PALESTINE MONOGRAPHS

1

ZIONIST COLONIALISM IN PALESTINE

•

FAYEZ A. SAYEGH

RESEARCH CENTER
PALESTINE LIBERATION ORGANIZATION

ZIONIST COLONIALISM IN PALESTINE

by

Fayez A. Sayegh, Ph.D.

Research Center * Palestine Liberation Organization
Beirut, Lebanon
September 1965

CONTENTS

FOREWORD

The past two decades, which have witnessed the collapse of European Imperialism and the progressive elimination of Western Colonialism from Asia and Africa, have witnessed also the introduction of a new form of Colonialism into the point-of-intersection of those two continents. Thus, the fading-out of a cruel and shameful period of world history has coincided with the emergence, at the land-bridge between Asia and Africa, of a new offshoot of European Imperialism and a new variety of racist Colonialism.

The fate of Palestine thus represents an *anomaly*, a radical departure from the trend of contemporary world history. Scores of nations and peoples have come to enjoy their right to self-determination, at the very time when the Arab people of Palestine was finding itself helpless to prevent the culmination of a process of systematic colonization to which Palestine had been subjected for decades. This climactic development took the combined form of forcible dispossession of the indigenous population, their expulsion from their own country, the inplantation of an alien sovereignty on their soil, and the speedy importation of hordes of aliens to occupy the land thus emptied of its rightful inhabitants.

The people of Palestine has lost not only *political control* over its country, but *pyhsical occupation* of its country as well : it has been deprived not only of its inalienable right to *self-determination*, but also of its elemental right to *exist* on its own land !

This *dual* tragedy, which befell the Arab people of Palestine in the middle of the twentieh century, symbolizes the *dual* nature of the Zionist program which had begun to unfold itself in Palestine in the late nineteenth century.

I.

THE HISTORICAL SETTING OF ZIONIST COLONIALISM

The frenzied "Scramble for Africa" of the 1880's stimulated the beginnings of Zionist colonization in Palestine. As European fortune-hunters, prospective settlers, and empire-builders raced for Africa, Zionist settlers and would-be state-builders rushed for Palestine.

Under the influence of the credo of Nationalism then sweeping across Europe, some Jews had come to believe that the religious and alleged racial bonds among Jews constituted a Jewish "nationality" and endowed the so-called "Jewish nation" with normal national rights—including the right to *separate existence* in a territory of its own, and the right to create a Jewish *state*. If other European nations had successfully extended themselves into Asia and Africa, and had annexed to their imperial domains vast portions of those two continents, the "Jewish nation" — it was argued — was entitled and able to do the same thing for itself. By imitating the colonial ventures of the "Gentile nations" among whom Jews lived, the "Jewish nation" could send its own *colonists* into a piece of Afro-Asian territory, establish a *settler-community*, and, in due course, set up its own *state* — not, indeed, as an imperial outpost of a metropolitan home-base, but as a home-base in its own right, upon which the entire "Jewish nation" would sooner or later converge from all over the world. "Jewish nationalism" would thus fulfil itself through the process of colonization, which other European nations had utilized for empire-building. **For**

Zionism, then, colonization would be the instrument of nation-building, not the by-product of an already-fulfilled nationalism.

The improvised process of Jewish colonization in Palestine which ensued was hardly a spectacular success, in spite of lavish financial subsidies from European Jewish financiers. By and large, Jews were more attracted by the new opportunities for migration to the United States or Argentina, than by the call for racial self-segragation as a prelude to state-building in Palestine. The objective of *escape* from anti-Jewish practices prevailing in some European societies could be attained just as well by emigration to America; the objective of *nation-building* — which alone could make the alternative solution of large-scale colonization in Palestine more attractive — was still far from widespread among European Jews in the late nineteenth century.

* * *

The failure of the first sporadic effort to implant a Zionist settler-community in Palestine during the first fifteen years of Zionist colonization (1882-1897) prompted serious reappraisal and radical revision of strategy. This was accomplished by the First Zionist Congress, held at Basle in August 1897 under the leadership of Theodor Herzl.

Haphazard colonization of Palestine, supported by wealthy Jewish financiers as a mixed philanthropic-colonial venture, was from then on to be eschewed. It was to

be supplanted by a purely nationalistic program of organized colonization, with clear political goals and mass support. Hence the over-all objective of Zionism formulated by the Basle Congress: "*The aim of Zionism is to create for the Jewish people a home in Palestine secured by public law*"[1].

It is worth noting that, from the Basle Program of 1897 until the Biltmore Program of 1942, Zionists preferred the euphmism "home" to the clear term "state" which would have been certain to arouse opposition in many quarters. But, in spite of public assurances to the contrary, Zionists were aiming from the outset at the creation of a settler-*state* in Palestine. At the conclusion of the Basle Congress, Herzl wrote in his diary: "If I were to sum up the Basle Congress in one word — which I shall not do openly — it would be this: at Basle I founded the Jewish State. If I were to say this to-day, I would be met by universal laughter. In five years, perhaps, and certainly in fifty, every one vill see it"[2].

* * *

In addition to defining the ultimate objective of Zionism, the Basle Congress made a diagnosis of the

1. Cohen, Israel, *A Short History of Zionism*, London, Frederick Muller Co., 1951, p. 47.

2. Herzl, Theodor, *Tage Bücher*, Vol. II, p. 24; quoted in Cohen, Israel, *A short History of Zionism*, *op. cit.*, pp. 11 and 47-48.

special character and circumstances of Zionist colonization in Palestine, and formulated a practical program suited to those special conditions. Three essential features in particular differentiated Zionist colonization in Palestine from European colonization elsewhere in Asia and Africa, and called for Zionist innovations:

(1) Other European settlers who had gone (or were then going) to other parts of Africa and Asia had been animated either by economic or by politico-imperialist motives: they had gone either in order to accumulate fortunes by means of privileged and protected exploitation of immense natural resources, or in order to prepare the ground for (or else aid and abet) the annexation of those coveted territories by imperial European governments. The Zionist colonists, on the other hand, were animated by neither impulse. They were driven to the colonization of Palestine by the desire *to attain nationhood for themselves*, and to establish a Jewish state which would be independent of any existing government and subordinate to none, and which would in due course attract to its territories the Jews of the world.

(2) Other European settlers could coexist with the indigenous populations — whom they would exploit and dominate, but whose services they would nevertheless require, and whose continued existence in the coveted territory they would therefore tolerate. But the Zionist settlers could not countenance indefinite coexistence with the inhabitants of Palestine. For Palestine was fully populated by Arabs, whose national consciousness had already been awakened, and who had already begun to nurse aspirations of independence and national fulfillment.

Zionist colonization could not possibily assume the *physical proportions* envisaged by Zionism while the Arab people of Palestine continued to inhabit its homeland; nor could the Zionist *political* aspirations of racial self-segregation and statehood be accomplished while the nationally-conscious Arab people of Palestine continued to exist in that country. **Unlike European colonization elsewhere, therefore, Zionist colonization of Palestine was essentially incompatible with the continued existence of the "native population" in the coveted country.**

(3) Other European settlers could, without much difficulty, overcome the obstacles obstructing their settlement in their chosen target-territories: they could count on receiving adequate protection from their imperial sponsors. But the prospective Zionist colonizers of Palestine could count on no such facilities. For, in addition to the *Arab people of Palestine*, certain to resist any large-scale influx of settlers loudly proclaiming their objective of dispossessing the "natives", the Zionists were likely to encounter also the resistance of the *Ottoman authorities*, who could not view with favor the establishment, on an important segment of their Empire, of an alien community harboring political designs of independent statehood.

* * *

It was in order to counteract these peculiar factors of its situation that the Zionist Movement, while defining its *ultimate objective* at the First Zionist Congress, pro-

ceeded to formulate an appropriate *practical program* as well. This program called for action along three lines: *organization*, *colonization*, and *negotiation*.

(1) The *organizational* efforts were given supreme priority; for, lacking a state-structure in a home-base of its own to master-mind and supervise the process of overseas colonization, the Zionist Movement required a quasi-state apparatus to perform those functions. The World Zionist Organization — with its Federations of local societies, its Congress, its General Council, and its Central Executive — was established at Basle in order to play that role.

(2) The instruments of systematic *colonization* were also promptly readied. The "Jewish Colonial Trust" (1898), the "Colonization Commission" (1898), the "Jewish National Fund" (1901), the "Palestine Office" (1908) and the "Palestine Land Development Company" (1908), were among the first institutions established by the Zionist Organization. Their joint purpose was to plan, finance, and supervise the process of colonization, and to ensure that it would not meet the same fate which the earlier experiment of haphazard colonization had met.

