Eastern country; its people constitute the demographic replacement recruited from a hundred different lands, of the indigenous people who have been displaced and dispersed into a dozen lands; its land is a land occupied but not owned, nor purchased, nor otherwise rightfully acquired by its present occupants. There is no other parallel to this situation anywhere else in the world today; and that is why the Arab-Israeli conflict cannot be understood in terms of other international situations, nor solved through approaches inspired by other solutions to other international disputes.

Israel *is* because Palestine *is not*: Israelis are where they are, because Palestinian Arabs have been evicted from their ancestral homeland, where they ought to have remained. The very being of Israel then is an act of non-being, an act of elimination of Palestine and its indigenous inhabitants. That is why there is an Arab-Israeli conflict, and that is what that conflict is all about! When your reporters tell you: "The Arab States do not recognize or accept Israel", they are reporting only half the truth: the other half of the truth, which they suppress or of which they themselves are ignorant, is that the "Israel" which the Arab States do not recognize or accept is a country whose very being has meant non-recognition and non-acceptance of the Arab people of Palestine and of their inalienable right to continue to live on their own soil and to enjoy both their individual rights and their collective right of self-determination in their homeland. Arab non-recognition of Israel is no more than a *passive* retort to Israel's *active and actualized* non-recognition of Palestine, and to Israel's displacement of the Palestinian Arabs, its usurpation of their individual and collective property, and its replacement of those Arabs by aliens imported from a hundred foreign lands.

AREA, POPULATION AND LANDOWNERSHIP OF PALESTINE

WITH the coming into force of the Mandate, the boundaries of "Mandated Palestine" were established within a total land area of 10,163 square miles. In addition, there is an inland water area of 272 square miles comprising Lake Huleh (5 square miles), Lake Tiberias or the Sea of Galilee (62 square miles) and half of the area of the Dead Sea (405 square miles), making a total area of 10,435 square miles.

In 1918, when the Allies occupied the country, Palestine had a population of about 700,000 inhabitants. Of these 644,000 were Arabs, (574,000 of whom were Moslem and 70,000 Christian), and 56,000 Jews.¹

In 1922, a census was taken and it showed the total population to be 757,182 (590,000 Moslems, 83,794 Jews, 73,014 Christians and 9,474 others).

In 1931, a second census was taken which showed the population to have increased to a total of 1,035,821 (759,712 Moslems, 174,610 Jews, 91,398 Christians and 10,101 others).²

In 1944, the total population was estimated by the Palestine Government to have reached the figure of 1,764,000 (1,179,000 Arabs, 554,000 Jews and 32,000 others).³

In mid-May 1948, using the same methods of estimation adopted by the Palestine Government, the total population of Arabs and Jews would have reached 2,065,000 (1,415,000 Arabs and 650,000 Jews).⁴

Thus, the proportion of Jewish to total population rose from 8 percent in 1918, to

about 12 percent in 1922, to about 17 percent in 1931, to 31 percent in 1944 and in mid-May 1948. The pace of this increase in the size of the Jewish community is all the more startling considering the fact that the rate of net natural increase among Palestinian Arabs was about 50 percent higher than that among Palestinian Jews (3.2 percent and 2.2 percent respectively). It was large-scale immigration that accounted for the fast rise in the ratio of Jewish to total population.

In 1918, the Jews owned only two percent (162,500 acres) out of a total land area of 6,580,755 acres.⁵

During the ensuing thirty years, the Jews purchased additional land, bringing their total holdings on the date of the termination of the Mandate in May 1948, to 372,925 acres, or 5.67 percent of the total land area of the country.⁶ However, the Palestine Government estimated in 1946 that "the Jews held over fifteen percent of the cultivable area of Palestine."⁷

Resistance to sale of land to Jews persisted throughout the period of the Mandate; and the extra area of 210,425 acres acquired between 1918 and 1948 was mostly purchased from Lebanese and Syrian absentee landowners living outside Palestine. The area sold by Palestinians during the Mandate is about 100,000 acres only, in spite of the high prices offered and the legislation that was designed until 1939 to facilitate transfer of land to Jews.

¹ *Government of Palestine: A Survey of Palestine 1945-1946*, p. 144.

² *Ibid.*, Table 7c, p. 149.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 143.

⁴ These figures are adjustments of earlier figures given in the Report of the UNSCOP-U.N. Document A/364, Vol I, Ch. IV, p. 54. The size of the Jewish Community is in the line with the size as on 8 November, 1948, when it was reported to have reached 716,000 because of large-scale immigration after the creation of the State. (For this last figure, see Israel Government Yearbook 1950, p. 359.)

⁵ *Palestine: A survey of Palestine 1945-1946*, p. 242.

⁶ Calculated from the Village Statistics 1945, published by the Palestine Government. To convert to dunums, multiply by 4.

⁷ Palestine Government Memorandum submitted to UNSCOP, dated 12 July, 1947.

Number of Arabs affected by creation of Israel

The number of Arabs who had left their homes by 14 May, 1948, was in the neighbourhood of 400,000. By the time the last Armistice Agreement had been signed, another 350,000 had been forced to leave the country, bringing the total number of refugees who had been expelled from their homes inside Israel to some 750,000.

According to the 1966-67 report of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency (UNRWA), the number of refugees registered with the Agency on 31 May, 1967, had risen, through natural population increase, to 1,344,576, of whom 860,951 were in receipt of rations.¹

These figures do not include, however, Palestinians who have lost their means of livelihood but not their homes, and as such, do not qualify for relief according to UNRWA regulations. Also they do not include persons who have been able to re-establish themselves

in neighbouring Arab countries without outside help and therefore are not in need of relief; or Palestinians who are not scattered throughout the world. The total number of Palestinian Arabs on the eve of the War of June 1967, was some 2,350,000. The approximate breakdown of this total follows:

	<i>In 1,000's</i>
1. Refugees, whether or not on relief	1,345
2. Non-refugee population of the West Bank	475
3. Non-refugee population of Gaza Strip	130
4. Persons never listed as refugees, living outside Jordan and Gaza	100
5. Arabs staying in Israel since May 1948	300
	<hr/>
	Total 2,350
The total today (May 1969) is some 2.5 million.	

¹ U.N. Document A/6713—UNRWA Report 1966-1967.

WHO STARTED THE WAR IN 1948?

THAT the zionists started war on the Palestine Arabs before the creation of the state of Israel is confirmed by the two outstanding Zionist leaders:

1. David Ben Gurion said: "As April 1948 began, our War of Independence swung decisively from defence to attack."¹ "Field troops and Palmach in particular were thus deployed and quickly showed the mettle that was soon to animate our army and bring it victory. In operation Nachshon the road to Jerusalem was cleared at the beginning of April, almost all of New Jerusalem occupied, and the guerillas were expelled from Haifa, Jaffa, Tiberias, Safad while still the Mandatory was present. The Hagana did its job; until a day or two before the Arab invasion not a settlement was so lost, no road cut. . . . Arabs started fleeing from the cities almost as soon as disturbances began in the early days of December 1947".²
2. Menachem Beigin, leader of the Irgun Zvei Leumi terrorist group, tells how "In Jerusalem, as elsewhere, we were the first to pass from the defensive to the offensive. . . . Arabs began to flee in terror . . . Hagana was carrying out successful attacks on other fronts, while all the Jewish forces proceeded to advance through Haifa like a knife through butter. The Arabs began to flee in panic shouting 'Deir Yasin'.³" He added: "In the months preceding the Arab invasion, and while the five Arab States were conducting preparations, we continued to make sallies into

Arab territory. The conquest of Jaffa stands out as an event of first-rate importance in the struggle for Hebrew independence early in May, on the eve of the invasion by the five Arab States . . ."⁴

The following is a list of the major attacks, occupations and expulsions which took place before the British left on 14 May, 1948, before a single soldier from any Arab State entered Palestine.

