

PAL
956.04
HAS

H. R. H. PRINCE HASSAN BEN TALAL

The
Palestine
Question

AMMAN — JORDAN

P. 18P.

624896779
P12 956.04 HAS

The
Palestine Question

By

H. R. H. PRINCE HASSAN BEN TALAL

DEPT. OF CULTURE AND GUIDANCE
MINISTRY OF INFORMATION
AMMAN - JORDAN

1965

This is a precise study of the Problem of Palestine, written and given by Prince Hassan Ben Talal, at Harrow School in July, 1964.

His Royal Highness Prince Hassan Ben Talal, younger brother of His Majesty King Hussein, was born in Amman on the 20th of March 1947, graduated from Harrow School, December 1964, majoring in History, and now an undergraduate at Oxford University, studying Law and Political Science.

This is a third impression of the lecture.

References of this lecture were :

- Orientalisms** Sir Ronald Storrs
- The Embittered Arab** Dr. Jamal Nasir
- A History of the Jewish People** James Parkes
- Documents on B.F.P.**
- The Imperial Idea & Its Enemies.** Elton

Culture and Guidance
Ministry of Information,
Amman — 1965.

THE PALESTINE QUESTION

During my time at school in England, I have become aware of the total lack of understanding with which English students and indeed Englishmen and Europeans of all ages regard my part of the world. This fact is not at all surprising, for the garbled accounts of the popular press which from day favours one cause or another in the Arab world, cannot in any way reveal the true nature of the fundamental problems of this part of the world; and what is more important, the history of these problems, without which no one can be expected to verge anywhere near understanding them. I should like hereby to reveal to you a major problem which has worried my own country — Jordan — for the last sixteen years, and despite continued effort as yet appears insoluble.

On every religious occasion the hearts of millions all over the world go out to the Holy Land. Yet these millions have never stopped to think of the misery and suffering that has been imposed on the peaceful inhabitants of that sacred spot. The history of Palestine has been kept hidden from the public, and though the world to-day has much for which to be ashamed, there is nothing in it so shameful as the condition of Palestine. There would never have been a Palestine Question if certain statesmen had not created it with the help of the influential members of the Zionist organization (a political group to which I shall return later). From the Arabs, the people of that country who are suffering from an extreme injustice, the world has heard little of their case and about the Holy Land.

There is a natural tendency to transmute the spiritual greatness of the Holy Land into physical largeness. Palestine is in fact closer in size to an English county than a country. The length of Palestine from Dan to Beersheba (both Israeli held towns)

is about 180 miles, and for about half its span the breadth is not more than 50 miles from Jordan to the sea. (From some points the gap is less than 20 miles). In the terms of the atlas "Palestine is little more than a stitch on the front of the vast mantle of Asia". The reason for appreciating the size of the area of Palestine is that over the years there have appeared confused details of the settling of large numbers of foreign immigrants. Although Palestine has had a separate political existence since the dissolution of the Ottoman Empire, geographically it is a part of Syria (that area originally covering present-day Syria, Jordan, Lebanon and Israel). It is a single region which stretches from the southern edge of the Arabian plateau to Sinai and the Dead Sea, and from the Mediterranean to the Syrian and Arabian deserts.

In 1918 at Versailles, with the close of the First World War, the spoils of battle were reaped by the allies. The Arabs under Hussein I King of the Hejaz, my great grand-father had played a prominent part in the war, honouring their alliance with the Great Powers, to the dual purpose of gaining their complete independence which had been promised them as a direct consequence of the Hussein/Macmahon correspondence and of winning Britain's war against the Turks. Yet Britain's obligations to France forced her to change her mind without the knowledge of her Arab allies (that being a story in itself). Hussein was exiled to Cyprus to die broken-hearted in gratitude for his support, and Saud the new candidate, a man who had taken no part in the Arab revolt, rose by the sword to form a new kingdom while the Arab armies fought in the north. The direct result of the Partition plan was quite ungeographical. Lebanon and Syria were entrusted to the French; while Iraq, Trans-Jordan and Palestine came under British mandate (a term ironically coined by the American historian George Beer).

Between the years 1918-1948 new pressures were to make themselves felt to add flavour to the well known motto of

"divide and rule". These pressures had been recognised during the war and further acknowledged after it by leading British statesmen against the advice of the "Middle East Club", or the man on the spot who understood the political atmosphere. From the geographical viewpoint created by the Partition, there seemed to be no harm to British politicians in solving another problem of the war and creating a Jewish national home in Palestine. The Arabs of Syria, Iraq and the peninsula of Arabic people appeared to cover a large amount of territory. The idea of creating such a national home was formed in the mind of Theodore Herzl, a Viennese journalist, who in 1897 organized the first Zionist congress at Basle.