(3) While the instruments of colonization were being laboriously created, diplomatic efforts were also being exerted to produce *political conditions* that would permit, facilitate, and protect large-scale colonization.

At the beginning, these efforts were focused mainly on the Ottoman Empire, then in control of the political fortunes of Palestine. Direct approaches to the Ottoman

authorities were made; lucrative promises of financial grants and loans were dangled before the eyes of the Sultan; and European Powers were urged to intercede at the Porte on behalf of the Zionist Organization, in order to persuade the Sultan to grant the Organization a Charter for an autonomous Zionist settlement in Palestine. Other efforts were exerted to induce the German Emperor to endorse the creation of a Chartered Land Development Company, which would be operated by Zionists in Palestine under German protection. Still other attempts were made to obtain permission from the British Government to establish an autonomous Zionist settlement in the Sinai Peninsula, as a stepping-stone towards colonization in Palestine. But none of these efforts bore fruit.

* * *

By the end of the first decade following the inauguration of the new Zionist Movement in 1897, Zionism had made little progress towards putting its elaborate colonization apparatus to work, and had scored even less success in its political efforts to obtain governmental permission and facilities for colonization in Palestine.

Its hopes for *de jure* colonization shattered, Zionism shifted its strategy once more, and turned to *de facto* colonization — hoping to gain thereby some political leverage which would serve it in good stead when the time came for renewal of its attempts to secure political recognition. In 1907/1908, therefore, a new phase of Zionist colonization was inaugurated, without prior "legalization" or sponsorship by a European Power. It was

more consciously nationalistic in impulse, more militantly segregationist in its attitude towards the Palestinian Arabs, and more concerned with strategic and political considerations in its selection of locations for its new settlements. But, for all its enhanced dynamism and sharpened ideological consciousness, the second wave of Zionist colonization was not appreciably more successful than the first, as far as its magnitude was concerned.

By the outbreak of the first World War, therefore, the Zionist colonization of Palestine had met with only modest success in over thirty years of action. *In the first place*, Zionists were still an infinitesimal minority of about 1% of the Jews of the world. Their activities had aroused the fear and opposition of other Jews, who sought the solution of the "Jewish Problem" in "assimilation" in Western Europe and the United States, not in "self-segregation" in Palestine. *In the second place*, Zionist colonization had proceeded very slowly. After thirty years of immigration to Palestine, Jews were still under 8% of the total population of the country, in possession of no more than 2 1/2% of the land. And, *in the third place*, Zionism had failed to obtain political endorsement from the Ottoman authorities controlling Palestine, or from any European Power.

The War, however, created new circumstances which were destined to improve considerably the fortunes of Zionist colonization in Palestine. For the War set the stage for an alliance — concluded in 1917 — between British Imperialism and Zionist Colonialism, which, during the following thirty years, opened the gates of Palestine to Zionist colonizers, facilitated the establishment of a

Zionist settler-community, and paved the way for the dispossession and expulsion of the Arab people of Palestine and the creation of the Zionist settler-state in 1948.

Whereas *unilateral Zionist colonization* failed, in the thirty years preceding the First World War, to make much headway, *the alliance of Zionist Colonialism and British Imperialism* succeeded, during the thirty years following the First World War, in accomplishing the objectives of both parties.

II

THE ALLIANCE OF BRITISH IMPERIALISM AND ZIONIST COLONIALISM

Until the First World War, Britain's policy in the Middle East had revolved around the maintenance of the integrity of the Ottoman Empire in Asia. The European domains of the Empire had been emancipated from Ottoman domination, and the North African domains had been annexed by various European Powers, long before the War; but the Asian domains had been insulated in the meantime from the imperial rivalries of the European Powers. Britain's imperial interests in the area — namely, control over the Suez Canal, and immunization of the region from rival European domination over the "overland route" to India — were better served by a tractable Ottoman Empire than they would have been by a European "Scramble for the Middle East", which might have brought one or another of Britain's European rivals to the vicinity of the Canal or athwart the "overland route".

When Turkey joined the Central Powers in the War, however, the premises of Britain's imperial policy for the Middle East were shattered overnight. Alternative policies for the post-War period had to be made.

At first, Britain envisaged a new order for the Middle East, in which Arab autonomy would supplant Ottoman imperial rule in South-West Asia. Anglo-Arab agreements to that effect, concluded in the fall of 1915, led to the Arab Revolt against Turkey in 1916.

But the pressures of other European Powers — then

wartime allies of Britain — precluded sole British overlordship. Secret agreements were therefore reached in the spring of 1916 between Britain, France, and Tsarist Russia, for division of the Ottoman spoils.

These agreements, however, soon proved irksome to the more empire-minded among Britain's policy-makers. For they threatened to bring France perilously close to the eastern approaches to the Suez Canal. And as British feelings of security (predicated on the belief in the impenetrability of the Sinai Peninsula) had been destroyed by recent wartime experiences, it came to be felt that not only Sinai, but also Palestine, must be made safe in order that the Canal might be rendered secure. The 1916 Anglo-French agreement, providing for the internationalization of most of Palestine, came therefore to be viewed with alarm by empire-minded British statesmen; and the staking of French claims to the entirety of Palestine could hardly have served to allay the aroused apprehensions of British imperialists.

By early 1917, a new British cabinet was actively searching for ways and means for extricating itself from the agreements which its predecessor had reached with France for the post-War division of the spoils of war in the Arab domains of the Ottoman Empire. It was at that point that formerly abortive Zionist attempts to secure British support for a Zionist-dominated Palestine were re-activated, at Britain's instigation.

Reciprocal interests had thus come to bind British Imperialism and Zionist Colonialism. On the one hand, Britain, by utilizing Zionist influence in the United States

and in France, would avert international rule in Palestine, on the pretext that a British-sponsored program of Zionist colonization required British rule in Palestine. On the other hand, by playing a catalytic role in bringing about the designation of Britain as the ruling Power in Palestine, Zionism would at last be able to embark upon the long-awaited program of large-scale colonization in the coveted territory under the auspices and protection of a Great Power. Britain would have the assurance that an embattled Zionist settler-community would remain indefinitely dependent upon Britain's protection, and would continue to require (and justify) British presence in Palestine; while, for its part, Zionism would also have the assurance that Britain, bound internationally by its wartime commitment to facilitate Zionist colonization, would provide the Zionist settler-community with the protection it needed, during the formative stages of its establishment, against expected Arab opposition. The alliance of convenience and mutual need, binding British Imperialism and Zionist Colonialism, was complete.

* * *

Preliminary Zionist efforts in Washington to secure America's approval were not unsuccessful — notwithstanding President Wilson's emphasis on the principle of self-determination, with which the Zionist colonization of Palestine despite Arab opposition would clash headlong. Nor were simultaneous Zionist efforts in Paris, to secure French approval of the revision of earlier Anglo-French agreements on the future of Palestine, entirely discourag-

ing. With such preparatory work out of the way, Britain announced its policy-statement of 2 November 1917, commonly known as the Balfour Declaration, proclaiming its support for the establishment of a Jewish "National Home" in Palestine. According to plan, the Zionists then requested the Peace Conference to confer the Palestine Mandate on Britain. Britain, in turn, incorporated its undertaking, first enunciated in the Balfour Declaration, in the text of the Palestine Mandate. The path was now clear, for both British Imperialism and Zionist Colonialism, to pursue jointly their respective objectives.

Britain lost no time in creating the appropriate conditions for Zionist colonization. It appointed a Zionist Jew as its first High Commissioner in Palestine. It recognized the World Zionist Organization as a representative "Jewish Agency". It opened the gates of Palestine to massive Zionist immigration, despite Arab protests. It transferred state lands to the Zionists for colonization. It protected the institutions of the fledgling "National Home". It permitted the Zionist community to run its own schools and to maintain its military establishment (the Haganah). It trained mobile Zionist striking forces (the Palmach), and condoned the existence of "underground" terrorist organizations (the Stern group and the Irgun). No wonder that, by the mid-thirties, a British Royal Commission had come to describe the Zionist settler-community in Palestine as a "state within a state". In the meantime, the Arab majority — while constantly assured that Britain would see to it that its rights would not be "prejudiced" by the rapid growth of the Zionist settler-community — was denied analogous facilities and deprived of the means for self-protection.

After thirty years of British rule, the Zionist settler-community grew to twelve times its size in 1917, and came to represent a little under one-third of the total population of Palestine. In the meantime, it had developed, under the auspices of the Mandatory Power, its own quasi-governmental institutions and a sizable military establishment.

* * *

But Britain had not entered into the partnership with Zionism in Palestine solely in order to serve the purposes of Zionist Colonialism; it had expected the partnership to serve, equally, the purposes of British Imperialism as well. Whenever Zionism sought to accelerate the processes of state-building (which would eventually render Britain's continued presence in Palestine neither necessary nor desirable in Zionist eyes), Britain pulled in the opposite direction to slow them down. The Second World War precipitated the showdown, which in the end brought about the dissolution of the Anglo-Zionist Alliance.