(a) **In the territory reserved for the 'Arab state'**

The Arab villages of Qaza, Salameh, Saris, Qastal, Biyar 'Adas and the towns of Jaffa and Acre were attacked and occupied in the period between December 1947 and mid-May 1948.

(b) **In the territory assigned to the 'Jewish state'**

The Arab inhabitants of the towns of Tiberias, Haifa, Safad and Beisan, and of hundreds of Arab villages, were attacked and either made to flee or were expelled prior to 15 May, 1948.

(c) **Within the area reserved for 'Jerusalem International Zone'**

The massacre of Deir Yasin took place on 9 April, 1948, and the Arab quarter of Katamon was attacked and occupied on 29 April, 1948.

During this six-month period, some 400,000 Palestinian Arabs were driven out of their homes and became refugees. In other words, more than half the Arabs who became refugees had been expelled or made to flee before May 15, the day the Arab armies entered Palestine.

¹ Ben Gurion, *David, Rebirth and Destiny of Israel* (New York: The Philosophical Library, 1954), p. 296.

² *Ibid.*, pp. 291-292.

³ Beigin, *The Revolt: Story of the Irgun*, p. 162.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 348.

ISRAELI EXPANSIONISM

EACH time the Arabs point out the dangers to them of Israeli expansionism, they are met with emphatic denials. It is just not possible to reconcile such denials with Israeli planning and action. It has already been pointed out that the limits of *Eretz Israel*, as loosely defined by the Zionist movement in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century, coincide with the so-called "biblical" and "historical" boundaries of the "Promised Land", namely, from "the Nile to the Euphrates".

The concrete political steps leading to the realization of this objective began with the Balfour Declaration which gave the Zionists a foothold in Palestine in the form of a "national home", followed by the establishment of a "Jewish state" in 1948. Since the June 1967 war, there has been great pressure inside Israel to establish "Greater Israel", including the territories occupied in June 1967.¹

The extension of Israel's geographical horizons, to which we have just referred, is neither a recent nor an isolated phenomenon. Apart from the adoption of an expansionist, centrifugal policy by Zionism before the establishment of the State, there is no shortage of evidence of the same tendency since 1948, although one would expect a state to be more aware of international obligations than an ideological movement that is not tied by diplomatic constraints. The declarations of Israeli leaders make their expansionist intentions much clearer than Israel's Western sympathisers would like to admit.

(1) Dr. Chaim Weizmann, President of the World Zionist Organization for more than three decades, and first President of Israel, during a visit to Jerusalem on 1 December, 1948, told his audience: "Do not worry because part of Jerusalem is not now within the state. All will come to pass in peace. Again I counsel patience." He added: "Fear not, my friends, the old synagogues will be rebuilt anew and the way to the Wailing Wall will be opened again. With your blood and sacrifices you have renewed the Covenant of Old. Jerusalem is ours by virtue of the blood which your sons shed defending it."² Nineteen years later, the Israeli army followed the counsel of Weizmann and

opened the way to the Wailing Wall: not peacefully or through patience, but by bomb-shell and napalm. The reader is reminded that Jerusalem means spiritually at least as much to the Arab-Moslem and Christian alike—as to the Jew. This is apart from Arab attachment to and identification with a city in which the Arabs have lived and which they have controlled for many centuries without interruption.

(2) David Ben Gurion said in an official publication that the state "has been resurrected in the western part of the land" of Israel and that independence has been reached "in a part of our small country". He added: "Every state consists of a land and a people. Israel is no exception, but it is a state identical neither with its land nor with its people. . . . It must now be said that it has been established in only a portion of the land of Israel. Even those who are dubious as to the restoration of the historical frontiers, as fixed and crystallised from the beginning of time, will hardly deny the anomaly of the boundaries of the new State."³

(3) David Ben Gurion, speaking at a meeting of the Mapai Party in 1952 said: "I accept to form the Cabinet on one condition, and that is, to utilise all possible means to expand towards the south". Could the Sinai campaign in 1956, but have been a fulfilment of this undertaking?

(4) On 12 February, 1952, Moshe Dayan, as Chief-of-Staff of the Israeli army, said on the Israeli radio: "It lies upon the people's shoulders to prepare for the war, but it lies upon the Israeli army to carry out the fight with the ultimate object of erecting the Israeli empire".⁴

This is probably one of the clearest and most unhypercritical of statements by responsible Israelis. In using the term "empire", Dayan called things by their right name.

(5) On 12 October, 1955, Menachem Beigin, leader of the Herut Party and member of Parliament and Government, said in the Knesset: "I deeply believe in launching preventive war against the Arab States without further hesitation. By doing so, we will

achieve two targets: firstly, the annihilation of Arab power; and secondly, the expansion of our territory". Again an unhypocritical statement.

(6) Another spokesman of the Herut Party, declared in New York in 1956, months before the Suez campaign: "Peace with the Arab countries is impossible with the present boundaries of Israel which leave Israel open to attack". He advised that "Israel should take the offensive immediately and capture strategic points along its border, including the Gaza Strip and then should take over the British-backed Kingdom of Jordan".⁵

With these declarations as a recent background, and with earlier declarations before the establishment of the State, the Arabs cannot but view with apprehension the dangers which the creation of Israel represents to Arab territory and peace. And there has been no lack of concrete acts of aggression to substantiate Arab fears.

THE INVASION OF EGYPT IN 1956

The reasons the Israelis gave for their action

varied. In a communiqué issued on the eve of the invasion, the Israeli Ministry of Foreign Affairs described the campaign in terms of both a "preventive war" and a "retaliatory raid".⁶ General Moshe Dayan's orders to his troops read: "Today the Southern forces will fight across the border and will enclose the Nile army in its own country".⁷ When asked to explain the Israeli action, the Liaison Officer for Armistice Affairs at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs qualified the terms of the official communiqué and confirmed that "this was not just a retaliatory raid, but that the Israel forces were going to stay in Sinai".⁸

In announcing the invasion of Egypt to the Knesset, David Ben Gurion was even more explicit. He said: "The army did not make an effort to occupy enemy territory in Egypt proper and limited its operations to free the area from northern Sinai to the tip of the Red Sea". Referring to the occupation of the Island of Tiran, south of the Gulf of Aqaba, he described it as "the Island of Yotvat, south of the Gulf of Eilat, which was liberated by the



Israeli army".⁹ The reader will remember that Eilath itself (originally Um Rashrash) had been occupied merely half a month after Israel signed the Armistice Agreement with Egypt in which she undertook to respect the demarcation lines defined in the Agreement; these lines excluded Eilath.

The repeated references to "liberation" and to old biblical names of places, like the indication of the intention to stay in Sinai, are reflections of the expansionism motivating the campaign. In any case, when Israel had to withdraw under pressure from the United Nations and more specifically from the United States, it still insisted on changing the *status quo ante* by making its withdrawal conditional on the Gulf of Aqaba being opened up for Israeli shipping. The Arab contention that the Gulf was without doubt territorial water was refused by Israel, as was the Arab suggestion to take the issue to the International Court at the Hague for a ruling. Few people recall that the International Law Commission in 1956 found no grounds for considering the Straits an

international waterway subject to the rules appropriate to such waterways.¹⁰

THE JUNE WAR 1967

Because it is more sensitive to threats to Israel than threats to the Arabs, public opinion in the West believed that the June 1967 War began with the U.A.R.'s closing of the Straits of Tiran to Israeli shipping in May and with the entry of U.A.R. troops into the Sinai Peninsula; and that the Israelis had to attack to prevent the destruction of their state. Because of this, the Israelis got political, moral and financial support from many nations and were able to brand the Arab states as the aggressors. In fact, President Nasser's actions in May were in answer to Israeli threats and attacks against Syria in April, though, because these went almost unnoticed in the Western press, very few people realised their occurrence.¹¹

A sampling of Israeli statements made before the June War and after it shows a wide gap: the statements preceding the war invariably containing assurances and pledges regarding



Israel's innocence of expansionist aims; the ones after explicitly stating Israel's intention to hold on to certain occupied territories, no matter what outcome the negotiations demanded by Israel might have. The Israelis have adopted as the main plank in their Arab policy the idea of direct negotiations. Few Westerners have seen clearly the dishonesty of calling for negotiations, while declaring certain issues (e.g. Jerusalem) "non-negotiable".

