



**A POINT OF VIEW
ON THE
PALESTINIAN PROBLEM**

by

Edwin M. Wright

The National Association of Arab Americans gratefully acknowledges the many contributions Dr. Edwin M. Wright has made, and continues to make in the field of International Relations, and his dedication to the cause of justice, especially on behalf of the displaced people of Palestine.

We would also like to express our appreciation for his permission to reproduce this statement which was given before the Cleveland City Club, in Cleveland, Ohio on April 13, 1973.

This material has been compiled and distributed by the National Association of Arab Americans, extra copies may be obtained by writing to:

**National Association of Arab Americans
1834 K Street, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20006
(202) 347-2429**

**A POINT OF VIEW
ON THE
PALESTINIAN PROBLEM**

by
Edwin M. Wright

It is an honor to be on this platform where so many distinguished speakers have stood. But I labor under a particular disability. I have been asked to represent the Palestinian and Arab point of view in the Arab-Israeli conflict. I am not an Arab nor am I a Palestinian who in 1948 was driven out of his ancestral homeland with a rifle muzzle at his back. Nor were my properties seized without compensation and turned over to Jews. Nor have I lived for 25 years in the wretched, hopeless, degrading and dehumanizing conditions of a refugee camp. Only one who has survived those experiences can adequately represent the Palestinians. If, therefore, I fail to do justice in my presentation, I ask the forgiveness of my Arab friends.

This year many cities in the U.S.A., urged on by their Zionist citizens and propaganda, will be celebrating the 25th anniversary of the establishment of Israel. U.S. senators and congressmen, who in past years have received generous fees for speaking to Jewish audiences, will repeat their eulogies of Israel and their condemnations of Arabs - and will again receive generous fees.¹ Editors and clergymen, who have accepted free trips to Israel and have seen nothing of the Arab world, will repeat the mishmash of a few facts, some half-truths and some purely fabricated statements that they picked up in the few days they were guests of their Zionist hosts. Every effort will be made to identify Israel with the United States as staunch allies with common political systems and goals, hoping thereby to have the U.S. produce another billion dollars a year for Israeli expansion and armaments. But while these celebrations are going on, it should be remembered that Israel was established in a vast graveyard where the destruction of a self-supporting and law-abiding Palestinian community took place.

In 1948 U.S. citizens were innocent and naive. They thought of Zionism as a semi-religious humanitarian movement to rescue Jews from Hitler's Europe. But in 1973 such ignorance cannot be forgiven. Zionism had planned to evict the Palestinian community long before Hitler. That is the only conclusion to be drawn from a study of pre-Hitler Zionist leaders, now available in English translations. The age of innocence is past, although Zionists who have effectively exploited that ignorance would like to have it continue forever.

WHAT IS ZIONISM?

Zionism is the official doctrine of the State of Israel and the World Zionist Organization, spelled out in the Status Agreement of 1952-53. It was founded by Theodor Herzl whose picture – like that of Marx in Russia or Mao in China – decorates official functions in Israel. His book, *Der Judenstaat*, and his *Diaries* are the bibles of Zionism, taught in schools and reflected in the literature and press of Israel. The phrases he coined are the stereotypes in Zionist speeches and political campaigns.

Herzl's dogmas are those of a fanatic. All Gentiles are by nature anti-Semitic and wish to destroy Judaism. Therefore, all Jews must migrate from the Gentile world to a homeland of their own – Palestine – and rebuild a Jewish State on the territory of the ancient kingdom of David and Solomon. To accomplish this, the "penniless population" (the name by which he describes the Palestinian Arabs) must be evicted to make room for a total Jewish *aliyah* (immigration). If any Jew did not migrate when the Jewish State with its superior institutions had been established, but remained where he was, he thereby proclaimed himself to be an anti-Semite because he preferred to live with Gentiles rather than to migrate to the new Israel.²

Modern Israel represents only a partial fulfillment of Herzl's dream. Less than half the land he claimed has yet been conquered, some of the despised "penniless population" of Arabs still remain, and the largest community of Jews in the world – American Jews – still prefer to live with Gentiles in America rather than to migrate to their "homeland". The major task of Zionism lies ahead – and its beginning has been a bloody one. Israel has no constitution. The nearest thing is the abovementioned Status Agreement. One of the best studies of this agreement has been made by Professor W.T. Mallison of George Washington University who states:

"Zionism postulated that anti-Semitism was fundamental and ineradicable...The most striking feature of Herzl's views is that . . . the juridical-political core of Zionism has not changed from Herzl's time to the present (June 1965)."³

In the fifth section of the Israeli-World Zionist Agreement, all Jews are regarded as "exiles" if they live outside the Jewish State of Israel. It is the central task of both the State of Israel and the World Zionist Organization to complete the unfinished task. Israel expects all Jews everywhere to cooperate in implementing Zionist objectives. It was in this context that President Ben Zvi of Israel proclaimed at the fifth anniversary of the establishment of the State on April 19, 1953:

"We strongly hope that the time has come for every Jew to immigrate and gather under the flag of Israel . . . May we achieve the ingathering of the Exiles."⁴

The greatest disappointment in this Zionist dream has been the Jewish community in the United States. They have very sensibly and intelligently decided to live with us Gentiles where they enjoy far greater freedom and opportunity than they would in Israel. I congratulate them on staying with us and contributing their great talents to our common heritage as citizens of the United States. But Israel's purpose is to uproot them and transfer them to Israel-thereby needing far more territory to accommodate the fourteen million or more Jews living amongst Gentiles. It would be a tragedy were Zionism to succeed – a tragedy for Jews, Arabs and all of us.

Herzl's theme, with slight modifications, is repeated in the correspondence between Dr. Chaim Weitzmann and Lord Cecil in 1917 while the British were preparing the Balfour Declaration.⁵ In 1919 President Wilson's two Commissioners, Henry King of Oberlin and Charles R. Crane, after a thorough investigation in Palestine reported that it was clear "The Zionists looked forward to a practically complete dispossession of the present non-Jewish inhabitants of Palestine."⁶ They predicted the British would need 50,000 troops to ram Zionism down the throats of the Palestinians and would probably generate a long period of violent confrontation with the Arabs. It is of interest that in all these documents the Palestinians are never given a name – a sort of Freudian block – fearful that if they were mentioned, their existence might create a problem.