By the end of the Second World War, Britain's wartime enfeeblement, and the imminent independence of India, had led to a relative diminution of Britain's interest in the Alliance, while the growing opposition of newly-emerging Arab States to Britain's role in Palestine had forced Britain to exercise some restraint in its formerly whole-hearted support for the Zionist cause. On the other hand, the advent of the United States as an active World Power, with economic and strategic interests in the Middle East, and the growing responsiveness of

American politicians to the Zionist cause, offered Zionism the prospects of an alternative Western sponsor for the new fateful phase of its capture of Palestine.

In the mid-forties, therefore, Zionist colonization of Palestine, sheltered and nursed for thirty years by British Imperialism, was ready to look for a more powerful and more militant supporter to see it through the forthcoming struggle for outright statehood; and the United States was available as a willing candidate that admirably fitted the requirements of Zionism.

If the League of Nations was the instrument selected for bestowing upon the Anglo-Zionist partnership a semblance of international respectability, the United Nations was selected for a similar purpose by the American-Zionist entente. Britain had prevailed upon a predominantly European League to endorse a program of European Zionist colonization in Palestine: the United States led a European-American majority to overrule the opposition of an Afro-Asian minority in the General Assembly, and to endorse the establishment of a colonial Zionist state in the Afro-Asian bridge, the Arab land of Palestine. For, apart from the Union of South Africa, itself ruled by an alien settler-minority, no Asian or African country spoke in favor of the "partition plan" proposed to the General Assembly by its Special Committee on Palestine; and, although in the final vote on 29 November 1947, one Asian and one African country (other than the Union of South Africa) did vote for the adoption of the recommendation, enthusiastic support for the proposal came exclusively from Europe, Australasia,

and the Western Hemisphere. **An alien state was to be planted in the land link between Asia and Africa without the free consent of any neighboring African or Asian country.**

It was at that stage in the tragic history of Palestine that Palestinian Arabs — debilitated by thirty years of British suppression — proved incapable of withstanding the assault of the Zionist community, organized and trained and armed as it was, and supported by the European-American international community of the day.

The Arab people of Palestine lost not only the battle for the *political control* of its own country — it lost its *country* as well. Palestinians were forcibly expelled from their homeland ; and their land, thus ruthlessly emptied of its rightful inhabitants, was opened for a well-organized and liberally-financed new wave of colonization, speedily executed in order to create a seeming *fait accompli*, the reversal of which world public opinion would be reluctant to urge.

* * *

The alliance of Zionist Colonialism with one Western Imperial Power was momentarily dissolved, after it had served its purpose ; but it was simultaneously reincarnated in a new form, to suit the new world circumstances and the new stage of Zionist Colonialism. As one Western sponsor retreated to the background, other Western sponsors rushed to the foreground. Zionist Colonialism made a tactical change of allies — but did not abandon

the strategy of imperialist alliances as such. For, without the umbilical cord linking the Zionist settler-community with its extra-regional sources of supply and power, it has and can have little ability of its own to survive.

Even the alliance with British Imperialism was dissolved only momentarily. For, when the time came for a revised British imperial strategy, under altered world circumstances, to seek fulfillment through a new alignment with Zionist Colonialism — which was then aiming, in its new status as a state, at new objectives of territorial expansion — collusion between the old allies, along with the Fourth French Republic, was readily arranged. The 1956 invasion of Egypt promptly ensued.

And, when the collapse of the Fourth Republic in France and the chastening experience of Britain in Suez made it inexpedient for the Zionist settler-state to continue to depend upon those two countries for the tools of further aggressiveness, Zionism appears to have found little difficulty in recruiting another European Power to serve as a supplier of aggressive weapons. At the bidding of the United States, the Federal Republic of Germany rushed to fill the vacuum — supplementing massive economic aid (which a tormented German conscience, cleverly manipulated by World Zionism, had prevailed upon the Federal Republic to extend to the Zionist settler-state under the alias of "reparations") with massive military gifts, secretly agreed upon and stealthily given.

* * *

But, for all the means of survival it manages to

acquire, now from one Western Power and now from another, the Zionist settler-state remains *an alien body* in the region. **Not only its vital and continuing association with European Imperialism, and its introduction into Palestine of the practices of Western Colonialism, but also its chosen pattern of racial exclusiveness and self-segregation renders it an alien society in the Middle East.** No words could better describe the essentially alien character of the Zionist settler-state than the following passage, written by its veteran Prime Minister :

> "The State of Israel is a part of the Middle East only in geography, which is, in the main, a static element. From the decisive aspects of dynamism, creation and growth, Israel is a part of world Jewry. From that Jewry it will draw all the strength and the means for the forging of the nation in Israel and the development of the Land; through the might of world Jewry it will be built and built again."(3)

3) Ben-Gurion, David, *Rebirth and Destiny of Israel*, New York, Philosophical Library, 1954, p. 489.

III

THE CHARACTER OF THE ZIONIST SETTLER-STATE

Apart from its vital link with Imperialism and its inescapable status as a total stranger to the Middle East, in the heart of which it has chosen to plant itself, the political embodiment of Zionist Colonialism (namely, the Zionist settler-state of Israel) is characterized chiefly by three features : (1) its *racial complexion* and *racist conduct pattern ;* (2) its *addiction to violence ;* and (3) its *expansionist stance.*

A. Racism

Racism is not an acquired trait of the Zionist settler-state. Nor is it an accidental, passing feature of the Israeli scene. It is congenital, essential, and permanent. For it is inherent in the very ideology of Zionism and in the basic motivation for Zionist colonization and statehood.

Zionism is the belief in the national oneness of all Jews — who are identified as such in terms of their supposedly common *ancestry*. Neither *religion* nor *language* comprises the alleged "national bond" of Jews, according to the Zionist creed: for relatively few Zionists are in fact believing or practicing Jews; and the Hebrew language was resuscitated only after the birth of Zionism. Recent legislation and precedent-making court decisions in the Zionist state, as well as the political literature of the Zionist Movement since its inception, would appear to indicate that it is *ancestry* — the sheer biological fact of

descent from other Jews — that makes a person "Jewish" in Zionist eyes.

Zionist *racial identification* produces three corollaries : *racial self-segregation, racial exclusiveness*, and *racial supremacy*. These principles constitute the core of the Zionist ideology.

The primordial impulse for Zionist Colonialism is the pursuit of "national self-realization" by the "Jewish nation", by means of territorial regrouping and independent statehood. *Racial self-segregation is therefore the quintessence of Zionism.*

By its very nature, racial self-segregation precludes integration or assimilation. From Herzl to Weizmann, from Ben Gurion to Goldmann, the leaders of Zionism have all believed and preached that the chief enemy of Zionism is not Gentile "anti-Semitism" but Jewish "assimilation". "Anti-Semitism" and Zionism thus agree on the basic premise : that all Jews are one nation, with common national characteristics and a common national destiny. The difference between them is that, whereas "anti-Semitism" disdains the alleged "national characteristics" of Jews and delights in Jewish suffering, Zionism idealizes those fancied characteristics and strives to bring all Jews together into a single Jewish state, to which even moderate Zionists attribute a "special mission".

According to the Zionist creed, "assimilation" is the loss of "Jewish identity"; it is the prelude to the "dissolution" and "elimination" of the "Jewish nation". "Self-segregation" is the Zionist retort to the call for "Jewish

assimilation" ; for "self-segregation" is envisioned as the only pathway to national "redemption", "salvation", and "fulfillment".

By the same logic, by virtue of which it uncompromisingly repudiates the assimilation of Jews into non-Jewish societies, the fundamental Zionist principle of racial self-segregation also demands *racial purity and racial exclusiveness* in the land in which Jewish self-segregation is to be attained. As such, the Zionist credo of racial self-segregation necessarily rejects the coexistence of Jews and non-Jews in the land of Jewish regrouping. Coexistence with non-Jewish communities — including the indigenous inhabitants — in the territory in which Jews are to be assembled is as much of a blemish on the image of pure Zionist racism as is continued Jewish residence in the lands of the Gentiles, i.e., the lands of so-called "Jewish exile".

The Zionist ideal of racial self-segregation demands, *with equal imperativeness*, the departure of all Jews from the lands of their "exile" and the eviction of all non-Jews from the land of "Jewish destination", namely, Palestine. Both are essential conditions of "Zionist fulfillment" and Jewish "national redemption".