STATEMENTS BEFORE THE WAR

(1) On 8 November, 1966, Michael Comay, then Israeli representative at the United Nations, told the special Political Committee—in rebuttal of Arab accusations of Israeli expansionist designs on Arab territories: "I would like to inform the Committee quite categorically that the Government of Israel covets no territory of any of its neighbours, nor does it feel obliged to hand over its territory to any of its neighbours. We are all members of the United Nations. We have signed the Charter obliging us to respect each other's political independence and territorial integrity. My government fully and unreservedly accepts this obligation towards the other 120 Member States of the United Nations".¹²

(2) Moshe Dayan, Minister of Defence, said: "We have no invasion aims. Our only target is to foil the Arab armies' aim of invading our country".¹³ On another occasion he was quoted as saying: "Soldiers of Israel, we have no aims of territorial conquest."¹⁴

(3) On the day of the attack Levi Eshkol declared: "We do not demand anything except to live in tranquillity in our present territory".¹⁵

STATEMENTS AFTER THE WAR

(1) Levi Eshkol: "A new political reality in the mid-east has been created:¹⁶ Israel intends to keep the former Jordan part of Jerusalem and the Gaza Strip. Israel without Jerusalem is Israel without a head..."¹⁷

(2) Abba Eban, Foreign Minister: "Israel will, under no circumstances, return to the 1949 Armistice Agreements".¹⁸ "Sometimes you cannot gain peace and security without territorial gains."¹⁹ "If the General Assembly were to vote by 121 votes to 1 in favour of Israel returning to the armistice lines... Israel would refuse to comply with the decision."²⁰ "Israel has no intention of 'squandering' the position won by its Middle East war victory and will hold lands captured from the Arabs until a

satisfactory peace settlement is reached."²¹ "The military victory is neither stable nor successful unless it is ratified by peace. What happened in 1967 happened because in 1957 Israel has been persuaded to give up the fruits of victory. This time there will be a different map of Israel... Israel does not have to be recognised. Israel exists."²²

(3) Yigal Allon, Minister of Labour: "We must have depth, especially in the central part of the country and the vicinity of Galilee and Jerusalem".²³

(4) Moshe Dayan, Minister of Defence: "Israel must not return to its 1948 borders."²⁴ We need to consider the reality of 1967 and the map of 1967. We need, not only permanent borders, but borders that will ensure peace".²⁵ "There are about a million Arabs whom we don't want, I should say as citizens of Israel, in the Jordanian part. We certainly don't want Egypt to go back to the Gaza Strip. This is the same story like Sinai... I don't think that we should in any way give back the Gaza Strip to Egypt or the western part of Jordan to King Hussein." Asked whether there was any way whereby Israel could absorb the huge number of Arabs whose territory Israel now occupies, he said: "Economically, we can; but I think that it is not in accord with our aims in the future. It would turn Israel into either a bi-national or poly-Arab-Jewish State instead of the Jewish State, and we want to have a Jewish State... We want a Jewish State like the French want a French State."²⁶ "On no account will we force ourselves to leave, for example, Hebron. This is a political programme but more important, it is a fulfilment of a people's ancestral dream."²⁷

(5) It was reported from Jerusalem that all maps issued by the Israeli Survey Department with markings of the 1949 armistice lines have now been classified as 'antiquated and historical'.²⁸

(6) The Israeli Government has now declared that the areas occupied as a result of the June 1967 war are no longer recognised as 'enemy territory'. This action has the double purpose, on the one hand, of overcoming criticism that the Israelis, in their treatment of the civilian Arab inhabitants, are contravening the 1949 Geneva Conventions; and, on the other hand, of acquiring freedom to expropriate property."²⁹

- ¹ The evidence is voluminous, so we will select a few leading references:
 - a. On 18 July, 1967, in Paris, Mr. Walter Eytan, Israeli Ambassador to France, declared that Israel had not taken anything that belonged to anybody else. See the "Times" (London), 27, July, 1967.
 - b. On 29 October, Levi Eshkol, Prime Minister, spoke of Greater Israel as defined in the text above. See "International Herald Tribune", 30 October, 1967.
 - c. "A Movement for Greater Israel" has been formed in Israel. According to "Le Monde" (20 December and 28 December, 1967) this Movement insists on the annexation of the areas now under occupation. It includes in its membership many leading professors, journalists, Knesset members, and is supported by such members of the Israeli Cabinet as Menachem Beigin, Yosef Sapir, and Moshe Dayan.
 - d. Mr. Yigal Allon, Minister of Labour, announced that official maps of Greater Israel had been issued, and that the old maps (with the 5 June borders) had become merely historical. See "Le Monde", 23 February, 1968.
- ² Joseph Dov, *The Faithful City: The Siege of Jerusalem 1948* p. 332.
- ³ Israeli Government Yearbook 1951-1952, p. 64; and Yearbook 1952, pp. 63 and 65.
- ⁴ From a statement broadcast on the Arabic Programme, Israel Radio, 12 February, 1952.
- ⁵ "New York Times", 25 January, 1956.
- ⁶ For text of communiqué, see U.S. Policy in the Middle East Documents (Washington: Department of State, 1957), pp. 135-6.
- ⁷ "Jewish Observer", 9 November, 1956.
- ⁸ Burns, E. L. M., *Between Arab and Israeli* (New York: Ivan Obolensky, 1963), p. 180.
- ⁹ "New York Times", 8 November, 1956. *Emphasis added.*
- ¹⁰ See reference to the report of the International Law Commission in a letter by Harvard Professor Roger Fisher to the Editor of the "New York Times", 10 June, 1967.
- ¹¹ E. Rouleau, J. F. Held, and S. Lacouture, *Israel et les Arabes: Le 3 e'me Combat* (Paris, Editions du Seuil, 1967), pp. 73, 176. Also, John S. Badeau, "The Arabs, 1967", in the "Atlantic" (U.S. Monthly), December 1967, p. 108.
- ¹² U.N. Document A/SPC/PV.505 of 8 November, 1966.
- ¹³ From an Israel radio broadcast on 5 June, 1967. However, compare this statement with that of General Hod, Commander of the Israeli Air Force, who indicated that the attack plan had been in preparation for 16 years in these words: "Sixteen years' planning had gone into those initial 80 minutes" (the air strike on 5 June, 1968). "We lived with the plan, we slept on the plan, we ate the plan. Constantly we perfected it." Article by Randolph and Winston Churchill, in "The Sunday Times" (London), 16 July, 1967, p. 7.
- ¹⁴ The "New York Times", 5 June, 1967.
- ¹⁵ From an Israel radio broadcast from Jerusalem on 5 June, 1967.
- ¹⁶ UPI Despatch, 9 June, 1967.
- ¹⁷ From an interview with "Der Spiegel". Reported in "Jerusalem Post", 10 July, 1967.
- ¹⁸ UPI Despatch, 17 June, 1967.
- ¹⁹ From an interview on West German television, 5 July, 1967.
- ²⁰ "New York Times", 19 June, 1967.
- ²¹ Reuter Despatch, 14 August, 1967.
- ²² The "Daily Star" (Beirut), 19 September, 1967.
- ²³ From a statement made on 12 June, 1967.
- ²⁴ The "Christian Science Monitor", 7 July, 1967.
- ²⁵ "The Guardian", 11 August, 1967.
- ²⁶ From statements on C.B.S. "Face the Nation" programme, televised from New York.
- ²⁷ UPI Despatch, 9 August, 1967.
- ²⁸ Quoted in the "Daily Star", 22 February, 1968.
- ²⁹ For contraventions against the 1949 Geneva Convention, see *Israel and the Geneva Conventions*. The Institute for Palestine Studies, Beirut, 1968.