Herzl's views did not, however, advocate political Zionism or Irredentism. He did not call for the establishment of the Jewish state in Palestine. His cry was for a state here, there and anywhere. He received, some years later, an offer from the British Government of six thousand square miles in the highlands of British East Africa (Uganda to be precise) the acceptance of which might have caused strange results! Herzl would have closed with this offer in 1903, but by that time there were too many others in the Zionist movement whose thought was riveted on Palestine. Yet Zionism, a movement founded in Eastern Europe for the furtherance of an apparently noble aim, was not initially acquainted with the significance of the numerous attitudes that dominated the area in which it chose to settle. (It will be interesting to note later how the religious Jews of Jerusalem, Hebron and the Sephardim were to be strongly opposed to political Zionism, believing that God would bring Israel back "in His own good time", to quote Storrs, "and that it was impious to anticipate His decree").

But above all there should have existed a consideration for the Arab outlook. To the Arabs, Syria represents their outlet on the Mediterranean Sea and their contact with the West.

It is their forwarded gate and it is and has long been the case that as far as they keep it and hold it and make it thoroughly their own, that they will mingle their lives and destinies with Europe. Palestine, furthermore, has always played an essential part in the religious life of the Muslim world. After Mecca and Medina, Jerusalem is the holiest city of Islam.

In 1917, Palestine was and has been for two thousand years an Arab area, and peopled almost entirely by Arabs. Of its population in that year, of a total of 650,000 more than 600,000 or roughly 91% were Arabs, and only about 50,000 were Jews. The Arabs of Palestine in other words are descendants of the indigenous inhabitants, who have lived in that country since the earliest recorded time, and who were there when the Jews entered it in biblical times and went on living in it after the Jewish dispersion.

One must, however, recognize the position of the early heathen Arab in comparison with the principled and enlightened Jew. Before the coming of Islam, the conversions of Judaism and its general religious and cultural influence over these Arabs is to be admired. Arnold speaks of it thus: "There are great elements in our humanization, the power of conduct is a great element; and this was so felt and fixed by Israel that we can never with justice refuse to permit Israel, in spite of all its shortcomings, to stand for it". Would that those shortcomings not have been produced in the form of a justly studied case, for then the human element of a people displaced by so many long years of history might have been accepted, and history could have slipped inoffensively on its way.

The Arabs after the rise of Islam respected the Jews and the Christians as being of the "Ahl-el-Kitab" or the people of the book. To-day in the Arab half of a divided Jerusalem, believers in every branch of Christianity worship. (The writings

of Christendom is not my topic and I shall not attempt to describe the discord which appears to exist between the different Christian sects). But a practising Jewish community is to-day tolerated in the Caliphate tradition, and fests of the Jewish prophets (all of whom are recognized by the Koran) are respected.

The third most important cradle of Islam had opened its arms to the great religions of the world, but men have taken advantage of the fact to their own benefit. Of the 50,000 Jews who lived in Palestine in 1917, many were long established citizens who had become completely Arabised themselves and lived at peace with both Muslim and Christian Arabs. But the political challenge to Palestine did not come from the Jewish community within it, but from the Zionist movement which had established itself in the latter half of the 19th century.

Already in 1914, Zionist leaders and particularly Dr. Weizmann and Lord Rothschild had begun to work on certain members of the British cabinet with a view to securing the British government's auspices and British protection of a Jewish state in Palestine. The most remarkable feature of the meetings that took place on the subject between the Zionist leaders and their friends in the British government on the one hand, and between the British ministers themselves inside the cabinet on the other hand, was the deliberate and almost total exclusion of the Arabs — the people who at the moment were the owners and inhabitants of Palestine. At long last the reason for that has now, after many years, been revealed, and I quote volume II of Documents on British Foreign Policy, wherein Balfour wrote: "*In Palestine we do not propose ever to go through the form of consulting the wishes of the present inhabitants..... Zionism is of far greater importance than the desires and prejudices of the 700,000 Arabs who now inhabit that ancient land. I do not think Zionism will hurt the Arabs; but they will never say*

they want it... As far as Palestine is concerned the Powers have made no statement of fact which is not admittedly wrong, and no declaration of policy, which at least in the letter, they have not always intended to violate". Such were the words of an eminent representative of the "Great Powers".