It is only in such a condition of thoroughgoing self-segregation that "Jewish superiority" can at last manifest itself, according to the teachings of Zionism: the "Chosen People" can attain its "special destiny" only when it is *all together* and *all by itself.*

* * *

Herein lies an important difference between Zionist racism and other forms of European racism familiar, since the advent of Colonialism, to the peoples of Asia and Africa. *Race-supremacist European settlers elsewhere in Asia and Africa* have, by and large, found it possible to express their "supremacy" over the other strands of "lesser peoples" and "inferior races" within the framework of "hierarchical racial coexistence". Separate and unequal, the European colonists and the "natives" have on the whole coexisted in the same colony or protectorate. Though they have openly disdained the "natives", ruthlessly suppressed them, and methodically discriminated against them, European colonists have as a rule deemed the continued presence of the indigenous populations "useful" for the colonists themselves; and, as such, they have reserved for the "natives" all the menial functions and assigned to them inferior roles in the settler-dominated societies. Not so the Zionists ! *Race-supremacist Zionist settlers in Palestine* have found it necessary to follow a different course, more in harmony with their ideological system. They have expressed their fancied "supremacy" over the Arab "natives", first, by isolating themselves from the Arabs in Palestine and, later on, by evicting the Arabs from their homeland.

Nowhere in Asia or Africa — not even in South Africa or Rhodesia — has European race-supremacism expressed itself in so passionate a zeal for thoroughgoing racial exclusiveness and for physical expulsion of "native" populations across the frontiers of the settler-state, as it has in Palestine, under the compulsion of Zionist doctrines. (Perhaps this divergence of Zionism from the norm of European colonization may be explained in terms of the fact that conscious dedication to the racist doctrines inherent in the ideology of Zionism has preceded, stimulated, inspired, and at every stage guided the process of Zionist colonization in Palestine — at least since the inauguration of the new Zionist Movement in 1897.)

So long as they were powerless to *dislodge* the indigenous Arabs of Palestine (the vast majority of the country's population), Zionist colonists were content with *isolating themselves* from the Arab community and instituting a systematic boycott of Arab produce and labor. Accordingly, from the earliest days of Zionist colonization, the principle was established that only Jewish labor would be employed in Zionist colonies. The "Jewish Agency", the "Jewish National Fund", the "Palestine Foundation Fund", and the "Jewish Federation of Labor" vigilantly ensured the observance of that fundamental principle of Zionist colonization.

Contentment with *boycotting* the Arabs of Palestine instead of *evicting* them from their country was, however, only a tactical and temporary suspension of the Zionist dogma of racial exclusiveness. It was forced upon Zionism by the circumstances surrounding the early stages of Zionist colonization. And it was viewed as a necessary evil, to be endured only so long as a more rigorous application of the racist doctrines of Zionism was prevented by extraneous factors beyond the control of the Zionist Movement. The ultimate aim of ousting the Arab inhabitants of Palestine in order to make possible the incarnation of the principle of racial exclusiveness, though momentarily suspended, was never abandoned, however.

As early as 1895, Herzl was busy devising a plan to "spirit the penniless population across the frontier by denying it employment"[4]; and, in 1919, Weizmann was forecasting the creation of a Palestine that would be "as Jewish as England is English"[5], and defining the Zionist program in terms of building "a nationality which would be as Jewish as the French nation was French and the British nation British"[6]. Thus, although it was not until 1948 that the Zionist aim was at last fulfilled, through the forcible expulsion of the majority of the Palestinian Arabs from their homeland, the objective of de-Arabizing Palestine (as a requirement of Zionizing that country) had been entertained by the Zionist Movement since its inception.

The Zionist concept of the "final solution" to the "Arab problem" in Palestine, and the Nazi concept of the "final solution" to the "Jewish problem" in Germany, consisted essentially of the same basic ingredient: the elimination of the unwanted human element in question. The creation of a "Jew-free Germany" was indeed sought by Nazism through more ruthless and more inhuman methods than

4) Herzl, Theodor, *Complete Diaries*, Vol. I, 1960, p. 38. (Entry of 12 June 1895; quoted in Childers, Erskine B., "Palestine: The Broken Triangle", in *Journal of International Affairs*, Vol. XIX, No. 1, 1965, p. 93).

5) Weizmann, Chaim, *Trial and Error*, New York, Harper and Brothers, 1949, p. 244.

6) Quoted in *The Political History of Palestine Under British Administration*, Jerusalem, Government Printer, 1947, p. 3 (paragraph 12).

was the creation of an "Arab-free Palestine" accomplished by the Zionists: but behind the difference in techniques lay an identity of goals.

* * *

If *racial discrimination* against the "inferior natives" was the motto of race-supremacist European settler-regimes in Asia and Africa, the motto of the race-supremacist Zionist settler-regime in Palestine was *racial elimination. Discriminatory treatment* has been reserved by the Zionists for those *remnants* of the Palestinian Arab people who have stubbornly stayed behind in their homeland in spite of all efforts to dispossess and evict them, and in defiance of the Zionist dictum of racial exclusiveness. It is against these remnants of the rightful inhabitants of Palestine that Zionist settlers have revealed the behavioral patterns of racial supremacy, and practiced the precepts of racial discrimination, already made famous by other racist European colonists elsewhere in Asia and Africa.

In fact, in its practice of racial discrimination against the vestiges of Palestinian Arabs, the Zionist settler-state has learned all the lessons which the various discriminatory regimes of white settler-states in Asia and Africa can teach it. And it has proved itself in this endeavor an ardent and apt pupil, not incapable of surpassing its teachers. For, whereas the Afrikaner apostles of *apartheid* in South Africa, for example, brazenly proclaim their sin, the Zionist practitioners of *apartheid* in Palestine beguilingly protest their innocence !

* * *

The remnants of Palestine's Arabs who have continued to live in the Zionist settler-state since 1948 have their own "Bantustans", their "native reserves", their "Ghettoes" — although the institution which they encounter in their daily lives is given by the Zionist authorities the euphemistic name, "security zone".

About 90 % of the Arabs living under Israel's jurisdiction live in such "security zones".

Alone in the Zionist settler-state, these Arabs live under *martial law*. Whereas, in other parts of the country, civil administration prevails, in the Arab-inhabited "security zones" the administrative functionaries are military officers, serving under the Ministry of Defence. Arabs charged with offenses under the martial law in force in the "security zones" (the "Emergency [Defence] Regulations") are prosecuted before military tribunals, the decisions of which are not appealable. Deportation and forced residence, by fiat of the Military Governor, are commonplace.

Alone in the Zionist settler-state, Arab inhabitants of the "security zones" are subject to the *pass system*, which harshly restricts their movement and travel.

Alone in the Zionist settler-state, Arabs are denied the basic rights of expression, assembly, and association. They are not permitted to publish newspapers or to form political organizations.

Educational opportunities for Arabs are severely restricted ; the higher the level of education, the more

discriminatory the restriction of opportunities. Nor is the quality of the educational system to which Arabs have disproportionately-limited access faintly comparable to the educational system open to Jews.

Economically, Arabs in the Zionist settler-state suffer from a threefold handicap : their limited access to employment opportunities creates large-scale unemployment ; such employment as they are permitted to obtain is confined largely to menial services ; and they are denied the right to "equal pay for equal work".

The agricultural lands and homes of the Arabs of the Zionist settler-state are subject to confiscation by administrative decree, under a succession of drastic laws, introduced by the state between 1948 and 1953, which deny aggrieved owners the ability to seek redress through the courts. Whole Arab villages have been expropriated and given to Jews for the establishment of Zionist settlements.

Arab participation in the administration of the Zionist settler-state, on any level of meaningful responsibility, is virtually unknown ; in most government departments, Arab participation *on any level* is completely non-existent. Even in the government office charged with Arab affairs, no Arab is employed !

Finally, the enjoyment by Arabs of the elementary right to citizenship in their own country is curtailed by *statutory discrimination*. Whereas a Jew, under the Nationality Law, is eligible for citizenship immediately upon arrival, indigenous Arabs of the Zionist settler-state

are subject to a system of qualified eligibility which has left a majority of Israel's Arabs languishing in the limbo of non-citizenship.

B. Violence and Terrorism

Habitual resort to force, by the military or para-military arms of the Zionist settler-state, has been directed principally against the Arabs — whose very existence in the land coveted by the Zionists rendered them automatically the primary and the ultimate target of Zionist hostility. But this addiction to violence has not been totally confined, in its manifestations, to Zionist relations with the Arabs. Towards the end of the British Mandate — when the alliance of British Imperialism and Zionist Colonialism, having served its purpose, was beginning to undergo the strains which finally led to its dissolution — the para-military and terrorist Zionist organizations (which Britain had respectively aided and condoned for decades) turned against the British garrison and British civil authorities in Palestine. And, after the outbreak of Zionist-Arab hostilities in Palestine, and the advent of United Nations mediators and truce observers, Zionist violence turned against the international personnel also. The assassination of the first United Nations Mediator and his military aide, and the occasional detention of United Nations observers, have served notice that no one who stands athwart the path of Zionism is immune from Zionist vengeance.