LEGISLATION GOVERNING THE 1968 ARAB MINORITY IN ISRAEL

LEGISLATION applicable to the Arab inhabitants in Israel since 1948 includes :

(1) The Military Emergency Regulations 1948.¹ Don Peretz sums up the effect of these 'regulations' on the Arab inhabitants as follows : "Arabs in these areas lived under a complex of legal restrictions. Their movement into, out of, and within security zones was regulated by the military. Legal residents could be banished and their properties confiscated. Whole villages could be removed from one area to another. The final authority regarding violations of emergency regulations was a military court, whose decisions were not subject to jurisdiction of the Civil Courts of Appeal".²

(2) Civil Emergency Laws and Regulations.³ Explaining these laws, Don Peretz said : "Every Arab in Palestine who had left his town or village after November 29, 1947, was liable to be classified as an absentee under the regulations. All Arabs who held property in the new city of Acre regardless of the fact that they may never have travelled farther than the few metres to the old city, were classified as absentees. The 30,000 Arabs who fled from one place to another within Israel, but who never left the country, were also liable to have their property declared absentee".⁴

(3) The Land Acquisition Law (Confirmation of Past Actions and Compensation).⁵ The purpose behind this law was to legalise 1948-1953 seizures of Arab lands and to ensure future acquisitions. Arab citizens of Israel protested this new act of injustice to the Israeli Parliament, to the United Nations, and to Western Powers; but without result. They were joined in their protest by a very few enlightened Jewish Israelis who condemned the law as oppressive, prejudicial and discriminatory.

Another Jewish writer, Derek Tozer, following a visit to the Middle East, described these laws as "extraordinary, even in modern times". He said : "The military governor will declare an Arab area a prohibited zone, thus debarring

entry to any Arab wishing to tend his land. The 1953 law is then invoked and agricultural lands become liable to confiscation, since the owners have failed to tend and till their lands themselves. This means that the property of the Arabs automatically becomes the property of the State".⁶

David K. Elston, columnist of the "Jerusalem Post", attacked the Land Acquisition Law as "perhaps the most serious factor creating embitterment among all Arabs". He pointed out that in Galilee, twenty villages had been deprived of their property by Jewish collectives, which "arrogated to themselves, through long-term leases granted by the Minister of Agriculture, lands of Arabs who were free from any guilt or wrong-doing".⁷

Dr. Shereshevsky of the Ihud Party, described the Land Acquisition Law as "robbery of land from people, inhabitants, of the State". He pointed out, "They are agricultural people, like you, citizens like you. There exists only one difference between them and you : they are Arabs and you are a Jew. This difference seemed to you so great and decisive that you were ready to trespass on all that is required by the Law of Israel and its tradition".⁸

Moshé Keren, another Jewish writer, described the law as "wholesale robbery with a legal coating," and added : "The future student of ethnology will wonder how it came to pass that it was the Jewish people, striving to build their state on the foundations of justice and righteousness and having themselves been the victims of unparalleled acts of robbery and expropriation that should have been capable of doing this to a helpless minority".⁹

(4) Law of Limitation, March 1958 : this requires Arab landowners without a registered title to produce evidence that they have been in continuous undisputed possession of their lands for fifteen years, or forfeit them to the Israeli Government. Under the Ottoman Empire and British Mandate laws, landowners had to prove

possession and cultivation for ten consecutive years to obtain title deeds. This meant that, with the new law, a significant number of Arab owners now had to produce fresh evidence of possession which was difficult, often impossible for them to obtain.

As indicated earlier, the cumulative effect of laws and regulations so far referred to has been to expropriate about 70 percent of the land belonging to the Arab minority. It is obvious that this process has nothing to do with security, everything to do with the Israeli hunger for land.

(5) The Law of Return and the Nationality Law.¹⁰ Under these two laws the right of Israeli residence and nationality is automatically and unconditionally conferred upon a Jew, of whatever nationality, the moment he steps on Israeli soil. Palestinian Arabs, on the other hand, are not so privileged, even within their own country. The fact that Palestine Arabs were born in the territory occupied by the Israelis is insufficient to confer upon them automatic citizenship, notwithstanding the specific stipulation in the United Nations Resolution on Partition.¹¹ To become an Israeli citizen, an Arab must be "naturalised". This is only possible by proving (a) that he was

born in the country; (b) that he lived in Israeli-occupied territory three out of the five years preceding the date of his application for citizenship; (c) that he is qualified for permanent residence; (d) that he is settled or intends to settle permanently in the country; and (e) that he has a sufficient knowledge of the Hebrew language (though Arabic is regarded as an official language).

After this Law was passed, the Minister of the Interior admitted in Parliament that racial discrimination existed in Israel. But he pointed out that this stemmed, not from the Nationality Law, but from the Law of Return by which only Jews are given the right of 'return'. The former law, he argued, intended to distinguish between those whose loyalty to Israel was sure and those who had to prove it.¹² Commenting on this law, the Hebrew paper "Haaretz" reminded Israelis of the Jewish struggle for minority rights in other countries and of Israeli neglect of Arab minority rights.¹³

Derek Tozer, previously quoted, said: "The official policy of the Government (of Israel) is unequivocal. Arabs, like Jews in Nazi Germany, are officially 'Class B' citizens—a fact which is recorded on their identity cards".¹⁴

¹ Israeli Government, *Collection of Regulations*, 1949, pp. 169-170.

² Peretz, *op. cit.*, pp. 95-96. The past tense used by Peretz does not mean that the regulations had stopped being in force when he wrote. As indicated earlier, they were abolished only at the end of 1966. The other discriminatory regulations discussed further on in this chapter are all still in force at the time of writing (June 1968).

³ The Abandoned Areas Ordinance 1949, *State of Israel Laws*, Vol. I, pp. 25-26; The Absentee Property Regulations 1948, "Jerusalem Post", 19 December, 1948; The Emergency Regulations (Cultivations of Waste Lands), 1948-1949, *State of Israel Laws*, Vol. II, pp. 70-77.

⁴ Peretz, *op. cit.*, p. 152.

⁵ Text published in "Middle East Journal" (Washington D.C.), Vol. VII, No. 3, Summer 1953, pp. 358-360.

⁶ From an article entitled "How Israel Treats Her Arabs", in the American "Mercury", August 1957.

⁷ Quoted by Peretz, *op. cit.*, p. 172.

⁸ From an article entitled "We Accuse", published in the Hebrew paper "Haaretz", 14 January, 1955.

⁹ From an article entitled "The Arabs Among Us", published in "Haaretz", 14 January, 1955.

¹⁰ Israeli Government Yearbook 1952, pp. 207-210.

¹¹ U.N. Resolution 181 (II) of 29 November, 1947, Ch. 3, Para. 1.

¹² Peretz, *op. cit.*, p. 125.

¹³ "Haaretz", 3 April, 1953.

¹⁴ American "Mercury", August 1957.

DO JEWS HAVE A "DIVINE RIGHT" TO PALESTINE?

by Fayez A. Sayegh, Ph.D.

PREDICTIONS OF A RETURN FROM THE BABYLONIAN EXILE

DURING the Babylonian Exile, the Prophets taught that a remnant of the Jews would return to Palestine, re-build the Temple and the Walls of Jerusalem, and restore the religious life of the community.

They were clear prophecies of concrete practical events. They were predictions of a return from a specific exile.

They were not—nor did they purport to be—predictions of a recurrent act of return, foreseen as inevitably following every act of dispersal which might occur in the future. The Prophets did not forecast perpetual return as a necessary follow-up to every exile.