Yoseph Weitz recalls that in 1940 he wrote in his diary:

"Between ourselves, it must be clear that there is no room in this country for both peoples . . . the only solution is Eretz Israel, at least the Western Israel, without Arabs and there is no other way but to transfer from here to the neighboring countries - to transfer them all - not one village, not one tribe should be left."⁷

So Prime Minister Ben Gurion made Weitz head of the Jewish Agency Settlement Department later on. Harold Laski, the British Labor Party ideologist, persuaded the Labor Party to include in its December 1944 policy the following plank:

"There is neither hope nor meaning in a 'Jewish National Home' unless we are prepared to let the Jews, if they wish, to enter this tiny land in such numbers as to become a majority; and that the Arabs, with handsome compensation for their land, should be encouraged to move out as the Jews move in."⁸

There had appeared in Great Britain in 1917 the phenomenon of Gentile Zionism. When Prime Minister in 1905, Lord Balfour had passed two Alien Bills which effectively kept Jews out of Great Britain. Churchill owed his election to Parliament by a narrow margin to Jewish votes and financial contributions.⁹ To satisfy these Gentile Zionists, the Jewish Zionists issued a series of statements stressing their liberal and humanitarian motives and, ever since, Zionism has presented two faces to the world. One stressed driving out the Arabs; the other stressed that the Jews would be kind to the Arabs and civilize them. These contradictions remain to this day, but Israel reflects Zionist ideology as enunciated by Herzl: drive the Arabs out, seize their lands and bring in Jews as fast as possible so as to consolidate the State in as large a territory as can be conquered.

This was the program of the leaders of Palestinian Zionism as represented by David Ben Gurion, Vladimir Jabotinsky, Menachem Begin and those who are now the leaders of the Government of Israel. The massacre of Jews in Nazi Germany gave them the emotional appeal to carry out their program - secretly. Leonard Slater's book, *The Pledge*, tells the story of how, for almost two years before the State of Israel was established, Ben Gurion, Golda Meir and others set up an apparatus in the U.S. which collected \$50 million, bought airplanes, etc., from the Jewish communist Slansky in communist Czechoslovakia. A military plan, Code D (*Daleth*), was drawn up to drive the Arabs out of the areas assigned to the Jewish State at first, and then to expand the attack into the Arab areas.¹⁰ as the British forces pulled out, the Zionists moved in, thanks to a schedule given to the Jews by a British officer.

Ben Gurion appointed an area near Jerusalem to the Jewish terrorist army under Menachem Begin. The moment the British left, on the night of April 9, 1948, the village of Deir Yassin was selected as a target - and as a warning to the Palestinians. Though David Shaltiel, the Jewish officer in charge, knew of the plan and testified that the Arabs of Deir Yassin were friendly to the Jews, 254 men, women and children were massacred and their bodies thrown into wells and the stone quarry. After the massacre, Begin paraded a few survivors at a press conference and announced to the whole world that the Arabs had better leave at once or suffer a similar fate.¹¹ Menachem Begin was rewarded by election to the Israeli Knesset (Parliament), by becoming Speaker for the second largest political party in Israel - now called Balal, by serving in the Israeli Cabinet for three years, and by being sent to the U.S. occasionally by Israel to raise money. Dr. Israel Eldad (formerly Sheib), the reputed murderer of Count Bernadotte, was also involved in this massacre and was never punished. Eldad Begin advocates an attack upon neighboring Arab states to fulfill Herzl's blueprint - the restoration of the kingdom of David and Solomon cleansed of its Arab population. He is a prolific writer and only criticizes the Meir government for not moving ahead at once.¹²

By July 1948, Generals Dayan and Rabin were assigned the task of cleansing the rich Lydda-Ramleh area in central Palestine. The same brutalities were repeated.¹³ Finally, by November, the Palmach moved into north Palestine close to the Lebanese border. Yigal Allon, by a bold combination of deceit, terror and a few selected shootings at random, drove the frightened population northward.¹⁴ But there occurred a strange event on

November 8, 1948, that will long haunt Arab-Israeli relations and the reputation of Israel abroad when it becomes better known. Two villages of Christians, Berem and Iqrit, who were long friendly with their Jewish neighbors, came out to greet the Israeli army with bread and salt – the traditional symbols of friendship – but they were evicted just the same. In July 1972, Mrs. Meir heard their plea to return to their homes but persuaded her Cabinet to ban them forever from returning to their homes because their land had been assigned to Jews and it would be an erosion of the Zionist ideal to let them return.¹⁵

Herzl's body was brought to Israel and buried on Mt. Herzl near Jerusalem. His spirit must have been pleased by this decision of his faithful follower, Prime Minister Meir.

HOW DID THE UNITED STATES BECOME INVOLVED IN THIS DESTRUCTION OF THE PALESTINIAN COMMUNITY?

President Truman told a part of the story in his memoirs – how he was hounded by Zionist pressure more than at any other time in his career. The Zionists threatened him.¹⁶ He could not trust his advisors in the State Department because they were “anti-Semitic” – the usual curse thrown at anyone who criticizes Zionism. Then Secretary Acheson gave his view in which he stated that he advised against the Zionist plan because it would harm U.S. larger interests in the area – but he was overruled by the President.¹⁷ In 1972 appeared two more pieces in the puzzle. Margaret Truman Daniels published her tribute to her father. She told how irritated he was by the threats and pressures, and that Zionists even used his mother as a conduit.¹⁸ Then there is the final tale told by President Truman of how his confidence in Eddie Jacobson made it impossible to resist Zionist pressures to see Dr. Weitzmann. But by far the most interesting material appeared only late in 1972 in the publication by the U.S. Government of its documents covering 1947 (in Vol. V).¹⁹ We now have the advice given by the State Department advisors who, quite the opposite from being anti-Semitic, proved to be extremely intelligent, competent and prophetic experts. What they predicted has largely come true. But most astonishing is a memo from President Truman to Dean Acheson dated December 11, 1947. President Truman had given orders that no one in the Administration should state any preference on the Palestine issue.