But, obviously, it is against the Arabs that Zionist violence has been most long-lasting, most methodical, and most ruthless.

Prenatally and at birth, the Zionist settler-state resorted to violence as its chosen means of intimidating the Arabs of Palestine and evicting them. Such massacres as those which were perpetrated at Dair Yaseen, Ain ez-Zaitoun, and Salah ed-Deen (in April, 1948) were calculated measures in a formal program of eviction-by-terrorization.

Since its establishment, the Zionist settler-state has turned its violence both inwardly and outwardly : against the Arabs remaining under its jurisdiction, and against the neighboring Arab states.

In the Zionist-occupied territories of Palestine, *massacres and other outrages* visited upon such Arab towns and villages as Iqrith (December, 1951), Al-Tirah (July, 1953), Abu Ghosh (September, 1953), Kafr Qasim (October, 1956), and Acre (June, 1965) have been the most infamous — but by no means the only — instances of a program of racial hate elevated to the level of state policy and efficiently executed by the official apparatus of the state.

To these instances must be added the large-scale *pogroms* unleashed on the Arab population of Gaza and Khan Younis during the brief but eventful period of Zionist occupation of the area, in the wake of the Tripartite Invasion of Egypt in 1956.

Systematic *military attacks* on the territories of neighboring Arab states are perhaps the most widely known manifestations of Israel's ready resort to violence — for many of these attacks were fully discussed by the

United Nations Security Council. In addition to the *full-scale war*, launched jointly by Zionist Colonialism and British and French Imperialism against Egypt in 1956, and deplored by the General Assembly in six resolutions adopted between 2 November 1956 and 2 February 1957, *smaller-scale* attacks on Hamma (April, 1951), Qibiya (October, 1953), Gaza (February, 1955), and across Lake Tiberias (December, 1955, and March, 1962) were duly condemned by the Security Council, on 18 May 1951, 24 November 1953, 29 March 1955, 19 January 1956, and 9 April 1962, respectively. Other attacks, too numerous to cite individually, have elicited similar condemnations from the competent Mixed Armistice Commissions.

C. Territorial Expansion

No student of the behavioral pattern of the Zionist Movement and the *modus operandi* of the Zionist settler-state can fail to realize that Zionist attainments at any given moment, if they fall short of the standing objective constantly aimed at by the Zionist Movement, are only temporary stations along the road to ultimate self-fulfillment and not terminal points of the Zionist journey — notwithstanding the assurances to the contrary which are solemnly given by Zionist and Israeli leaders.

For example, although from 1897 until 1942 the official leaders of Zionism constantly denied in public any intention of seeking "statehood", emphasizing that it was merely a "home" that they were after, the internal documents of the Movement and the diaries of its leaders clearly indicate that, notwithstanding public disavowals, it was indeed statehood that was the objective of Zionism all along.

(The goal of establishing a Zionist state, first admitted openly in 1942, was attained six years later.)

Similarly, until 1948, the leaders of Zionism were constantly assuring the world that they harbored no intention of dispossessing or evicting the Arabs of Palestine from their homeland—although evidence abounds that, in fact, they were aiming at nothing less than the thorough Zionization and de-Arabization of Palestine from the very beginning; and, when the opportunity arose in 1948, Zionists wasted no time in pushing the Arabs across the frontiers.

In these two vital matters, the true aims of Zionism had been well known to all students and close observers of the Movement; the Zionist stratagem of public disavowal was merely a smoke-screen designed to conceal the true and unchanging objectives, in order to gain time for preparing the ground for the right move at the right moment.

Territorial extent is a third element of the Zionist plan, regarding which the same stratagem of deceptive public disavowal has been utilized. It differs from the other two elements (viz., statehood and eviction of Arabs) only in that, whereas these two aims have been realized and the camouflage has finally been removed, the third aim (viz., territorial expansion) remains only partly realized, and the veil remains only partially lifted.

The perennial aim of Zionism was and still is *statehood* in *all of Palestine* (called by Zionists "Eretz Israel", or the Land of Israel), *completely emptied of its Arabs.*

The minimum definition of the territorial scope of Palestine, as Zionism envisions it, was officially formulated in 1919 ; and it covers about double the area currently occupied by the Zionist settler-state. It includes — in present geographical terminology — the Kingdom of Jordan (on both sides of the River), the "Gaza strip", Southern Lebanon, and Southern and Southwestern Syria, as well as the portions of Palestine now occupied by the Zionists. This area still falls short of the territory bounded, in accordance with the famous Biblical phrase, by the Nile and the Euphrates — which is the territory claimed as their national heritage by Zionist "extremists". But, even if only the minimum Zionist concept of Palestine is taken to be the real basis of Zionist planning, that will leave the road towards Zionist territorial expansion in the future wide and open. For no more than one-half of this coveted area is now under the control of the Zionist settler-state. (See maps on pages 36 and 37).

* * *

Twice since its establishment has the Zionist settler-state demonstrated the fact that, as far as *territorial scope* was concerned, it was following the same *modus operandi* which the Zionist Movement had followed so successfully in the preceding fifty years with respect to *statehood* and the *eviction of Arabs:* (1) In 1948 and early 1949, it occupied areas not earmarked for the "Jewish state" in the General Assembly recommendation for the partition of Palestine — only a few months after the Zionist Organization had assured the Assembly that it was content

with the territories "given" to the proposed "Jewish state". And, (2) in late October and early November, 1956 — taking advantage of the preoccupation of the Egyptian armed forces with the defense of Egypt against the invading forces of Britain and France — the Zionist partner in the aggressive tripartite conspiracy found it possible to occupy the "Gaza Strip" and parts of the Sinai Peninsula. For four months thereafter, the Zionist state rejected repeated United Nations demands for immediate withdrawal — pleading that the annexed Palestinian and Egyptian territories were part of the Zionist "historical homeland" and "national heritage".

Not only by ominous deeds, but also by ominous words, has the Zionist settler-state given indication of its intention, when the time was propitious, to grab new territories lying within the boundaries of what it claims as its national patrimony. The veteran Premier of the Zionist state, David Ben Gurion, on at least two occasions has solemnly announced, in two official state documents, that the state was created "in a part of our small country"[7], and "in only a portion of the Land of Israel"[8]; and the state itself has proclaimed that "the creation of the new State by no means derogates from the scope of historic Eretz Israel." [9]

* * *

7) State of Israel, *Government Yearbook*, 5712 (1951/1952), Introduction p. x.

8) State of Israel, *Government Yearbook*, 5713 (1952), Introduction p. 15.

9) State of Israel, *Government Yearbook*, 5716 (1955), p. 320.

The map on this page shows the *Palestinian, Lebanese, Syrian and Jordanian* territories openly coveted by Zionism. The shaded area was officially delineated in the Memorandum of 3 February 1919 submitted by the World Zionist Organization to the Peace Conference, and was described therein as "essential for the economic foundation of the country."

To this area must be added an undefined portion of *Egyptian* territory as well. The official Zionist Memorandum left the southern border of the coveted land "to be agreed upon" later on.

The maps on these two pages show the expansionist designs of Zionism in Palestine and in the neighboring Arab countries.

The map on this page shows the portions of Palestine actually occupied at present by the Zionist settler-state.

Compare with the map on the opposite page, drawn on the same scale.

In view of the consistent behavioral pattern of the Zionist Movement; in view also of the traditional Zionist concept of the territorial extent of "Eretz Israel", of which even the "moderate" version comprises an area twice as large as the one usurped thus far by the Zionist state; and in view of the clear warnings, voiced by the most candid and authoritative leaders of Zionism, to the effect that the Zionist state has not abandoned its determination to seize new Arab territories—in view of all this, it would be absurd to believe, ostrich-wise, that Zionism might indefinitely rest content with possessing only a fraction of the territory which, it maintains, is its "national heritage", and which in any case it has planned all along to occupy.

Of the three essential elements of the Zionist program — racial self-segregation in a Zionist state, racial exclusiveness and eviction of Arabs, and occupation of all of so-called "Eretz Israel" — only the third remains unrealized. It is the "unfinished business" of Zionism. It cannot fail to be the main preoccupation of the Zionist Movement, and of the Zionist state, in the future.

For the Zionist settler-state, to *be* is to prepare and strive for *territorial expansion.*

IV

THE PALESTINIANS' RESPONSE: FROM RESISTANCE TO LIBERATION

The response of the people of Palestine to the menace of Zionism has passed through five stages.