These predictions of a return from a specific exile—the Babylonian Exile—were in fact fulfilled. The Temple and the Walls of Jerusalem were indeed rebuilt. A period of political independence, under the Maccabees, was indeed secured. In short, what the Prophets had predicted, has been fully accomplished.

Having been already fulfilled, the prophecies of the return cannot be viewed as still awaiting fulfilment. One cannot validly read into them what they did not proclaim. Nor can one attribute to them what they did not envisage, and build upon them a case for a "second return" from a subsequent exile which occurred after the predicted return from the earlier exile had already taken place.

It cannot be over-emphasized that, within the Old Testament, there is no prophecy of a "second return" after the return from the Babylonian Exile.

PROMISES OF POSSESSION OF PALESTINE

A. The Promises Cited

In a study he published concerning these promises, Professor Guillaume summed them

up as follows:

"The first explicit promise of Palestine to the descendants of Abraham was at Schechem (now Nablus) in Genesis xii. 7: 'Unto thy Seed will I give this land.'

"Chaper xiii. 15, when Abraham is standing on a hill near Bethel, has the words: 'All the land which thou seest to thee will I give it and to thy seed for ever.'

"Chapter xv. 18 is more explicit: 'Unto thy seed have I given this land, from the river of Egypt unto the great river, the river Euphrates.'

"The promises are repeated to Isaac; and to Jacob in xxviii. 12: 'The land whereon thou liest, to thee will I give it, and to thy seed, and thy seed shall be as the dust of the earth and thou shalt spread abroad to the west, and to the east, and to the north, and to the south; in thee and in thy seed shall all the families of the earth be blessed.'

"When Abraham made a covenant with God through circumcision (xvii. 8) all the land of Canaan was promised to him as 'an everlasting possession.'

"Other passages might be quoted, but these are representative, and others add nothing that is relevant here."

B. Who Are The Heirs To These Promises

It is evident from the Scriptural passages cited above and from similar passages, that the promises, were made to Abraham and his "seed" in the first instance. When they were subsequently made to Isaac and Jacob and their "seed", no exclusion of other descendants of Abraham was indicated. The inclusiveness of the earlier promises was not cancelled by the relative narrowness of the later ones.

Inasmuch as the Jews are not the only descendants of Abraham, there can be no justification for the claim that they are the only heirs to the promise of Palestine to "Abraham and

his seed". And, inasmuch as not all Jews are descendants of Abraham, there can be no justification for the claim that all Jews—i.e., Jews as Jews—are heirs to the promise of Palestine.

In other words, the Zionist contention that, on the authority of the Divine promises recorded in the Old Testament, Palestine belongs to ALL Jews and to Jews ALONE, is contradicted by two facts: first, that many NON-Jews are descendants of Abraham; and, secondly, that a sizable proportion of Jews are NOT descendants of Abraham.

1. Many Non-Jews are Descendants of Abraham:

Apart from Muslim tradition, there is ample evidence in the Old Testament itself that the term, "the seed of Abraham", includes Arabs. For, through Abraham's first-born son, Ishmael, who was born to Abraham by Hagar the Egyptian, many an Arab tribe came to be among the offspring of Abraham; and, through his second wife, Keturah, Abraham became the father of other Arab tribes also. (Genesis xxv. 1-4; and I. Chronicles i. 32).

It is significant that in the same passage in which God says to Abraham, "In Isaac shall thy seed be called", he adds that Ishmael also "is thy seed". (Genesis xxi. 12, 13). The narrowing-down of the scope of the term, "seed of Abraham", in subsequent promises, did not cancel the initial inclusiveness of that term.

Furthermore, many of the descendants of Abraham through Isaac and Jacob—i.e., many of the "seed of Abraham" in the narrower sense of the term—are among the non-Jews whose exclusion would seem to be suggested by the unwarranted identification of the "seed of Abraham" with the "Jews". For a large proportion of the exiled Jews preferred to remain where they were, when other Jews returned to the Holy Land after the Babylonian Exile; and those Jews who chose not to return formed the Diaspora, subsequently becoming the backbone of the Christian Church and an ethnically indistinguishable component of the population of the Near East.

2. Many Jews are not Descendants of Abraham:

Just as many non-Jews are among the descendants of Abraham, so too many Jews are not of the seed of Abraham.

For, throughout the centuries, conversion and

proselytization have introduced into the ranks of Jews many who were not of the offspring of Abraham.

Thus, several centuries before Christ, "many from among the peoples of the land became Jews; for the fear of the Jews was fallen upon them", according to the Book of Esther (viii. 17).

Even in Christ's time, proselytization was not unknown; and we have it on the authority of Christ Himself that scribes and pharisees used to "compass sea and land to make one proselyte" (Matthew xxiii. 15).

Nor did the practice end with the later dispersal of Jews. For example, According to the *Universal Jewish Encyclopedia* (Vol. VI, pp. 375-378), wholesale conversion of the Khazars of Russia to Judaism occurred in the Eighth Century A.D.

It is, one trusts, unnecessary to cite further evidence testifying to the fact that, even among the Jews, racial purity is non-existent.

3. Conclusion: The "seed of Abraham" is INDETERMINABLE:

The inescapable conclusion of the two aforementioned sets of facts is that the seed of Abraham is today indeterminable.

One can no more establish who, among Jews, is a descendant of Abraham, than authoritatively determine who, among certain groups of non-Jews, is not of the seed of Abraham. After more than thirty-five centuries of ethnic intermingling, dispersal, and conversion, the progeny of Abraham is no longer capable of accurate identification. The "seed of Abraham" is indistinguishable, genealogically or biologically; and the identification of "Jews" with "descendants of Abraham" is a dual mistake.

Most assuredly, then, the over-simplified Zionist contention, that the Jews of today are the heirs to the promises made to Abraham (and repeated to Isaac and Jacob) with respect to possession of Palestine, is inaccurate from the standpoint of both its exclusiveness and its inclusiveness.

It follows, too, that no one can validly invoke the promises recorded in the Scriptures to justify his claim to Palestine on the basis of descent from Abraham.

C. Were The Promises Revoked?

In an article in which he examined the

relevance of the promises under discussion to recent events in Palestine, the Rev. Dr. Oswald T. Allis wrote :

"This promise was conditioned on obedience to the will of God. Note the word, 'because thou hast obeyed my voice' (Genesis xxii. 18) and also Genesis xxvi. 5, where the renewal of the covenant with Isaac is explained by the words, 'because that Abraham obeyed my voice, and kept my charge, my commandments, my statutes, and my laws'.

"This basic principle, that possession of the land and prosperity in it was conditioned on obedience, is stressed again and again. It is made especially clear in the solemn warnings in Leviticus xxvi and Deuteronomy xxviii; and it is definitely declared that to be 'scattered among the nations' will be the punishment of disobedience (cf. Deut. iv. 27).

"These prophecies plainly foretold the course of Israel's history. . . . Certainly the Old Testament teaches both prophetically and historically that possession of the land was conditioned on obedience to Him who had given it to Abraham His 'friend' (Isa. xli. 8)".

Similarly, Professor Guillaume writes :

"Had we no prophetic messages to guide us it would be apparent that these promises of possession of the land of Canaan were not unconditional, the covenant relation between Israel and God demanded loyalty from the people, and individual and corporate righteousness. Were the people to fail in these respects a terrible doom awaited them."

Of direct relevance to this discussion is Christ's parable of the wicked husbandmen, which He concluded with the words :

"The kingdom of God shall be taken away from you, and shall be given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof" (Matthew xxi. 33-46).

IN THE LIGHT OF THE CHRISTIAN GOSPEL

It is in the light of the Christian Gospel that a Christian must understand the abiding truth and relevance of the promises recorded in the Old Testament.

For, in the Gospel of Christ, a new dimension of human existence, and of the God-man encounter, is revealed; and, viewed from the vantage-point of this new dimension, whatever

subsisted on the older dimension is transfigured and appears transformed.