“It seems to me that if our Delegation to the United Nations is to be interfered with by members of the United States Senate and by pressure groups in this country, we will be helping the United Nations down the road to failure. I have a report from Haiti in which it is stated that our Consul in Haiti approached the President of that country and suggested to him, that for his own good, he should order the vote of his country changed, claiming that he had instructions from me to make such a statement to the President of Haiti. It is perfectly clear that pressure groups will succeed in putting the United Nations out of business if this sort of thing is continued . . .”²⁰

Some U.S. Zionist, presuming on his closeness to the President, impersonated the President, usurped the authority of the U.S. Government and threatened the President of Haiti with some sort of sanction if he was not obedient to Zionist desires. I do not know of any other such incident in the history of international relations. But it worked. Similar threats seem to have been given to the Philippines and other small states hoping for U.S. economic aid. So the threats to the Arabs in Palestine were simultaneous with threats to the President of the U.S., Haiti, and other states. It is an interesting insight on how Zionism worked – and still works.

How Israel considers itself related to U.S. Jews is spelled out in numerous documents and speeches in Israel. In Israel everyone must carry a “leumi” card – poorly translated into English as peoplehood or nation. The German word “volk” as defined by the philosopher Herder is a better definition. A “volk” has myths about a common ancestry, origin, and Fatherland. There are mythological “volk” heroes, songs and legends, a sense of superiority to other “volk” groups and a fear of contamination if they associate with

them. This corresponds to the Zionist term "leumi". A member of a "volk" always carries his "volk" identity with him – as does a Jew. While I could quote many passages, two may illustrate this. Prime Minister Ben Gurion, the first in Israel, wrote that whenever Jews in the Americas speak of "our country", they mean Israel, and whenever the Israeli Ambassador speaks, they know he is representing them.²¹ In 1971 Mrs. Meir reinforced this statement in a few words. When asked what boundaries Israel intended to accept, she replied,

"Israel is where Jews are. It is not a line on a map."²²

These concepts are, of course, in absolute contradiction to the United States concept of citizenship, but they explain why U.S. Zionists threaten the President of the U.S., the President of Haiti and others for the purposes of Israel, the "leumi" center. They live outside Israel but belong to it. In Zionist terms, they are exiles from their homeland.

These official documents make clear that the purpose of Zionism from the time of Herzl to the present is the transfer of all the Jews of the world – including those in the U.S. – into the land of Israel, which makes imperative the expulsion of the Palestinians and the expansion of Israel's boundaries. This is clear from the actions of Mrs. Meir's government in the cases of Berem, Iqrit and, more recently, Petach Rafiyeh where, in April 1972, Israeli Jews evicted over two thousand Palestinians illegally, filled their wells, surrounded the area with barbed wire and declared the area as belonging to Israel.²³ Cabinet member Israel Galih then announced that the whole of Gaza belonged to Israel – and nothing was done but to accept the further use of violence to expand Israel's territories. An Israeli journalist expressed it better than I can:

"It is the duty of the Israeli leaders to explain to the public with clarity and courage a number of facts . . . the first of these is that there is no Zionism, no settlements or Jewish State without the eviction of the Arabs and the expropriation of their lands."²⁴

History, the pronouncements of Zionist leaders, the actions of the Israeli armed forces, and the decisions of the Government all attest to the honesty and truth of his witness.

I have noted that British Zionists made an effort to gain the support of Gentiles by a form of deceit – masking the real purposes of Zionism and pretending to be liberal, humanitarian and highly moral. This has been transferred to the United States. In order to hide the real story of the expulsion of the Palestinians from their homes, the Israeli Government and the Israeli Embassy in the U.S. have put out the statement:

"They (the Arabs in neighboring states) were joined by something less than 500,000 other Arabs who before the War of Independence had lived in the territory which became Israel, but during the fighting, in obedience to the behests of the Arab military commanders, had left their homes."²⁵

Although this statement was disproved twenty years ago, it is still used to deceive us as to the flight of the Arabs. Howard Sachar, who can in no way be called critical of Israel and is a well known scholar at George Washington University, in his most recent book should end the use of this deceit – but won't. American Jews find it comforting to think the Arabs left of their own volition and have enthusiastically repeated this statement for the benefit of the Gentile world. However Howard Sachar writes:

"An alleged appeal for evacuation by the Arab governments themselves, ostensibly to make way for the impending invasion of Arab armies (in April-May 1948) was a frequent repeated Jewish claim after the war. Yet no such order for evacuation was ever found in any release of the Arab League or in any military communique of the period. Rather the evidence in the Arab press and the radios of the time was to the contrary. By and large . . . the Arab League ordered the Palestinians to stay where they were and stringent punitive methods were reported against Arab youths of military age who fled the country. Even Jewish broadcasts (in Hebrew) mentioned these Arab appeals to remain."²⁶

Despite the fact that such a falsehood has been exposed by such reputable scholars as Professor Sachar, the Zionist propaganda will continue to repeat it – in the theory that if a falsehood is repeated a million times, it becomes a truth.

THE ENERGY CRISIS, 1972, THE UNITED STATES AND THE ARAB WORLD

For a generation now, the U.S. has been inundated with Zionist propaganda disseminated by a well-financed and professional apparatus. It seems to have a double purpose:

- 1) To get U.S. dollars flowing to Israel at a high level which has now reached the annual state of over a billion dollars.
- 2) To create hostility between the U.S. and the Arab peoples whom Israel considers its "enemies".

In both they have been remarkably successful. The U.S. has been given a false presentation of the issues and facts while the *Arabs have begun to despair of U.S. honesty, integrity or the validity of U.S. mediation* or reconciliation.²⁸ But 1973 is not 1948. Then the U.S. considered it could impose a Zionist ideology upon the Arab world – and flushed with a victory over Germany and Japan, it considered itself all powerful and secure because of our atomic superiority. The year 1973 has proven the illusions of 1948 will avail us nothing in the new set of circumstances which face us in 1973. The energy crisis may be summed up in a few sentences.