(1) At the outset — when Zionists were coming in relatively small numbers and emphasizing the religious or humanitarian motives of their enterprise, while concealing the political, ideological, and colonial-racist character of their Movement — the Arabs of Palestine believed the immigrants to be "pilgrims" animated by religious longing for the Holy Land, or else "refugees" fleeing persecution in Eastern Europe and seeking safety in Palestine. Palestinian Arabs therefore accorded the immigrants a hospitable welcome. Even Herzl noted the "friendly attitude of the population"[10] to the first wave of Zionist colonists.

* * *

(2) When, after the inauguration of the new Zionist Movement in 1897, the second wave of Zionist colonization began to roll onto the shores of Palestine (from 1907/1908 onwards), Arab friendliness began to give way to suspicion and resentment. The methodical ouster of

10) "Der Baseler Kongress" in Gesammelte Schriften, Berlin, 1920, p. 164. Quoted in Rabinowicz, Oskar, *Fifty Years of Zionism.* London, Robert Anscombe & Co., 1950, p. 31.

Arab farmers, laborers, and watchmen from the new Zionist colonies, and the systematic boycott of Arab produce, aroused Arab anger. But the larger political-nationalist dimensions of the Zionist program remained concealed from Arab sight: it was the immediate impact of the Zionists' presence upon the Arabs directly affected by the Zionists' race-exclusivist and race-supremacist practices, that was causing Arab wrath. Inasmuch as Zionist colonization was still of modest proportions, however, the hostility it provoked remained more or less local.

* * *

(3) The alliance of British Imperialism and Zionist Colonialism, concretely expressed in the Balfour Declaration of 2 November 1917, and the British capture of Jerusalem on 9 December 1917, at last opened Arab eyes to the true significance of what was happening, and brought home the realization that nothing less than dislodgment was in store for the Arabs, if Zionism was to be permitted to have its way. Palestinian masses instinctively recognized the events of the day as an occurrence of dire portent; and, for thirty years thereafter, Palestine was to be the scene of persistent and tireless Arab resistance to the Anglo-Zionist partnership. The period from 1917 to 1948 was the period of Arab resistance *par excellence.*

* * *

The disquiet which followed the publication of the Balfour Declaration was momentarily calmed, however,

by British assurances made during 1918. An official Declaration by the British Government (issued on 16 June 1918) assured the Arabs that, as far as the territories occupied by the Allied armies were concerned, "the future government of those territories should be based on the principle of the consent of the governed. This policy will always be that of His Majesty's Government."[11] And, only four days before the Armistice, a widely-publicized joint Anglo-French Declaration (issued on 7 November 1918) notified the Arabs of Syria, Iraq, and Palestine that it was the intention of the two Allies "to further and assist in the setting up of indigenous governments" and "to recognise them as soon as they are actually set up."[12] These declarations — though they soon proved to be insincere and dishonest — served in the meantime to allay the fears of the people of Palestine.

As 1919 opened, all eyes were on Paris: the Peace Conference was hopefully expected to resolve the contradictions of Allied wartime promises and to inaugurate the long-awaited new era of world history, founded on the principle of national-self determination, of which President Wilson had made emphatic enunciation. But, as those hopes dwindled and the influx of Zionist colonists — interrupted during the War — was resumed, Arab fears were revived. And so was Arab resistance to the twin dangers of protracted British occupation and expanded Zionist colonization.

---

11) Text in Antonius, George, *The Arab Awakening*, Beirut, Khayats, 1955, pp. 433-434.

12) *Ibid.*, pp. 435-436.

* * *

Palestinian Arab opposition to the Anglo-Zionist partnership was first expressed, in 1919, *in diplomatic representations* and in *collective declarations* of the general will of the people.

The American King-Crane Commission was left in no doubt about the true feelings of the people of Palestine. On 29 August 1919, the Commission reported that:

> "...the non-Jewish population of Palestine — nearly nine-tenths of the whole — are emphatically against the entire Zionist program... There was no one thing upon which the population of Palestine was more agreed than upon this..."[13]

The findings of the Commission corroborated the decisions of the General Syrian Congress, consisting of elected representatives of the populations of Palestine, Lebanon, and Syria. A resolution, passed unanimously by the Congress on 2 July 1919, announced:

> "We oppose the pretentions of the Zionists to create a Jewish Commonwealth in the southern part of Syria, known as Palestine, and oppose Zionist migration to any part of our country; for we do not acknowledge their title but consider them a grave peril to our people from the national, economical, and political points of view. Our Jewish compatriots shall enjoy our common rights and assume the common responsibilities."[14]

13) *Ibid.*, p. 449.

Similar utterances of unqualified rejection of Zionism continued to be made by every Palestinian Arab gathering throughout the decades of British occupation of Palestine. Not once did a Palestinian Arab group or conference express acceptance — even partial or qualified — of Zionist colonization. And the feelings, so unequivocally expressed to the King-Crane Commission in 1919, continued thereafter to be expressed, with equal forcefulness, to the Mandatory Government and its countless Commissions, as well as to the League of Nations and the United Nations, by every Palestinian delegation that had a chance to appear before any of those bodies.

* * *

But declarations of opposition, however important as an expression of national will, were not the only means of resistance to which the people of Palestine had recourse.

In March 1920, armed hostilities broke out between Arab villagers and Zionist colonists in northern Palestine; and in April 1920, Arab-Zionist fighting took place in Jerusalem. These were followed by uprisings in 1921, 1929, and 1933, and by a country-wide rebellion in 1936 which was renewed in 1937 and lasted until the outbreak of the Second World War in 1939. And, from December 1947 until the withdrawal of Britain and the simultaneous

14) *Ibid.*, p. 441.

proclamation of the Zionist settler-state in May 1948, Palestinian Arabs were engaged in a life-and-death battle with the British garrison as well as with the Zionist colonists.

By their untiring reiteration of their rejection of Zionist Colonialism and by their unstinting sacrifice of life and limb in defense of the sanctity of the homeland over thirty years, Palestinians of all walks of life eloquently testified — by word as well as deed, in ink as well as blood — to their devotion to their national rights and their unqualified opposition to the Zionization of their country.

* * *

The range of means by which Palestinians chose to express their opposition to the partnership of Zionist Colonialism and British Imperialism, from 1917 to 1948, was not confined to declaration and rebellion. In more prosaic — and perhaps more difficult and more costly — methods, the unqualified "No !" of the Arabs of Palestine was addressed to empire-builders and to racist colonists alike.

At the height of the famous rebellion of 1936, the people of Palestine launched a devastating civil disobedience movement, coupled with a country-wide strike which lasted for 174 days (perhaps the longest national strike in history) and affected all businesses, communications, and government services run by Arabs. In spite of its high cost to themselves, the men and women of Palestine persisted in their strike, resisting all efforts of the

Mandatory Power to break it, and did not call it off until the rulers of the neighboring Arab States intervened and promised to initiate collective Arab negotiations with the British Government with a view to remedying the causes of Palestinian Arab grievances.

More importantly, the Palestinian Arabs brought into their struggle against the Zionization of Palestine the only remaining weapon at their command: if they had no control over the immigration of Zionist colonists into Palestine, they did have some control over the sale of land to those colonists. This weapon they used unsparingly, throughout the period of the Mandate.

The record shows that, during thirty years of British occupation and active encouragement of Zionist colonization — while the Zionists were allowed by the Mandatory Power to multiply to twelve times their number in 1917, and while the ratio of the Zionists to the total population was allowed to rise to one-third — Zionist acquisition of land grew at a snail's pace, as a result of the Arabs' refusal to sell their land to the colonists. Statistics published by the British Government reveal that the total area acquired by Zionists from 1920, when land registries were opened, until the dislodgment of the Arabs, was under 4% of the total area of Palestine.[15] Of this Zionist-acquired land, a part was sold by non-Palestinian absentee land-owners, and another part was transferred to the Zionist colonization funds by the British Government itself (public domain, over which the Mandatory Government was

15) *Survey of Palestine*, Jerusalem, Government Printer, 1946, p. 243 (paragraph 520).

trustee for the Palestinian people). In fact, an official spokesman for the Jewish Agency disclosed to a British Commission that, "of the land purchased by the Jews, . . . relatively small areas not exceeding in all 10 per cent were acquired from peasants."[16]

* * *

(4) In 1948, the Palestinian Arab people was forcibly dispossessed. Most Palestinians were evicted from their country. Their unyielding resistance and their costly sacrifices over three decades had failed to avert the national catastrophe.

But those sacrifices were not in vain. For they safeguarded the Palestinian national rights and underscored the legitimacy of the Arabs' claim to their national heritage. Rights undefended are rights surrendered. Unopposed and acquiesced in, usurpation is legitimized by default. For forfeiture of its patrimony, the Palestinian generation of the inter-War era will never be indicted by the Palestinian generations to come. It lost indeed — but not without fighting. It was dislodged indeed — but not for want of the will to defend its heritage.