The activities of the Zionist leaders continued unabated, and so by their intensive and extensive approaches they carried the day; and on 2nd November 1917 Lord Balfour as Foreign Secretary addressed to Lord Rothschild a letter which has come to be known as the "Balfour Declaration". The Declaration did not provide for the conversion of Palestine into a Jewish state. It spoke of no more than the establishment of a Jewish home in Palestine. The Zionists were to use the Declaration in order to create in Palestine a state, which they claimed the right to support and did do so by force of arms in expelling the Arab inhabitants. Balfour's words now became "*it is clearly understood that nothing shall be done which might prejudice the civil and religious rights of existing non-Jewish communities in Palestine or the rights and political status enjoyed by Jews in any other country*".

Yet the process which led to the final triumph of Zionism was to be slow and treacherous. As Palestine, the mandated territory, groped its way to independence, leeches of foreign influence had fastened to her throat awaiting the moment to eliminate the rights of her people. A new figure had countenanced Herzl's failure and risen to lead Zionism to victory. This was Dr. Chaim Weizmann, university lecturer in chemistry at the University of Manchester in the constituency of Arthur James Balfour. By 1914 Weizmann had assumed complete mastery of the Zionist movement. With the initial success of the Balfour Declaration, he gained British consent to head a commission to Palestine, and I quote James Parkes in his "History of the Jewish People", to "*plan for the restoration and*

extension of Jewish settlement as soon as hostilities with the Turks were over".

Parkes suggests that Weizmann attempted through Prince Feisal, son of the king of the Hejaz, to come to an understanding with the Arabs. But he omits stating the position in which the Emir was thus placed. The Hussein/Macmahon correspondence had originally promised total independence for these people (and Palestinians among them) who had fought for their liberty. The great powers were to prove after the revelation of Sykes/Picot agreement (a callous partitioning of the area by French and British civil servants in May 1916 without Arab knowledge) that this was not so. Now Feisal, the man who had led the Arab armies through Jerusalem to Damascus was asked to impose immigrants (who numbered over 60,000 by 1935) on a people who originally paid him no allegiance, but like all Arabs rose to the call of Hussein Ibn Ali to gain self-rule. It is part of the whole tragedy of the Palestinian people in this century that the best leader whom they could produce in these extremely difficult circumstances, was a scheming and unscrupulous politician, Haj Amin el-Husseini, Mufti of Jerusalem, who was as willing to murder his Arab rivals (his machinations resulted in the murder of my Grandfather in July 1951) as to oppose his British and Jewish enemies.

But Weizmann did not have to negotiate with Haj Amin el-Husseini and the person he came into contact with was Sir Ronald Storrs, the former Oriental Secretary and the then military governor of Jerusalem. It would be relevant to quote the account of his encounter with Weizmann so as to note the failure of British policy, and Zionism's final deviation from its word. He says: "After proposing 'The King', I explained that I had seized the occasion of so many representatives of communities being gathered in Jerusalem (all the Christian sects, the French government and the Palestinian community were

represented) to clear away certain misunderstandings aroused by the visit of the Zionist Commission. Dr. Weizmann then pronounced an eloquent exposition of the Zionist creed: Jews had renounced their rights to Palestine; they were brother Semites, not so much "coming" as "returning" to the country; there was room for both work side by side; let his hearers beware of the treacherous insinuations that Zionists were seeking political power — rather let both progress together until they were ready for a joint autonomy. Zionists were following with the deepest sympathy the struggles of Arabs and Armenians for that freedom which all three could mutually assist one another to regain. He concluded: "The hand of God now lies heavy upon the peoples of Europe: let us unite in prayer that it may lighten". To my Arabic rendering of this speech, the Mufti replied civilly, thanking Dr. Weizmann for allaying apprehensions which, but for his exposition, might have been aroused. He prayed for unity of aim, which could alone bring prosperity to Palestine, and he quoted generalizing a Hadith, a tradition of the Prophet, "Our rights are your rights and your duties our duties".

It is understandable that Zionism — a movement spiritually created after the Diaspora and pushed to the furthest limits of exhaustion by the horrors of war — should seek refuge in Palestine. But in Balfour's words "steady colonization would have to precede the granting of political favours". Did the planting of Zionists in Palestine, in what was to become a political capacity, conform with this outmoded nonsense? *Why should a group of influential men make their own history while a nation, which through two wars stood and was to stand by Britain in sharing her aims, be ignored and double-crossed?* Nuri es-Said, the future premier of Iraq, ahead of whom spanned a long future in the lee of British power, was assured that the imperialists wished first to divide and then to rule the Arabs "lest some single Arab state should develop ambitions of its

own, which would conflict with grand policy and strategy". This policy and strategy only mattered provided men who had never set foot on Arab soil had their way against the wiser suggestions of the Middle East Club.