A. Old Concepts : New Meanings

1. "The Law"

"Ye have heard that it was said . . . but I say unto you. . . ." With these words, repeated again and again in the Sermon on the Mount, Christ offers a re-interpretation of many of the basic tenets of the Law—the Law which He came "not to destroy but to fulfill" (Matthew v. 17-48).

2. Nationalistic vs. Universal Faith

The parochialism, provincialism, or "nationalism" of the Jewish traditions gave way, in Christ's Gospel, to a world-embracing universalism.

If Abraham was told, "In thee shall all the families of the earth be blessed" (Genesis xii. 3), Nicodemus was assured : "For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have eternal life" (John iii. 16).

The Apostles preached a Gospel that recognized no distinction between Jew and Gentile, bond and free.

"The mystery of Christ," asserted Paul the Apostle, "which in other generations was not made known unto the sons of men, as it hath now been revealed" is "that the Gentiles are fellow-heirs and fellow-members of the body, and fellow-partakers of the promise in Christ Jesus." (Ephesians iii. 4-6).

He Who, early in His earthly ministry, had told the Canaanitish woman, "I was not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel" (Matthew xv. 24) commanded His disciples, after His passion and before His ascension, saying, "Go ye therefore, and make disciples of all the nations. . . ." (Matthew xxviii. 19).

He incurred the wrath of the Jews for rebuking the narrow nationalism of their faith (Luke iv. 23-29).

3. "Children of Abraham"

The tribalistic belief in a "chosen people" was transcended within the context of a revolutionary universalism which emphasized the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man.

Privileges derived from, or based upon, racialistic ties or descent from a common ancestor lost their *raison d'être* and their very grounds within the context of the new doctrine

The biological acceptance of the term "children of Abraham" was ridiculed and boldly challenged.

Said John the Baptist to the Pharisees and Sadducees: "Think not to say within yourselves, We have Abraham to our father; for I say unto you, that God is able of these stones to raise up children unto Abraham." (Matthew iii. 9).

When unbelieving Jews protested, "We are Abraham's seed, and have never been in bondage to any man . . . Our father is Abraham," Jesus retorted: "If ye were Abraham's children, ye would do the works of Abraham." (John viii. 31-59).

4. "Israel"

Just as the biological concept of descent from Abraham gave way to a spiritual concept, so did "Israel of the flesh" give way to "Israel of the spirit". Wrote Paul in his Epistle to the Romans: "They are not all Israel, that are of Israel" (ix. 6); "By their unbelief they were broken off, and thou standest by thy faith. . . . God spared not the natural branches. . . ." (xi. 20, 21).

5. Not "Where"—But "In What Spirit"

Within the revolutionary re-interpretation of old concepts which the Christian Gospel introduces, the spiritual importance of places as such vanishes, giving way to emphasis on the spirit; it is the spirit alone that possesses importance. When the Samaritan woman inquired: "Our fathers worshipped in this mountain; and ye say, that in Jerusalem is the place where men ought to worship," Jesus replied:

"The hour cometh, when neither in this mountain, nor in Jerusalem, shall ye worship the Father. . . . The hour cometh, and now is, when the true worshippers shall worship the

Father in spirit and truth: for such doth the Father seek to be his worshippers. God is a spirit: and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and truth." (John iv. 19-25).

B. "Land, City And Temple Have Lost Their Religious Importance"

The joint impact of these and related Christian re-interpretations of Old Testament concepts, on the endeavour of Zionism and its Christian apologists to invoke the authority of the Scriptures for justifying the secular, political programme of Zionism, may best be summed up in the following words of Dr. Allis:

"Under the Christian dispensation, the land, the city, and the temple have lost the importance that formerly attached to them.

"According to the Law of Moses it was almost a necessity for a believing Israelite to live in or near the land of Canaan. The tabernacle, and later the temple, was the centre of worship for his people, He was required to go up to Jerusalem to celebrate the three annual feasts. For him Jerusalem and the temple had unique significance and importance.

"For the Christian, whether he be Gentile or Jew, all this is changed. A believing Jew is today as near heaven in the United States . . . as if he were in Jerusalem. An unbelieving Jew is just as far from heaven in Jerusalem as he would be in New York or London.

"For the Christian, whether Jew or Gentile, the land of Palestine has a sentimental interest. But that is all.

"It is only the Jew who still lives more or less in the Old Testament dispensation who regards the possession of the land as important. And part of its importance to him is due to racial pride and nationalistic aspirations."

EXTRACTS FROM THE NON-JEWISH JEW

by
ISAAC DEUTSCHER

THE responsibility for the tragedy of European Jews, for Auschwitz, Majdenek, and the slaughters in the ghetto, rests entirely on our western bourgeois 'civilisation', of which Nazism was the legitimate, even though degenerate, off-spring. Yet it was the Arabs who were made to pay the price for the crimes the West committed towards the Jews.

They are still made to pay it, for the 'guilty conscience' of the West is, of course, pro-Israeli and anti-Arab. And how easily Israel had allowed itself to be bribed and fooled by the false 'conscience money'.

Paradoxically and grotesquely, the Israelis appear now in the role of the Prussians of the Middle East. They have now won three wars against their Arab neighbours. Just so did the Prussians a century ago defeat all their neighbours within a few years, the Danes, the Austrians, and the French. The succession of victories bred in them an absolute confidence in their own efficiency, a blind reliance on the force of their arms, chauvinistic arrogance, and contempt for other peoples. I fear that a similar degeneration for degeneration—it is—may be taking place in the political character of Israel. Yet as the Prussia of the Middle East, Israel can be only a feeble parody of the original. The Prussians were at least able to use their victories for uniting in their Reich all German-speaking peoples living outside the Austro-Hungarian Empire. Germany's neighbours were divided among themselves by interest, history, religion, and language. Bismarck, Wilhelm II, and Hitler could play them off against one another. The Israelis are surrounded by Arabs only. Attempts to play off the Arab states against one another are bound to fail in the end. The Arabs were at loggerheads with one another

in 1948, when Israel waged its first war; they were far less divided in 1956, during Israel's second war; and they formed a common front in 1967. They may prove far more firmly united in any future confrontation with Israel.

The Germans have summed up their own experience in the bitter phrase: 'Man kann sich totsiegen!' 'You can drive yourself victoriously into your grave.' This is what the Israelis have been doing. They have bitten off much more than they can swallow. In the conquered territories and in Israel there are now nearly a million and a half Arabs, well over forty percent of the total population. Will the Israelis expel this mass of Arabs in order to hold 'securely' the conquered lands? This would create a new refugee problem, more dangerous and larger than the old one. Will they give up the conquered territories? No, say most of their leaders. Ben Gurion, the evil spirit of Israeli chauvinism, urges the creation of an 'Arab Palestinian State' on the Jordan, that would be an Israeli Protectorate. Can Israel expect that the Arabs will accept such a Protectorate? That they will not fight it tooth and nail? None of the Israeli parties is prepared even to contemplate a bi-national Arab-Israeli state. Meanwhile great numbers of Arabs have been 'induced' to leave their homes on the Jordan, and the treatment of those who have stayed behind is far worse than that of the Arab minority in Israel that was kept under martial law for nineteen years. Yes, this victory is worse for Israel than a defeat. Far from giving Israel a higher degree of security, it has rendered it much more insecure. If Arab revenge and extermination is what the Israelis feared, they have behaved as if they were bent on turning a bogey into an actual menace.

ZIONISM AND ANTI-SEMITISM

by Sami Hadawi

AN impression existed at one time that "Zionism would diminish anti-Semitism in the world. We are witness to the opposite," declared Dr. Judah Magnes, the late President of the Hebrew University in Jerusalem.¹

There is a principle which has guided enquiries into crimes and disturbances from Roman times to the present day. The Romans asked *Qui bono*: For whose benefit is it? And today, detectives will start an investigation by determining who stood to benefit from a crime. We may therefore consider: Who derives the most advantage from anti-Semitism? Do the Arabs? The Jews? Or the Zionists?