Nor has the people of Palestine retroactively bestowed undeserved legitimacy upon the Zionist colonization of Palestine by recognizing the *fait accompli* after the fact.

16) *British Blue Book* (commonly known as the "Shaw Report"), Cmd. 3530, p. 114.

Many have been the self-appointed counselors of "realism", urging upon Palestinians acknowledgement of the new *status quo* in Palestine and acceptance of their exile "in good grace"; and many have been the lucrative offers of economic aid for "resettlement" and "rehabilitation" outside Palestine. But the people which had remained for thirty years undaunted by the combined power of British Imperialism and Zionist Colonialism, and which subsequently refused to allow the seizure of its land and the dispersal of its body to conquer its soul also, knew very well how to resist those siren-calls.

The Zionist settler-state, therefore, has remained a usurper, lacking even the semblance of legitimacy — because the people of Palestine has remained loyal to its heritage and faithful to its rights.

* * *

(5) The people of Palestine, notwithstanding all its travails and misfortunes, still has undiminished faith in its future.

And the people of Palestine knows that the pathway to that future is the liberation of its homeland.

It was in this belief that the Palestinian people — after sixteen years of dispersion and exile, during which it had reposed its faith in its return to its country in world conscience and international public opinion, in the United

Nations, and/or in the Arab states — chose at last to seize the initiative. In 1964, it reasserted its corporate personality by creating the Palestine Liberation Organization.

Only in the liberation of Palestine, spearheaded by Palestinians prepared to pay the price, can the supreme sacrifices of past generations of Palestinians be vindicated, and the visions and hopes of living Palestinians be transformed into reality.

EPILOGUE
THE LIBERATION OF PALESTINE

The right to *national liberation* is an extension of the right to *national self-defense*, which the Charter of the United Nations not only upholds but also declares to be "inherent" and beyond "impairment" by the provisions of the Charter itself.[17] If continued acquisition of the fruits of an attack is tantamount to continuation of the attack itself, the liberation of territories seized by aggression is an extension of the inherent right to resist the original aggression. Liberation and self-defense are two facets of the same inalienable right.

The right to national liberation has come to be all but universally recognized. Only die-hard imperial and colonial regimes still invoke the mythical principle of the inviolability of dominion acquired by past and continuing aggression, in the hope that they might arrest the process of decolonization before the rising tide of national liberation engulfs their anachronistic regimes.

* * *

Exercise of the right to national liberation is not confined to situations in which alien domination subjects a people to the control of another, or in which the resources of one people are selfishly exploited by another. Exercise of the right to national liberation extends also —

17) *United Nations Charter*, Article 51.

and in greater justice — to those situations in which the land of one people was subjected to the control of another while it was forcibly emptied of its rightful inhabitants.

The tragic fate of Palestine subsumes all these elements of foreign domination, exploitation, and dispossession — and others besides. The territory of Palestine is under alien rule. Its resources are exploited by others. Its people are exiles from their homeland. The remnants of its Arab inhabitants languish under a regime of racist discrimination and oppression as harsh as any race-supremacist regime in Asia or Africa. All this has been accomplished by connivance with Imperialism, and by terror and violence. And no aspect of this multi-faceted *fait accompli* has been legitimized, whether by commission or by omission, by the people of Palestine or any fraction thereof.

* * *

In its determination to pursue the difficult path of national liberation, the people of Palestine is encouraged by the faith in the justice of its cause repeatedly expressed by newly-liberated peoples in successive international conferences. From Bandung to Accra, from Casablanca to Belgrade, that faith in the justice of the cause of the Palestinian Arabs has been clearly expressed.[18] And, at the Second Conference of the Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, "full support to

18) See "Appendix", *below.*

the Arab people of Palestine in their struggle for liberation from colonialism and racism" was solemnly declared.[19] The supreme leaders of peoples who still retain vivid memories of their recent experiences under imperialism, colonialism, and/or racism have thus evinced responsiveness to the pains and hopes of the Palestinian people, still suffering from all these evils and from dispossession and dispersion as well. Such responsiveness cannot fail to augment the profound faith of Palestinians in the ultimate triumph of justice, liberty, and human dignity in their land.

* * *

The problem of Palestine, although it directly afflicts only the Palestinians, is not the concern of Palestinians alone.

The Zionist settler-state, bent on expansion, is a threat to the security and territorial integrity of *the Arab states* as well. It has already invaded their lands. It still covets their territories.

As a colonial venture, which anomalously came to bloom precisely when Colonialism was beginning to fade away, it is in fact a challenge to *all anti-colonial peoples in Asia and Africa.* **For, in the final analysis, the cause of anti-colonialism and liberation is one and indivisible.**

19) *Ibid.*

And — as a racist system animated by doctrines of racial self-segregation, racial exclusiveness, and racial supremacy, and methodically translating these doctrines into ruthless practices of racial discrimination and oppression — the political systems erected by Zionist colonists in Palestine cannot fail to be recognized as a menace by *all civilized men* dedicated to the safeguarding and enhancement of the dignity of man. **For whenever and wherever the dignity of but one single human being is violated, in pursuance of the creed of racism, a heinous sin is committed against the dignity of all men, everywhere.**

APPENDIX

TEXTS OF RESOLUTIONS ON PALESTINE
adopted at Conferences of
African, Asian-African, and Non-Aligned States

&

CHART OF PARTICIPATION
IN THOSE CONFERENCES

1. Bandung:

THE FIRST ASIAN-AFRICAN CONFERENCE

held at Bandung, Indonesia,

from April 18 to April 24, 1955,

by reprsentatives of 29 Asian and African countries. (See CHART).

Paragraph 1 of Section E of the Final Communique of the Conference reads as follows :

> "In view of the existing tension in the Middle East caused by the situation in Palestine and of the danger of that tension to world peace, the Asian-African Conference declared its support of the rights of the Arab people of Palestine, and called for the implementation of the United Nations resolutions on Palestine and the achievment of the peaceful settlement of the Palestine question."

2. Accra:

THE FIRST CONFERENCE OF INDEPENDENT AFRICAN STATES

held at Accra, Ghana,

from April 15 to April 22, 1958,

by representatives of 8 African countries. (See CHART).

Paragraph 9 of Resolution 10 of the Conference reads as follows:

> "Expresses its deep concern over the question of Palestine, which is a disturbing factor of World Peace and Security, and urges a just solution of the Palestine question."

3. Casablanca:

THE CASABLANCA CONFERENCE OF THE HEADS OF AFRICAN STATES

held at Casablanca, Morocco,

from January 3 to January 7, 1961,

by representatives of 8 African and Asian countries. (See CHART).

The first of the Resolutions announced by the Conference reads as follows:

"The Conference at Casablanca,

"Having examined the important problem of Palestine, and deeply concerned about the situation created in Palestine by depriving the Arabs of Palestine of their legitimate rights:

"1. Warns against the menace which this situation presents to the peace and security of the Middle East and the international tension which results therefrom.

"2. Insists on the necessity to have a just solution to this problem in conformity with the United Nations resolutions and the Asian-African resolution of Bandung to restore to the Arabs of Palestine all their legitimate rights.

"3. Notes with indignation that Israel has

always taken the side of the imperialists each time an important position had to be taken concerning vital problems about Africa, notably Algeria, the Congo and the nuclear tests in Africa, and the Conference, therefore, denounces Israel as an instrument in the service of Imperialism and neo-colonialism not only in the Middle East but also in Africa and Asia.

"4. Calls upon all the States of Africa and Asia to oppose this new policy which imperialism is carrying out to create bases for itself".

4. Cairo:

CONFERENCE OF THE MINISTERS OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS OF THE STATES OF THE AFRICAN CHARTER OF CASABLANCA,

held in Cairo, the United Arab Republic,

from April 13 to May 5, 1961,

by representatives of 6 African countries. (See CHART).

The Statement issued at the end of the Conference contained the following paragraphs:

> "The Ministers of Foreign Affairs examined African and international problems which have preoccupied Africa and the world. There was complete identity of views on all these problems...
>
> "...
>
> "They reiterated their support for the legitimate rights of the Arab people of Palestine and their desire to implement the resolutions on Palestine adopted at Casablanca."

5. Belgrade:

THE (FIRST) CONFERENCE OF THE HEADS OF STATE OR GOVERNMENT OF NON-ALIGNED COUNTRIES,

held at Belgrade, Yugoslavia,

from September 1 to September 6, 1961,

by representatives of 28 African, Asian, European, and Latin American countries. (See CHART).