Because of negligence in the past ten years to find and develop new sources of energy, oil now produces almost 40% of the total energy we are consuming. U.S. production peaked in 1967 and is on the down grade. Canada and Venezuela are both decreasing their supply of oil to the U.S. It is too late now to start to develop new sources which will take a decade or 15 years to bring into production. There is only one alternative – the importation of large quantities of oil – mostly from the Persian Gulf. There we are dealing with an Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC) made up of the eleven countries exporting oil – of which seven are Arab States. The three with the largest reserves are Saudi Arabia, Kuwait and Libya. Iran, as a non-Arab state, will also play an important role in the future. The Persian Gulf States have over 400 billion barrels of proven reserves and are now exporting 16.5 million barrels per day. In January 1973, the U.S. imported 6.2 million barrels per day with more than half coming from the Persian Gulf. All estimates are that each year will see an increase of imported oil and by 1975-76 the level could be 9 million barrels per day. James Aiken, the State Department Petroleum Advisor, points out that if for any reason that flow of energy from the Persian Gulf might be interrupted, the U.S. could nowhere find a substitute. It would mean the partial grounding of our defense forces and the lights would begin to go out all over the U.S. Professor A. J. Meyer indicates the irrational and bombastic nature of our political campaign as follows, in listing the many forces threatening a deepening of the crisis:

"I refer to the genuflecting (bowing down and worshipping) to the ethnic vote (in this case the Jewish) now being engaged in publicly by candidates in the forth-coming elections . . . It has become a well-known feature of American politics, both parties do it, and each vies for public acclaim as the supporter of Israel – its existence, its economy and if necessary, its geographical expansion . . .

"Rare indeed is the U.S. political figure who points to the coming domestic oil and gas shortage, suggesting that an improvement in U.S.-Arab relations might be constructive..."²⁹

John G. McLean, in an important speech, puts it this way:

"Dependence upon a small number of distant foreign countries . . . for a vital portion of our energy supplies will be a new fact of life in the economic and political history of this nation. It is a condition we have not faced before. It suggests that we will need to take a new look at all our foreign policies with respect to the Middle East and attach to them a much higher priority than they have thus far been accorded."³⁰

To put this into simple English – the Arabs do not need the U.S.A. They have a list of clients who want their oil. But the U.S.A. does need them. They have the oil; we have the need. This is why Sheik Ahmad Zaki Yamani of Saudi Arabia was able to negotiate a new

set of agreements that, in lieu of depreciating U.S. dollars, the oil companies purchasing oil will pay Saudi Arabia partially in company stock, so that the Saudi Arabians will start with 25% of the stock and gradually increase their share to 51% by 1982 — applying to all participating oil companies. The costs of building tankers, new oil terminals and all the “downstream” elements from producer to consumer will need a capital expenditure of between \$400 to \$600 billion in the next ten years.³¹ Arab profits will help to generate that sum. The magnitude of these developments demands that the U.S. pass out of the stage of innocence and ignorance and move into the stage of intelligent thinking. Above all, it is essential that the Zionists be prevented from poisoning U.S.-Arab relations as they did so effectively in 1948 and have continued to do ever since. The U.S. should mature and get its information and facts by direct contact with those nations who have the most to contribute to our security and economic stability. We now have no diplomatic missions in four Arab states.

Zionists agree that General Time is on their side. All they have to do is hold what they have conquered, place more Jewish settlements where they have evicted Arabs (in contradiction to the Geneva Convention which Israel signed) and the world will finally accept the “fait accompli”,³²

The Arabs argue that General Oil is on their side. All they need to do is wait for another three or four years and the U.S. will have placed itself in a hopeless position where they cannot get along without Arab cooperation.

In the newly developing situation, what the U.S.A. has on its side is General Need. Time is running out along with our oil

It is a tragedy that the U.S.A. has paid no attention to the justice of the Palestinian grievances. Palestine has been their home for generations of ancestors. It has been taken away from them by violence. Justice has been denied them. Perhaps we needed the economic prod to remind us of the moral values involved. President Nixon has stated only recently that the situation between the Arabs and Israel might explode at any minute. King Faisal has given us warning. Three times Israel has attacked the Arab neighbors and the Arab governments have restrained any attacks against Americans.³³ But if Israel attacks a fourth time with U.S. equipment, the outrage of the Arabs may be too great to contain and the energy flow to the U.S. could be blocked. The stakes are far too great to leave Arab-American relations to Zionists and Israeli generals. 1973 is not 1948. Four years from now may be too late. It is imperative that the U.S.A. and the Arab States, as far as possible, develop mutual confidence and good working relationships NOW.

The unprovoked attack by Israel on a refugee camp in northern Lebanon on February 21, 1973, killed 30, many innocent, and wounded 60. It included the blowing up of a U.S. food storage depot for the refugees. This was followed by the shooting down of a crippled commercial airliner. Then the savage attack by a Black September commando unit in the Sudan, resulting in the execution of two U.S. diplomats and a Belgian indicates how far the Middle East is drifting toward anarchy. The Israelis insist they have a right to bomb guerillas — without provocation, anywhere and at any time. *The Palestinian youth, rotting in their miserable camps, no longer read the Koran — but their Bible is Franz Fanon's *The Wretched of the Earth*, which advocates the theme that for oppressed peoples, violent terrorism has a therapeutic value — giving them a sense of virtue at being killed while they kill their oppressors. Until the Palestinians are given a chance to earn their own bread and feel like human beings in their own homes, anarchy will spread — the Israelis hunting them down with commando raids far from their borders, and the Palestinians seeking manhood by murdering their torturers. These are the fruits of 1948.*

And what is at stake?

Only the security of the United States and its economic stability. *History will not forgive even a powerful nation like the U.S.A. the luxury of ignorance and innocence much longer.*

REFERENCES AND NOTES*

*Because many of the statements made in my discussion may be challenged, I append references and further documentation.