The Arabs have nothing to gain and much to lose from anti-Semitic practices. Firstly, were it not for Hitler's inhuman policy of racial discrimination and persecution, the Jews of Europe would never have left their homes in significant numbers; the Palestine tragedy would not have occurred; and the present tension and instability in the Middle East would not have arisen. Secondly, the aims of the anti-Semites run contrary to Arab interests and security. Anti-Semitic practices mean insecurity for Jews in their countries of origin, inducing greater immigration to Palestine, thereby creating a population problem in that country and the inevitable need for territorial expansion. Such conditions can only aggravate the Arab-Israeli conflict still further; make it more difficult for the Palestine Arabs to regain their homes peacefully; and increase conflict in the Middle East.

But the Zionists have much to gain and nothing to lose from the creation of a feeling of insecurity among world Jewry. Without the constant threat of anti-Semitism there could be no Zionism; Jewish immigration to Israel would diminish if not cease altogether; Israel would lose the colossal financial aid it now receives from United States and world Jewry; and the 'Jewish State' would cease to become

the nationalist empire and fulcrum for international political influence and economic control envisaged by the Zionists.

The close relationship between Zionism and anti-Semitism was commented upon by British historian Arnold Toynbee in May 1961. Speaking at the annual meeting of the American Council for Judaism in Philadelphia, Toynbee stated: "Zionism and anti-Semitism are expressions of an identical point of view. The assumption underlying both ideologies is that it is impossible for Jews and non-Jews to grow together into a single community and that therefore a physical separation is the only practical way out. The watchword of anti-Semitism," he said, "is, 'Back to medieval apartheid'; the watchword of Zionism is 'Back to the medieval ghetto'. All the far-flung ghettos in the world are to be gathered into one patch of soil in Palestine to create a single consolidated ghetto there," Toynbee concluded.²

The Zionist smear of anti-Semitism is being used extensively and indiscriminately against all those who disagree with Zionist policy. An American citizen, in a letter to the press, complained that he was "weary of being labelled an anti-Semite for expressing views about the foreign state of Israel which are contrary to those of 'American' Zionists. Do the concepts of 'brotherhood' and 'tolerance'," he asks, "apply only in one direction? I suspect," he said, "it is the threat of being called anti-Semitic by the very vocal Zionists which prevents American politicians from objectively debating the issues of American foreign policy vis-a-vis the Middle East."³

Anti-Semitism is being used by the Zionist movement as a double-edged weapon. On the one hand, it serves to silence any person who opposes Zionism and Israeli policy; on the other hand, it is used to discourage Jews from becoming assimilated into the lives of the countries of their origin.

Commenting on the first point, Professor David Riesman, of Harvard University, said: "The Zionists can muster not merely the threat of the Jewish vote and the no less important Jewish financial and organisational skills, but also the blackmail of attacking anyone who opposes their political aims for Israel as an anti-Semite."⁴

On the question of assimilation, Dr. Nahum Goldman, President of the World Zionist Organisation, in a speech he delivered on 23 July, 1958, at the opening of the World Jewish Congress in Geneva, Switzerland, is reported by the "New York Times" to have warned world Jewry that "a current decline of overt anti-Semitism might constitute a new danger to Jewish survival. . . . Jews nearly everywhere are equal citizens, both politically and economically," Goldman said. "However," he asserted, "the disappearance of anti-Semitism in its classical meaning, while beneficial to the political and material situation of Jewish communities, has had a very negative effect on our internal life . . ."⁵

Another expression of the values of anti-Semitism as a deterrent to Jewish assimilation, comes from a report from the Israeli-occupied sector of Jerusalem. Speaking before the Zionist General Council held in January 1966, Rabbi Mordechai Kershlum, of New York, stressed the importance of fighting assimilation. "I always fear," the Rabbi said, "lest the anti-Semites have adopted a new method. Instead of torture and persecution, they say, 'Give them peace and they will disappear of their own accord'.⁶

Perhaps the most important exploitation of anti-Semitism as a device to achieve Zionist ends, was revealed in an article in "Davar", the official organ of the Socialist Labour (Mapai) Party, the newspaper of Israel's governing party. Editor Sharun wrote: "I shall not be ashamed to confess that, if I had the power as I have the will, I would select a score of efficient young men — intelligent, decent, devoted to our ideal and burning with desire to help redeem Jews—and I would send them to the countries where Jews are absorbed in sinful self-satisfaction, plague these Jews with anti-Semitic slogans, such as 'Bloody Jew', 'Jew go to Palestine' and similar intimacies. I can vouch that the results, in terms of consider-

able immigration to Israel from these countries, would be ten thousand times larger than the results brought by thousands of emissaries who have been preaching for decades to deaf ears."⁷

The aims of the Zionist movement, apart from 'ingathering' the Jews of the world into the Palestine area, are to 'shake-down' Jews who do not go to Israel for contributions toward its support, solicit United States and United Nations assistance to Israel and promote the idea of Israel as the representative and guardian of the rights and interests of Jews wherever they may be. The letters of protest sent by the Israeli Government to the more than twenty states where 'swastikas' appeared and the Adolph Eichmann trial, indicate the role which the 'Jewish state' has assigned to itself. Israel speaks out on behalf of world Jewry, defends the interest of all Jews, whether they seek it or not.

The pro-Zionist Kimche brothers wrote that it was the Hitlerite catastrophe that gave post-war Zionism "a moral argument to which the Gentile world could have no answer"; and that when the British Navy turned immigrant ships away from the Palestine coast in the 1940s, it gave "the Jews a great moral weapon".⁸

Commenting, author Erskine H. Childers, wrote, "One of the most massively important features of the entire Palestine struggle was that Zionism deliberately arranged that the plight of the wretched survivors of Hitlerism should be a 'moral argument' which the West had to accept. This was done by seeing to it that Western countries did not open their doors, widely and immediately, to the inmates of the D.P. (displaced persons) camps."

Speaking at the Sixth Annual National Conference of the American Council for Judaism, Morris L. Ernst revealed the extent of opposition to the efforts of President Roosevelt "to give relief to the people pushed around by Hitler". Mr. Ernst disclosed that as the representative of the President, he was "thrown out of parlours of friends of mine" when he discussed with them his plan of relief for D.Ps, who very frankly warned him: "Morris, this is treason—you're undermining the Zionist movement," to which he replied, "Yes, may be I am. But I'm much more interested in a haven for a half a million or a million people—oppressed throughout the world".⁹

Childers went on to say: "The very basis of the post-war Palestine struggle was an appeal to the world's humanitarianism over a situation deliberately designed to canalise that humane instinct into one premise: Jewish statehood in Palestine". He added: "None of us who remember the emotional atmosphere of the time can dismiss the role this Zionist campaign played in all that followed. The evidence of the campaign, though suppressed by Zionists and conveniently forgotten by Western liberals who knew about it, is overwhelming. It is detailed in White House conversations. It was publicly acknowledged, for example, by Sulzberger of the "New York Times", who asked in 1949, 'In God's name why should the fate of all these unhappy people be subordinated to the single cry of Statehood?'"¹⁰

Richard Crossman, the champion of the Zionist cause on the Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry, writing in his 1946 Washington Diary, said: "The Zionists are terrific . . . their main preoccupation is not to save Jews alive out of Europe but to get Jews into Palestine and to establish a Jewish state".¹¹

This discriminatory policy was again made clear in 1959, when Jews were allowed to leave Rumania. Those who signed to go to Israel were assisted in every way; those who elected to resettle in other countries, were not only refused the assistance of the United Jewish Appeal funds collected for needy Jews, but were made to refund money given for travel between Rumania and Austria.