Of the uglier aspects of the Palestine Question is the ingrained resentment that every young Arab holds not only against those who were to throw him from his homeland, but also against "the grand policy" which countenanced that act.

Soon after Weizmann's declaration of good faith, hot words were being bandied in Palestine. It had been assumed by the Zionists that the indigenous inhabitants of Palestine were few in number, "backward" and unimportant, to quote Storrs again that; "as brother Semites they would welcome Jews, and as poor ones capitalists: that their interests would not only suffer but would positively be advanced by an influx of enthusiastic and energetic "capitalists": that they must realize the Jews were "returning" by the will of the League of Nations".

The Palestinian opposition to Zionism therefore came on the whole as a surprise, sometimes almost as an outrage, to the world at large; an act of chivalrous generosity (at no expense to the donors) was being heckled and thwarted by a selfish, petulant and fanatical reaction. In Dryden's words:

"But when the Chosen People grew more strong,
The rightful cause at length became the wrong,
And every loss the man of Jesus bore,
They still were thought God's enemies the more.
Thus, worn and weakened, well or ill content,
Submit they must to David's government".

Arab opposition may seem unreasonable or reactionary. But the British attitude towards Zionism was not one of returning members of a great religion to their homeland and the

cradle of their civilization. Arabs both Muslim and Christian recognized Jews as "fellow believers" and if given the opportunity might have accepted them as such in their midst. But they were the men who for four centuries had groaned under the "heavy empty hand of Turkish misrule". Yet as the Middle East Club endlessly pointed out they had aspired to become the "first brown dominion and not the last brown colony".

The pre-war generations' gaze had been fixed on the southwest, where across Sinai a hundred miles away stood before them another ancient country, Egypt "restored to prosperity and endowed with the civilization of Europe by the power of Great Britain and the genius of an Englishman". A national sovereign sat on his throne assisted by a council of Egyptian Ministers, against a background of parliamentary institution. No attempt was being made to impose the English at the expense of the Arabic language or culture, or to manipulate the customs tariffs for the benefit of British trade. They had taken up arms in 1916 to free themselves from bondage and in return for their alliance were to receive assistance, arms and unconditional independence.

Admittedly the Palestinian Arab did not play a large part in co-operation with the advancing allied armies. But Syrian Arabs of influence had paid their lives for their allied sympathies, when a score of them were executed at Beirut, and when the Mufti of Gaza was hanged, together with his son, at the Jaffa gate of Jerusalem. With the British "liberation" of their country they found their hopes not accomplished but extinguished. They were even then denied the official use of their own noble language, but they were entitled to choose from one of two foreign languages as well as, and on either side of their own.

The landowner and the peasant may have found slight material advantage from Jews and British, but in the words of the

Palestinian chicken "Ita'amni el-yome: wishnuqni bukra — feed me up to-day: wring my neck to-morrow". The price of prosperity was heavy. Weizmann had apparently made his views clear after his declaration in Jerusalem. On the king's birthday, however, in 1921, Sir Herbert Samuel declared in statesmanlike form that the Balfour Declaration meant that "the Jews, a people who were scattered throughout the world, but whose hearts are always turned to Palestine, should be enabled to make here their home, and that some among them, within their limits that are fixed by the members and interests of the present population, should come to Palestine in order to help by their resources and efforts to develop the country, to the advantage of all its inhabitants".

Within two months the good effect of this statement was undone by a violent denunciation at the Carlsbad Zionist Congress. Herzl's original "Juderstat" had been absolutely excluded by the British and also, as has been seen, officially repudiated by official Zionism. But then the versatile Vladimir Jabotinsky declared vehemently that the Jews did not want a national home in Palestine, but a Jewish state. Which if either, of these statements were the Arabs expected to believe? How could they forget that when Dr. Weizmann was asked what he meant by a Jewish National Home, his reply was that he eventually had visualized a situation where "Palestine should be just as Jewish as America was American, or England was English".