- 1) In an article in the *Rockford Register-Republican* of June 13, 1970, "Speaking Dates for Senators are Highly Profitable", Leo Gapay listed the generous fees paid by Jewish groups to Senators Muskie, Humphrey, McGovern, Percy, etc. Muskie received \$80,630.00. In 1971 and 1972 the sums paid out to various senators almost doubled. In 1972 Senator Humphrey listed \$22,500 for nine speeches to Jewish groups. In the Truman era, Vice-President Barkley received \$1,000 per speech. The speeches show no originality. They follow whatever theme is first announced by the Israeli government in Jerusalem.
- 2) The sources of Theodor Herzl's dogmas are in *The Jewish State* (1896) translated by Silvie D'Avigdor, New York, 1943. The passage quoted is from page 81. Later two volumes of Herzl's *Diaries* were translated and published by Marvin Lowenthal (1956). A brief description of Herzl is given in Moshe Menuhin's *The Decadence of Judaism in Our Time*, an Exposition Banner Book, 1965, pages 31-52. Menuhin graduated from the Gymnasia Herzliya in Tel Aviv, the institution where the idea was drummed into the heads of future Zionists that Eretz Israel (the Land of Israel) must become "goy-reim", or cleansed of Gentile-Arabs (page 52).
- 3) "The Zionist-Israel Juridical Claims to Constitute 'The Jewish People' Nationality Entity and to Confer Membership in It: Appraisal in Public International Law" by W.T. Mallison. *The George Washington Law Review*, Vol. 32, June 1964, No. 5, pages 993-4.
- 4) Department of State, Foreign Broadcasts Interception Service, April 20, 1953.
- 5) Erskine Childers, "The Broken Triangle", Chapter 7 in *Palestine, a Search for Truth* by Alan Taylor and Richard Tetlie. Public Affairs Press, 1970, pages 80-81.
- 6) Harry N. Howard, *The King-Crane Commission*, Khayatt's Press, Beirut, Lebanon, 1963, pages 350-1.
- 7) *Davar*, September 19, 1967, quoted in a valuable article by Naom Chomsky of Harvard University in *The Holy Cross Quarterly*, Vol. 5, No. 2, Summer 1972. Chomsky argues that the Palestinians have a just grievance for the destruction of their community by Zionist Israel. Acknowledgment of this fact by Israel is an essential first step in any effort at reconciliation.
- 8) Col. Richard Meinerzhagen, *Middle East Diary 1917-1956*, Cresset Press, London, 1959, page 198.
- 9) Robert G. Weisbard, *African Zion*, Jewish Publication Society, Philadelphia, 5728 - 1968, pages 110-120 and 234-5.
Also Alan Taylor, *Prelude to Israel*, Philosophical Society, 1959, pages 10-15.

One of the phenomena associated with Gentile Zionism is how innocent and ignorant these men were of the inner core of Zionist dogma. Herzl has mastered the art of tailoring his Zionist approach to feed the appetites of various Imperial Powers such as Russia, Germany, Italy, etc. This is now adopted by Zionists in the U.S.A. who din into our ears how successfully Israel is furthering U.S. interests in the Middle East. What is actually taking place is an embarrassment of the U.S.A. in its relations with the Arab States. The situation threatens violence and chaos where the U.S. desires normal and healthy relationships. The contradictory nature of Zionist statements to the Gentile world is illustrated in Fred Khouri, *The Arab-Israeli Dilemma*, Syracuse. 1968, pages 41 ff. To get Gentile support for Zionism, Zionist spokesmen stated how they intended to respect the rights of the Palestinians, while at the same time, Weitzman and Ben Gurion "largely ignored their admonitions about how to encourage Arab-Jewish cooperation." When the opportunity came in

1948, Zionism showed its real intentions to evict the Palestinians by any means possible – even massacres being perpetrated to terrorize the Arabs. See the following note 10.

- 10) John Davis, *The Evasive Peace*, published by John Murray, London, 1968, gives a short but very accurate statement (pages 53-60). The source material he uses is from a two volume work in Hebrew, *Ha Sephr Ha Palmach*, edited by Gila'd Zerubgavel, an Israeli. The work was partially translated by Walid Khalidy, *Plan Dalat: The Zionist Master Plan for the Conquest of Palestine*, Middle East Forum, Beirut, Lebanon, November 1961.

The problem of making this material available to the U.S. public is illustrated by the difficulty John Davis had in finding a U.S. publisher. They were afraid of Zionist retaliation and refused to accept the responsibility of publication, although John Davis is a distinguished U.S. citizen and for four years served as director of the U.N. refugee program in the Middle East. John Murray in London was willing to publish it and later a U.S. firm timidly came out with a paperback edition. Davis states (pages 59-60):

“Evidence that the wholesale clearance of the Arab population from areas allotted to the Zionists or seized by them (from Arab areas) was no coincidence but the result of an overall preconceived Zionist plan has now been placed on the record.”

Quoting from Yigal Allon (now Vice-Premier of Israel) is the following description of the campaign in southern Galilee dated May 10, 1948, five days before the armies of the Arab states crossed into the Arab areas of Palestine:

“There were left before us only five days before the threatening date, May 15, 1948. We saw a need to clear the inner Galilee and to create a Jewish territorial succession in the entire area of upper Galilee. The long battles too weakened our forces . . . We therefore looked for means which did not force us into employing forces in order to cause the tens of thousands of sulky Arabs who remained in Galilee to flee . . . I gathered all of the Jewish Mukhtars (village mayors) who have contacts with Arabs in different villages and asked them to whisper into the ears of some Arabs that a great Jewish reinforcement has arrived in Galilee and that it is going to burn all the villages of the Huleh. They should suggest to these Arabs as their friends, to escape while there is still time . . . The tactic reached its goal completely . . . wide areas were cleared.”

The pretended friendship of Jewish mayors for their Arab friends turned out to be the Judas kiss of betrayal and by this deceit, threats and terror, Allon drove out the Galileans from their homes.