A shocking disclosure of Zionist opposition to Jewish immigration to the U.S.A. was made in an article published in the May 1959 issue

of "Unser Tzait", a monthly publication of the Jewish Labour Fund, entitled "A Secret Document about Rumanian Jews". The document was a transcript of the minutes of a meeting held by the Presidents' Conference on 25 February, 1959, at which the question of Jewish emigration from Rumania was discussed. The Presidents' Conference an organisation consisting of the heads of nineteen leading Zionist and pro-Zionist bodies in the United States, organised by the Jewish Agency for Israel to exert political pressure on the American Government in favour of Israel—met to formulate opposition to measures favouring the admission of Rumanian Jews into the United States. Nothing was to obstruct their immigration to Israel. The Presidents' Conference also sought to persuade Senator Jacob K. Javits of New York not to introduce an immigration bill which would admit some Rumanian immigrants to the United States as refugees.¹²

Another exposure of Zionist methods this time concerning Arab countries appeared in an article by Ian Gilmour, who said: "Since the basis of Zionism is that Jewish assimilation in other countries is in the long run impossible and that anti-Semitism and persecution are bound to break out sooner or later, Zionism has almost a vested interest in racial discrimination. The Israelis mount 'rescue operations' to have allegedly threatened Jews in other countries. . . . He added: "In the Arab countries, Jewish difficulties and emigration to Israel were the result not of anti-Semitism but of Zionist activities and the existence of the State of Israel. Zionism aggravated the disease that it professed to cure,"¹³ he remarked.

¹ Quoted by Ian Gilmour in the "Spectator" magazine, 24 June, 1960.

² "New York Times", 7 May, 1961.

³ From a letter by Richard J. Marquardt, published in "Holiday Magazine" of March 1963.

⁴ "Jewish Newsletter", 9 January, 1961.

⁵ Menuhin, Moshe, *The Decadence of Judaism in our Time* (New York: Exposition Press, 1965), pp. 400-401.

⁶ "Jerusalem Post", 14 January, 1966, p. 8.

⁷ Lilienthal, Alfred, *What Price Israel?* (Chicago: Henry Regnery, 1953), p. 207.

⁸ Kimche, Jon and David, *Both Sides of the Hill* (London: Secker & Warburg, 1960), pp. 20, 31.

⁹ American Council for Judaism, "The Council News", May 1950, p. 2.

¹⁰ "The Spectator" magazine, 22 July, 1960.

¹¹ Crossman, Richard, *Palestine Mission: A Personal Record* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1947), p. 47.

¹² "Jewish Newsletter", 18 May, 1959.

¹³ "The Spectator" magazine, 24 June, 1960.

P.L.O. RESEARCH CENTRE

606 Sadat Street, Beirut (Apt. 22)

Ras Beirut, Beirut—Lebanon. Telephone: 296803

PUBLICATIONS

- I. "FACTS AND FIGURES" SERIES :
1. Twenty Basic Facts About the Palestine Problem (Arabic, English, French and Spanish).
 2. The United Nations and the Palestine Problem (Arabic, English, French and Spanish).
 3. Discrimination in Education Against the Arabs in Israel (English).
 4. Israel in the International Arena (Arabic).
 5. The Palestine Problem in Thirty-Three International Conferences (Arabic).
 6. United States and West German Aid to Israel (Arabic and English).
 7. A Short Survey of the Palestine Problem (Arabic, English and French).
 8. The Israeli Press (Arabic).
 9. Political Life in Israel (Arabic).
 10. The Afro-Asian Institute, Tel-Aviv (Arabic).
 11. Arab Diplomatic Representation (Arabic).
 12. Scientific and Cultural Institutes in Israel (Arabic).
 13. Zionist Diplomacy (Arabic).
 14. The Arabs in Israel (1) (Arabic).
 15. The World Zionist Organization (Arabic).
 16. Interaction of Political, Military, and Economic Factors in Israel (Arabic).
 17. Dangers of Israel's Scientific Progress (Arabic).
 18. High-Pressure Planning in Israel (Arabic).
 19. Israel on the Eve of Aggression (Arabic).
 20. Arab Oil and the Battle for Palestine (Arabic).
 21. The Arabs in Israel (2) (Arabic).
 22. Zionist Literature (Arabic).
 23. Israel in Western Europe (Arabic).
 24. Territorial and Historical Waters in International Law (English).
- II. "PALESTINE MONOGRAPHS" :
1. Zionist Colonialism in Palestine (Arabic, English and French).
 2. The Armistice in International Law (English).
 3. The Expansionist Aims of Israel (Arabic).
 4. The Kibbutz (Arabic).
 5. Terrorist Roots of the Herut Party of Israel (Arabic).
 6. The Arab Boycott of Israel (English).
 7. The Mapai Party (Arabic).
 8. A Look at the Parties of Israel (Arabic).
 9. The Histadrut (Arabic).
 10. Violence and Peace: A study in Zionist Strategy (Arabic).
 11. The Israeli Infiltration in Asia (Arabic).
 12. Military Balance (Arabic).
- III. "PALESTINE BOOKS" :
1. The Israeli Economy (Arabic).
 2. Arabs, the Vatican and Israel (Arabic).
 3. Liberation—Not Negotiation (English).
 4. Arab Summit Conferences and the Palestine Problem (English).
 5. Revolutionary Preparation (Arabic).
 6. Arab Resistance in Palestine (Arabic).
- IV. "PALESTINE ESSAYS" :
1. The Concepts and Slogans of Bourguibism (Arabic).
 2. Zionism and Racism (English).
 3. Palestine and Arab Nationalism (Arabic).
- V. "PALESTINE CHRONOLOGY" :
1. Volume I: January 1 to June 30, 1965 (Arabic).
 2. Volume II: July 1 to December 31, 1965 (Arabic).
 3. Volume III: January 1, to June 30, 1966 (Arabic).
- VI. "PALESTINE MAPS" :
1. A six-Colour Wall Map of Palestine, 140 x 100 cms. (Arabic).



فلسطين

DO YOU KNOW

THAT in an ordinary primary school in one of the provinces of Egypt, school children aged 8 to 10 were playing in the yard when all of a sudden, death came to them from the sky. Death came with bombs from American made phantom jets used by Israel to bring death to innocent children. Thirty children, boys and girls, were killed and forty-one were wounded. There were fifteen fractured skulls among the wounded and many of the children with burns from napalm bombs and unlikely to survive. Newspaper correspondents saw in the mortuary the corpses of the killed and saw the undertaker washing the blood from children in readiness for their mothers to take them up.

THAT two months ago the same phantom jets bombarded with napalm bombs a civilian factory near Cairo, and a 100 civilian workers were killed and another 100 were wounded.

THAT the Amnesty International published recently a report in which it unmasked the torture of Arab prisoners by Israeli authorities. Arab civilians are captured, beaten unconscious, strapped to tables and given electric shocks. They are tortured by truncheons, knout, overdoses of water and intolerable nagging; Arab girls are arrested, grabbed by the hair, kicked, punched, beaten with metal rods and suffer from all kinds of torture ever devised or thought of.

Aren't these acts of killing innocent children, bombing and torturing of civilians typical of the German Nazi during the last War? Aren't yesterdays victims of Nazi persecution todays murderers and persecutors?

And you, a student with a free mind, look back with revulsion against Nazi persecution of Jews. Aren't the very principles which impel you to do that and which make you oppose any discrimination against Jewish people in this or other countries compel you to speak out when the Israeli authorities inflict such horrors upon Arab children and civilians? Don't the same principles which make you oppose and condemn the racist governments of Rhodesia and South Africa impel you to speak out when Israel discriminates, tortures and kills innocent souls? Don't the same principles urge you to speak out when Israel dispossesses millions of Arabs and seizes by force their lands, homes and businesses and condemns hundreds of thousands of women and children to an appalling existence in refugee camps?

U.A.R. Students Society,
Birmingham University