Words were to be followed by deeds. Gun running to the Jewish community came into fashion. In 1935, cement sacks opened by customs officers at Jaffa were found to contain 500 bayonets, 300 rifles and 400,000 rounds in a total of 359 sacks. The result was a bitter campaign by the Arab Press and riots in Jaffa and even Tel Aviv (a situation almost analogous with that of present-day Cyprus).

It must have been shortly after this that the Haganah or

secret army was founded, for the furtherance of acts of violence against British and Arabs alike. The most remarkable single feat against the former must have been the dynamiting of the King David Hotel in Jerusalem, where both British and Arab civil servants lost their lives.

Shortly before the establishment of Israel, Dr. Weizmann, the future President of Israel, was heard to say: "I am certain that the world will judge Israel by what it will do to the Arabs!" So, a people who won world sympathy for the suffering they had endured at the hands of tyrants were to apply these same methods of oppression which they had experienced in subjugating others.

Seeing the situation deteriorating before them, the British resolved to wash their hands by making a final statement of policy. They had come to the conclusion that neither their former support of the Jews nor their former interest warranted a continued development of the National Home (an idea which in itself was gradually turning into a dream).

The most important points of the White Paper of 1939 were:

FIRST, That it was stated quite clearly and finally that it was not the intention of the British Government to establish a Jewish State in Palestine, nor that this state was ever intended by the Balfour Declaration, a fact which the Zionist leaders fully recognized at the time when the Balfour Declaration was issued.

SECOND, it stated that His Majesty's Government had carried out the obligation towards the Jewish community regarding the establishment of the Jewish National Home in Palestine.

THIRD, it stated that His Majesty's Government was charged as the Mandatory authority "to secure the development of self-

governing institution" in Palestine. Apart from this specific obligation it would regard it as contrary to the whole spirit of the Mandatory system that the population of Palestine should remain for ever under Mandatory tutelage. It is proper that the people of the country should as early as possible enjoy the rights of self-government which are exercised by neighbouring area. (Iraq, Jordan, Syria and Lebanon became independent in 1932, 1946 and 1944 respectively. Palestine did not gain her independence until 1948. Such was Balfour's granting of "political favours" in action). His Majesty's Government desired to see established ultimately an independent Palestine state. It should be a state in which the two peoples in Palestine, Arabs and Jews, were to share authority in government in such a way that the essential interests of each were secured.

FOURTH, it stated that after 75,000 Jews had come into Palestine within five years, further Jewish immigration should depend on Arab consent.

FINALLY, it stated that limits to the transfer of land to Jewish hands in certain areas must be set if Arab cultivators were "to maintain their existing standard of life and a considerable landless Arab population was soon to be created". In other words, whereas previously the grant of self-government to the Arab majority had been made dependent upon their consent to Jewish immigration, from now onwards further Jewish immigration was to be made dependent on the consent of the Arab majority expressed through self-governing institutions.

With this the Zionists decided that they had no further use for Britain. Their first aim was to get rid of Britain and secondly to seize Palestine by force of arms. It was in this period that a flood of righteous indignation swept over Britain against the baby it had nourished. But affairs had gone too far. President Wilson had ascertained the position by the investigations of the King-Crane commission of 1919. Its effects had

been to convince the President among other things that the establishment of a Jewish National Home by Zionism in Palestine would be impossible without the use of arms. It had been a deduction recognizable to any fool, yet it was not laid before the British government. (The greatest imperialist power in the world was to have its hand forced by a country which had no part in the dispute).

The Zionists took advantage of the outbreak of war to accumulate arms in mechanising the illicit Haganah. The Arabs for fear of "stabbing the British in the back" watched in silence, and Jordanian and Iraqi troops set about engaging the Germans and the Vichy French. (The revolutionaries of the last war were now put to work as mercenaries fighting for great causes, while their immediate enemies flourished). Palestine was, however, admitted to the Arab League after its foundation in 1944, and by the Alexandria protocol it became known that "Palestine constitutes an important part of the Arab world, and the rights of the Arabs in Palestine cannot be touched without prejudice to peace and stability in the Arab world".

In February of that year the American congress declared that "... the doors of Palestine shall be opened for free entry of Jews into that country, and that there shall be full opportunity for colonization, so that the Jewish people may ultimately reconstitute Palestine as a free and democratic Jewish commonwealth". So much for the high-sounding British declarations of policy. The Arabs who had stood by them were to see their brethren reduced to second class citizens in an aura of "enlightened democracy".