Paragraph 10 of Section III of the Declaration of the Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries reads as follows:

> "The participants in the Conference condemn the imperialist policies pursued in the Middle East, and declare their support for the full restoration of all the rights of the Arab people of Palestine in conformity with the Charter and resolutions of the United Nations."

6. Djakarta:

MEETING OF MINISTERS TO PREPARE FOR A SECOND AFRICAN-ASIAN CONFERENCE,

held at Djakarta, Indonesia,

from April 10 to April 15, 1964,

by representatives of 22 African and Asian countries. (See CHART).

Paragraph B of Section V of the Final Communique reads as follows:

> "Representatives of all Nationalist Movements from non-self-governing territories recognised by the Organisation of African Unity in Africa and from Asia, which have not yet attained independence, may come to the Conference with the right to be heard and the host country is requested to provide facilities for their attendance. This provision should also apply to South Africa, Southern Rhodesia, Oman, Aden and Palestine."

7. Cairo:

THE SECOND CONFERENCE OF THE HEADS OF STATE OR GOVERNMENT OF NON-ALIGNED COUNTRIES,

held at Cairo, the United Arab Republic,

from October 5 to October 10, 1964,

by representatives of 57 African, Asian, European, and Latin American countries. (See CHART).

Sub-Section 5 of Section I of the Final Communique reads as follows:

> "The Conference condemns the imperialistic policy, pursued in the Middle East and, in conformity with the Charter of the United Nations, decides to:
>
> "1. Endorse the full restoration of all the rights of the Arab people of Palestine to their homeland, and their inalienable right to self-determination;
>
> "2. Declare its full support to the Arab people of Palastine in their struggle for liberation from Colonialism and racism."

CHART

PARTICIPATION IN THE CONFERENCES OP AFRICAN, ASIAN-AFRICAN, AND NON-ALIGNED STATES

NOTE. — The symbol "x" stands for *participation;*
"*" indicates *representation by observers;*
"—" signifies *non-participation;*
Footnotes relating to individual countries appear at the end of the CHART.

Country	1 Bandung 1955	2 Accra 1958	3 Casablanca 1961	4 Cairo 1961	5 Belgrade 1961	6 Djakarta 1964	7 Cairo 1964
1. Afghanistan	x	—	—	—	x	x	x
2. Algeria[1)]	—	—	x	x	x	x	x
3. Argentina	—	—	—	—	—	—	*
4. Angola	—	—	—	—	—	—	x
5. Bolivia	—	—	—	—	*	—	*
6. Brazil	—	—	—	—	*	—	*

CHART (Cont'd)

Country	1 Bandung 1955	2 Accra 1958	3 Casablanca 1961	4 Cairo 1961	5 Belgrade 1961	6 Djakarta 1964	7 Cairo 1964
7. Burma	x	—	—	—	x	—	x
8. Barundi	—	—	—	—	—	—	x
9. Cambodia	x	—	—	—	x	x	x
10. Cameroun	—	—	—	—	—	x	x
11. Central African Rep.	—	—	—	—	—	—	x
12. Ceylon	x	—	*	—	x	x	x
13. Chad	—	—	—	—	—	—	x
14. Chile	—	—	—	—	—	—	*
15. China, People's Rep.	x	—	—	—	—	x	—
16. Congo (Braz.)	—	—	—	—	—	—	x
17. Congo (Leop.)	—	—	—	—	x	—	—

CHART Cont'd

Country	1 Bandung 1955	2 Accra 1958	3 Casablanca 1961	4 Cairo 1961	5 Belgrade 1961	6 Djakarta 1964	7 Cairo 1964
18. Cuba	—	—	—	—	x	—	x
19. Cyprus	—	—	—	—	x	—	x
20. Dahomey	—	—	—	—	—	—	x
21. Ecuador	—	—	—	—	*	—	—
22. Ethiopia	x	x	—	—	x	x	x
23. Finland.	—	—	—	—	—	—	*
24. Ghana[2)]	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
25. Guinea	—	—	x	x	x	x	x
26. India	x	—	x	—	x	x	x
27. Indonesia	x	—	—	—	x	x	x
28. Iran.	x	—	—	—	—	x	—

CHART (Cont'd)

Country	1 Bandung 1955	2 Accra 1958	3 Casablanca 1961	4 Cairo 1961	5 Belgrade 1961	6 Djakarta 1964	7 Cairo 1964
29. Iraq	x	—	—	—	x	x	x
30. Jamaica	—	—	—	—	—	—	*
31. Japan	x	—	—	—	—	—	—
32. Jordan	x	—	—	—	—	—	x
33. Kenya	—	—	—	—	—	—	x
34. Kuwait	—	—	—	—	—	—	x
35. Laos	x	—	—	—	—	—	x
36. Lebanon	x	—	—	—	x	—	x
37. Liberia	x	x	—	—	—	x	x
38. Libya	x	x	*	—	—	—	x
39. Malawi	—	—	—	—	—	—	x

CHART (Cont'd)

Country	1 Bandung 1955	2 Accra 1958	3 Casablanca 1961	4 Cairo 1961	5 Belgrade 1961	6 Djakarta 1964	7 Cairo 1964
40. Mali	—	—	x	x	x	—	x
41. Mauritania	—	—	—	—	—	—	x
42. Mexico	—	—	—	—	—	—	*
43. Morocco	—	x	x	x	x	x	x
44. Nepal	x	—	—	—	x	x	x
45. Nigeria	—	—	—	—	—	—	x
46. Pakistan	x	—	—	—	—	x	—
47. Philippines	x	—	—	—	—	x	—
48. Saudi Arabia	x	—	—	—	x	—	x
49. Senegal	—	—	—	—	—	—	x
50. Sierra Leone	—	—	—	—	—	—	x

CHART (Cont'd)

Country	1 Bandung 1955	2 Accra 1958	3 Casablanca 1961	4 Cairo 1961	5 Belgrade 1961	6 Djakarta 1964	7 Cairo 1964
51. Somalia	—	—	—	—	x	—	x
52. Sudan	x	x	—	—	x	—	x
53. Syria[3]	x	(x)	(x)	(x)	(x)	x	x
54. Tanzania[4]	—	—	—	—	—	x	x
55. Thailand	x	—	—	—	—	—	—
56. Togo	—	—	—	—	—	—	x
57. Trinidad & Tobago	—	—	—	—	—	—	*
58. Tunisia	—	x	—	—	x	—	x
59. Turkey	x	—	—	—	—	x	—
60. Uganda	—	—	—	—	—	—	x
61. United Arab Rep.[5]	x	x	x	x	x	x	x

CHART (Cont'd)

Country	1 Bandung 1955	2 Accra 1958	3 Casablanca 1961	4 Cairo 1961	5 Belgrade 1961	6 Djakarta 1964	7 Cairo 1964
62. Uruguay	—	—	—	—	—	—	*
63. Venezuela	—	—	—	—	—	—	*
64. Vietnam (North)	x	—	—	—	—	—	—
65. Vietnam (South)	x	—	—	—	—	—	—
66. Yemen	x	—	—	—	x	—	x
67. Yugoslavia	—	—	—	—	x	—	x
68. Zambia	—	—	—	—	—	—	x

Footnotes :

1. Algeria was represented at Casablanca, Cairo, and Belgrade (1961), by representatives of the Provisional Government of Algeria
2. At the time of the Bandung Conference, Ghana was the Gold Coast.

3. Syria participated in the Conferences held at Accra (1958), Casablanca, Cairo and Belgrade (1961) as part of the United Arab Republic.
4. The Djakarta Conference was held prior to the unification of Tanganyika and Zanzibar and the formation of Tanzania; and it was Tanganyika, not the Federal Republic of Tanzania, that participated in it.
5. The United Arab Republic participated in the Bandung Conference as Egypt.

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

FAYEZ A. SAYEGH

- Received his B.A. and M.A. at the American University of Beirut, Beirut, Lebanon; and his Ph.D. at Georgetown University, Washington, D.C., U.S.A.
- Is Associate Professor of Political Studies at the American University of Beirut.
- Was Visiting Lecturer in Political Science at Yale University; Visiting Associate Professor of Political Science and Philosophy at Stanford University; and Professor of International Studies at Macalester College.
- Has published several books and monographs, including the following on the Palestine Problem: *The Palestine Refugees; The Arab-Israeli conflict; The Record of Israel at the United Nations*; and *The Hammarskjold Proposals & The Refugee Question.*
- Was President of the Palestine Arab Congress and Honorary Chairman of the Institute of Arab-American Affairs.
- Was *Chargé d'Affaires* of the Arab States Delegations' Office at the United Nations; Counsellor of the Yemen Delegation to the United Nations; and Advisor to the Delegation of Lebanon to the United Nations.
- Founded the Research Center of the Palestine Liberation Organization; and served as a member of its Executive Committee.