- 11) Menachem Begin, *The Revolt*, Abelard Schuman, 1951, pages 162 ff. Begin's book is the official document of the Irgun on this massacre. A more full description appeared by Uri Millstein in *Haaretz*, August 30, 1968. A still more detailed record is in Collins and LaPierre, *O Jerusalem*, Simon and Schuster, 1972, Chapter 22, “The Peace of Deir Yassin.” Without warning at 4:30 a.m. of April 9, 1948, a force of 132 Jewish terrorists attacked the village. Upon victory, “A kind of collective hysteria overtook the attackers . . . they fell with increasing fury on the inhabitants.” They lined the survivors against the walls and shot them, killing any who were trying to escape. The Jews “killed, looted and raped” (pages 274-5). David Shaltiel's testimony is on page 584. The village had no strategic importance and was friendly to the Jews but Begin chose this easy target in order to terrorize the Palestinians and to increase the influence of the Irgun in Jewish circles.
- 12) Dr. Israel Eldad's militant party advocates conquering all Jordan, Syria and Lebanon up to the southern boundary of Turkey – the Suez to the Cappadocian Mountains mentioned by Herzl. He would expel all the non-Jewish population so as

to make room for a large Jewish *aliyah* of millions. In Y. Ben Porat's discussion of Israeli parties, Eldad's group is on the right of the extremist, expansionist, terrorist Gahal party of which Begin is the spokesman. Eldad is the Super Zionist. These militant terrorists have a free press in Israel but if any Palestinian expressed such violent and extreme attitudes about the Jews he would be imprisoned or expelled at once — without trial. This is because Arabs fall under the British Emergency Regulations of 1945 and have no protection under the civil courts. A good article outlining the positions of the various Israeli parties on expansion is found in *The New Middle East*, December 1972, by the Israeli journalist Y. Ben Porat.

- 13) Collins and La Pierre (op. cit. page 551) report:

"In the wake of the sudden Israeli triumph (at Lydda and Ramleh) tens of thousands of Arab refugees began swarming up the hills toward Ramallah. This time their flight was not a result of fear, but a calculated Israeli policy to drive them out. The earlier Arab departures had made it all too clear that the land seized by the Israelis was more valuable without the embarrassing presence of its Arab inhabitants. Loudspeaker vans roamed the streets telling the Arabs to leave. Arab leaders were summoned to Israeli army headquarters and bluntly advised to get out . . . large parts of the population were physically evicted from their homes and ordered on to the road to Ramallah.

"Under a broiling sun, clutching what few possessions they had time to gather, an occasional Israeli bullet whistling overhead to keep them moving, the miserable column of human beings stumbled over the thorn-strewn hillside toward Ramallah. An unknown number of the aged and young died during their trek."

Of course Zionists have tried to hide these well known facts and have largely succeeded.

- 14) A series of dispatches in the Archives of the State Department sent by the U.S. Consul in Jerusalem early in November 1948 describe the Israeli methods used. The following is one such dispatch dated November 14, 1948:

"Details massacre allegedly committed by Jews at Dawaymeh village reported Dispatch 116 November 12, 1948. Arabs claim 500 to 1000 men, women, children lined up and killed by machine gun fire after village captured October 29th. Investigation by U.N. indicates massacre did occur but observers unable number persons involved.

"After surrender three villages Galilee area, Jews ordered villagers turn in all arms in 25 minutes. When unable meet deadline five men from one village and two from each of others selected at random and shot. Killings confirmed by U.N. investigation.

"Conduct this nature can only impede final Palestine settlement and leaving rankling bitterness."

Nothing more prophetic was ever written.

- 15) See my article, *A Tale of Two Hamlets Berem and Iqrit: Symbols of Israel's Treatment of Its Christian Citizens*. It is available from NOCMEU, Box 16094, Cleveland, Ohio 44116. I have there collated the material from a number of sources, including two put out by the Government of Israel. Reactions in Israel are quoted in *KNOW*, edited by Norton Mezvinski, 340 E. 51 St., New York, N.Y., Vol. 1, No. 5, dated August 17, 1972.

The callous method by which Prime Minister Meir dismissed the whole question

of Israel's honor and justice to the Christian villagers by stating the agitation was only a communist effort, gives an insight into her moral judgements. Amos Elon in his article in *The New York Times Magazine* supplement of October 22, 1972, indicates some Jews in Israel are sensitive to moral issues but only four members of the Cabinet dared to dissent, the rest voted with Mrs. Meir to violate earlier promises and deny these Christians the hope to return to their ancestral homes – forever.

- 16) Harry Truman, *Memoirs*, Garden City, N.Y., 1956, Vol. II, pages 113 ff.
Another valuable source is Walter Millis, *The Forrestal Diaries*, N.Y., 1951, pages 360 ff.

How naive President Truman was and how badly advised by his Zionist friends is indicated in his statements that he believed the Partition Plan at the U.N. was “practical”, would bring peace to the Middle East and be accomplished “without bloodshed” (page 157). He accepted these false evaluations while ignoring his State Department's experienced experts. The result has been 25 years of deepening crisis, bloodshed and threats to international security – with no sign of a light at the end of the tunnel yet. In fact, it is probably hopeless to expect the Zionist leadership which created the problems to reach a compromise solution. We shall probably wait for the next generation to escape from the passions and hatreds generated by this Zionist leadership.

New light on the policy of Ben Gurion toward the Arabs has just appeared in a book by David Shoenbrun, *The New Israelis*, Atheneum, 1973. When Ben Gurion was forming his first cabinet in 1948, he offered the position of Foreign Minister to Nahum Goldmann. Goldmann believed Israel's first priority was conciliation with the Arabs – a program to end the problem of the 800,000 Palestinian refugees and negotiate satisfactory borders with the Arab states. (“The Future of Israel” in *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 48, April 1970). But, according to Goldmann, Ben Gurion believed that the only language the Palestinians understood was the pressure of the Israeli military iron heel. Because of Goldmann's attitude, he was read out of the Zionist party by Mrs. Meir and not even invited to attend its last session in Jerusalem in 1971. Mrs. Meir has continued Ben Gurion's policy. Schoenbrun suggests the most profound preoccupation of the younger generation of Israelis is their future relationship with the Arabs. They feel they have been led into a hopeless cul-de-sac by the European Zionist leaders in the past generation. A brief review of this book by Francis Russel appeared in *The Christian Science Monitor* of March 21, 1973.

- 17) In 1970 Secretary Dean Acheson published his *Present at the Creation* in which for the first time he publicly stated his doubts about President Truman's policy. His advice was prophetic: that establishment of a Jewish State in a territory dominantly occupied by Arabs would generate a long period of violence which might undermine the U.S. larger interests in the area. He indicated the passionate emotionalism of the issue by adding that he dared not discuss the matter with his best friends, Felix Frankfurter or ex-Justice Brandeis, because it would have impaired their relationships. With many American Jews 25 years later, the issue still cannot be discussed objectively or intelligently. To shatter their illusions with fact is too much of a shock. The reaction is vituperation – a flow of adrenalin.
- 18) Margaret Truman (Daniel) quoted from *The Denver Post* excerpt of December 13, 1972, pages 1-9.
- 19) *Foreign Relations of the United States*, Vol. V, 1947. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. Over 300 pages cover the reports on the Palestine controversy.
- 20) *Foreign Relations of the United States*, op. cit. page 1309.
- 21) *Israeli Year Book 1953-4*, page 35.
- 22) *Maariv*, September 26, 1971

- 23) *The New Outlook*, Tel Aviv, May 1972. The evictions of the Palestinians from Gaza is discussed in "The Pitach Rafiah Controversy."
Also see *Haolam Hazeq*, March 15, 1972.
- 24) Y. Ben Porath in *Yedioth Aharonot*, July 14, 1972.
- 25) *Topics*, March 1968, No. 16, "The Arabs of Israel", Israeli Government Printer, page 2. This statement is both inaccurate and false. The U.N. refugee agency (UNRWA) listed 730,000 refugees and all reports from the field – U.N., U.S. and independent journalists – recorded the brutal methods used by the Israeli army to "cleanse the land."
- 26) Howard Sachar, *Europe Leaves the Middle East 1918-1954*, 1972, page 551.
- 27) The efforts on the part of Zionists to create ill will between the U.S. and the Arab states is generated by the "black and white" totalitarian view of the Zionist. The Arabs are his enemies; the U.S. must be his friend. Therefore, in Zionist logic, the U.S.A. must be made to feel hostility toward the Arab world. In 1947-8, I was on the staff of the U.S. delegation to the United Nations in New York. Zionist youth on the sidewalks of New York were soliciting funds, urging passersby to "Give a dollar to kill an Arab." The Arab delegations protested to Ambassador Austin that they were being insulted while guests of the U.S.A. at the U.N. Ambassador Austin appealed to the Mayor to ask Jewish groups to cease this type of activity. It did no good. Hysterical Zionists continued to solicit "on the sidewalks of New York" with constant insults to the Arab guests.

A more bizarre event took place in Cairo and Alexandria, Egypt, in 1954. There were signs that the U.S.A. and Egypt were discussing a plan with Nasser by which he would negotiate an acceptance of Israel. Miles Copeland has related the silly events that took place in *The Game of Nations* and they also appear in Hassanein Heikal's *The Cairo Papers*, 1972. Israel wanted no U.S. Nasser rapprochement, so the army activated a spy-sabotage unit of young Egyptian Jews and instructed them to place bombs in several U.S. buildings, leaving behind clues that these were done by anti-American Egyptians. One of the targets was the U.S. Information Agency Library in Alexandria but, in the MGM Theater, a bomb exploded prematurely and the perpetrators were caught. They confessed. Israel denied any responsibility and never did admit the outrage was planned by the Israeli government. Mrs. Meir was then Foreign Minister and the responsibility came under her office. But in late 1960 the scandal exploded by the discovery of forged signatures. Ben Gurion clamped down military censorship but many of the facts leaked out to the press. The first full exposure appeared in William Zukermann's *The Jewish Newsletter* of March 6, 1961. Howard Sachar wrote a more detailed story in *From the Ends of the Earth*. The whole story of lies, forgeries, intrigue and conspiracy became known as "The Lavon Affair" and eventually forced the resignation of Ben Gurion.

In a recent pamphlet (*The Middle East, Two Wars for the Price of One*, Institute of International Studies, University of South Carolina, 1972), Donald Bergus, a senior State Department official who has served in both Israel and Egypt, states, "Egypt feels impelled to maintain her influence in and consolidate her leadership of the Arab World. Israel feels that her vital national interest requires her to oppose and frustrate this Egyptian objective." The Israeli propaganda machine in the U.S.A. has tried to portray Egypt as hostile to the U.S.A., therefore the U.S.A. must support Israel. The long testimony of I. Kenan before the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives, July 22-30, 1970, constantly repeats the theme that there is a U.S.S.R. - Egyptian threat to the U.S.A.-Israeli alliance. He even goes so far as to state "Israel's existence is a priori protection for American oil interests in the Persian Gulf in Saudi Arabia, Kuwait and Bahrain and Iran." (page 81) This is obvious nonsense, but nonsense is the stock in trade of Zionists. U.S. oil companies are being phased out of the Persian Gulf or will be owned 51% by Saudi Arabia in a few years. The U.S.A., like Europe and Japan, will be client of the oil producing Persian Gulf States and security of oil supply will depend on

confidence and good will between the owners and the buyers. Israel cannot possibly play any part in such trade, except as mischief-maker.

The dilemma of U.S. presidents caught between the desire for normal relationships with the Arab states and Zionist pressures to support only Israel to expand is illustrated in the *Cairo Papers* mentioned above. For the first time, the correspondence between President Nasser and three U.S. presidents has been published. The presidents try to assure Nasser of "even handedness", of "sincerity" and a desire for normal friendly relationships, while trying to entice Jewish money and votes in U.S. elections. It is a dismal story bordering on hypocrisy and prevarication.

Again on February 21, 1973, an Israeli commando unit attacked an Arab refugee camp in north Lebanon at Nahr el Barid. The excuse was that guerillas were in the camp. But *Newsweek* of March 5, 1973, and Dana Adams Schmidt of the *Christian Science Monitor*, detected another reason. On February 23, the highest ranking Egyptian to visit the U.S.A. in nine years was to meet President Nixon. Unfortunately, following the killing of over 30 Palestinians, wounding 60 and blowing up a U.S. food supply depot in an unprovoked attack, a Libyan crippled commercial airliner was shot down near the Suez Canal with a death toll of 106. (In July 1955, an Israeli El Al plane had strayed 130 kms. off course crossing Bulgaria and was shot down by anti-aircraft fire. Israel denounced this as a monstrous crime, that Bulgaria was responsible for this "irresponsible act;" "a violation of responsibility to human life;" "a serious international violation," etc. See *Haaretz*, July 29, 1955 and July 31, 1955. Yet when Israel shot down a crippled stray plane on February 21, 1973, it was all the fault of the pilot.)

Rumors reached the White House on February 21, 1973 that Hafiz Ismail was about to cancel his visit to Nixon because of the outrageous acts of Israel. Whereupon President Nixon called President Sadat, and Secretary Rogers called Mr. Ismail in London and urged him to continue his plans to visit Washington. Israel almost succeeded in breaking up the Nixon-Ismail visit.

- 28) The Arab states bordering on Israel are convinced there is collusion between Israel and the U.S.A. to expand Israeli territory at their expense. Four Arab states have no diplomatic relationships with the U.S.A. In 1971, Secretary Rogers and Joseph Sisco persuaded President Sadat to accept the Security Council Resolution 242 of November 1967 and the Jarring mission as the basis for discussions with Israel. But Israel balked and Sadat accused the U.S.A. of another broken promise. The Israeli newspaper *Maariv*, November 10 and 12, 1972, published an article about a Nixon-Meir deal. Nixon would scuttle the Rogers plan and open up the U.S. arsenal to Israel in return for which Mrs. Meir would indirectly let the U.S. Jewish community know that Israel preferred Nixon for president in the elections. This was done by having the Israeli Ambassador make a speech in June 1972 stating that the American Jewish community should thank Mr. Nixon for his assistance to Israel. This sort of interference in U.S. internal affairs is normal for Zionists but violates all international precedents.
- 29) In September 1972, the Middle East Institute (1761 N Street, N.W., Washington, D.C.) held its annual conference on the subject of "World Energy Demands and the Middle East." The discussions have been published in two volumes. It is among the best quickly available compilations of information on the energy crisis. It includes the presentations by Professor A.J. Meyer, James Akins and Sheik Ahmad Zaki Yamani from which these quotations are taken.
- 30) John G. McLean, *The United States Energy Outlook And Its Implications For National Policy*, World Affairs Council, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, September 21, 1972, page 6.
- 31) Middle East Institute, *op. cit.* page 98.
- 32) Middle East Institute, *op. cit.* page 90.
- 33) The Arab states have little reason to trust U.S. motives or presidential statements.

The record is too long and too painful to try to reproduce here. The following is an illustration. In May 1967, President Lyndon Johnson announced:

“To the leaders of all the nations of the Near East, I wish to say what three presidents have said before . . . that the United States is fully committed to the support of the political independence and territorial integrity of all the nations of the area. The United States strongly opposes aggression by anyone in any form; overt or clandestine.”

A few weeks later when war broke out, Foreign Minister Abba Eban of Israel announced at the United Nations that on June 5, 1967, Israel had detected Egyptian planes on the attack and had therefore counterattacked. This lie was repeated for five years, then in June 1972, the Israeli government released to the press the Cabinet decision of June 4, 1967 to attack Egypt.

Despite Abba Eban's prevarication, few experts were fooled and both the State Department and the Defense Department reported to President Johnson that their information indicated it was Israel which attacked first. Yet President Johnson did nothing. Then on December 9, 1969, Secretary Rogers, presumably with White House approval, made his speech which asserted that the U.S.A. would “support Israel's existence but not its expansion.” In 1971, the Nixon-Meir deal (see note 27) repudiated the Rogers proposal and supported Israel's expansion – this being the approach to an election year.

Milton Ellerin, formerly of the F.B.I. but now Director of the Trends Analysis Division of the American Jewish Committee is reported in the *Cleveland Jewish News* of December 15, 1972 as follows:

“It is possible for a segment of the American public to assume from the (coverage of) the last election, that Jews are more loyal to Israel than to the U.S.A.; that Israel tells American Jews how to vote; that Jews are richer than other Americans; that they control the press and can buy candidates and thereby dominate the political process.”

I would only add one adjective: “It is possible for an *intelligent* segment, etc.

It is little to be wondered that Arabs as a whole have lost faith in the U.S. political world. Yet Arabs for 125 years have had personal contacts with U.S. citizens and there is widespread belief that Americans as a whole are more honest, open-minded and sincere than their government. The government seems to reflect the pressures and attitudes of the 3% who are Jewish, though they also know there are a few anti-Zionist Jews. What the Arabs hope is that the 97% will reassume the direct, friendly and constructive relationships which have existed for 125 years – before the Zionists intervened to dominate the scene. The Palestinians have every reason to hate the United States as the sole supporter – financially, militarily and politically – of a Zionist state which planned, executed and continues to destroy the whole Palestinian community. Israel and the U.S.A. have treated the Palestinians as if they were non-people. That is the atmosphere which breeds such groups as the Black September movement. They are outlaws made so by Zionism of the Herzl, Ben Gurion, Meir school of thought. Zionism is the cause. The Black September movement is the effect of the desperation of Palestinians made un-people.

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Dr. Edwin M. Wright was born in Iran and later served seventeen years as an educator in the Middle East. His government service began in 1941 with the Office of Strategic Services, and from 1941 to 1945 he served as a U.S. Army Intelligence Officer stationed in Cairo and Tel Aviv. In 1946 he was appointed to the staff of the U.S. Department of State, Division of Middle East Affairs, and in 1955 became Assistant Dean of the Foreign Service Institute. He received the Superior Merit Award of the Department of State in 1964.

Since his retirement in 1966, he has taught at several colleges and universities including Johns Hopkins and the University of South Carolina. He has published articles in U.S. journals and is widely known as a lecturer on Middle East history.

Dr. Wright holds the A.B. degree and an honorary doctorate from Wooster College and the M.A. degree from Columbia University.

The Northeast Ohio Committee on Middle East Understanding, Inc.
Post Office Box 16094
Cleveland, Ohio 44116

Reprint permission granted by the Author