The Zionists now placed their full reliance on the American government, in the same way as they had done with the British: They relied too on other sources, Czechoslovakia among them, to create an army equipped with modern weapons which they used first against the British and then against the defenceless

Arab inhabitants. The British government in despair referred the matter to the United Nations. At the September meeting in 1947 the whole authority and influence of the U.S.A. was behind the Zionist cause and the General Assembly passed a resolution on 29th November recommending the partition of Palestine and the accumulation of arms in mechanising the illicit Haganah. The Jews were encouraged by this partition scheme to establish their Jewish state by force. The Arabs had demanded that the question should be referred to the International Court of Justice for a decision on whether the United Nations had the right to decide the issue of the ownership of Palestine. The ad hoc committee of the assembly rejected the request by a majority of one vote. All the Asiatic states with their millions were opposed to the partition resolution.

On 14th May, 1948, the Mandate ended and the State of Israel was proclaimed. (Chaim Weizmann was to become its first president in 1949). It was immediately recognized by President Truman who declared, "I have no Arab constituents". Simultaneously the Zionists launched a campaign of brutal violence against the Arab inhabitants characterized by the massacre of Deir Yassine with the sole purpose of reviling them and driving them out.

The Arab armies entered with the intention of protecting them. (In fact the Jordanian army had only reached Jerusalem which it held with one battalion, the Egyptians were broken after crossing the Sinai, and the only Iraqi regiment to enter Palestine before the Armistice was of no consequence at all. Thus any accusations of premeditated Arab aggression are proved false). The Armistice agreement was imposed, only to be violated by Israel to her own interest. In December 1948 the Israeli government issued its first "absentee property regulations" defining as "absentee" any Arab who had been evicted from his home after the U.N. partition resolution. Over a

million Arab refugees were forced into Jordan, where this country, originally built as a strategic buffer against the Bedouin, with its own population of under a million and whose independence had only been granted as late as 1946, sought to make them at home. Jordanian forces had, however, at the command of King Abdullah, secured the west bank of the River Jordan, an area which included old Jerusalem, Bethlehem, Hebron and Jericho, and Zionist violence left Nazareth as the only Holy spot on the Israeli side of the border.

Since 1948 the United Nations has been passing similar resolution as that passed on 11th December of that year — that refugees choosing to return to their homes should be permitted to do so and that compensation should be paid for the property of those choosing not to return and for loss or damage of property.

Israel has consistently and obstinately refused to implement any of those resolutions, and the Jordanian government is striving with the aid of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency to sustain a million people with the sixpence per day that this agency provides. (Conditions are, however, gradually improving with the establishment of world benevolent funds). Jordan has in fact been doing everything within her means in order to help people who left behind their large properties to be seized by Israel.

On 17th September 1949 Count Bernadotte, the Swedish U. N. mediator, was assassinated by the Stern gang inside Jerusalem, and I quote: "The assassination of Count Bernadotte was an outrage committed against a man who had devoted his life to the cause of humanity and an open defiance of the authority of the U.N.". War this action inspired by religious motives of return to the promised land, or were any of the horrors of 1948 and 1949, when men, women and children were

indiscriminately slaughtered, a part of those original noble motives?

In October, 1961, the Palestine Conciliation Commission estimated the separate buildings individually owned by the Arab refugees at 450,000 buildings, the annual income of Arab properties amounts to 47 million sterling. The grand total from 1948 to the present day can speak for itself. On the question of how the income from Arab properties is spent, the following give the reply: "In the official digest of the Jewish agency of 5th May 1951 page 43, the following is to be found:

40 per cent of the revenue goes for repair, 25 per cent for taxes, 13 per cent goes for administrative expenses, 12 per cent for development. The balance of 10 per cent is still held by Israel'.

As for the Arabs who remained in Israel, most of their properties were confiscated and they live as second class citizens in a so-called Jewish Democratic State.

The Palestine Question remains to the present day, to be at the root of all developments and turmoils in the Middle East since the end of the Second World War until a just solution is brought about and the people of Palestine are given their right of self determination. Apart from the fact that the Arabs of Palestine, similar to any other people, can never accept a substitute to their country and homes, the Arab world at large regards the establishment of a Jewish State as a wedge driven into its very heart and an obstacle to its complete unity. Arabism as a movement does not exist and cannot pit its strength against Zionism in the world sphere of propaganda. The Arab of Palestine thus feels himself under an overwhelming inferiority in the presentation of his case to the conscience of the world. The Arabic language covers a wide area, but the struggles in the Middle East even (in Storrs words) "when reinforced by the Vatican and the relics of Pan-Islam" remain essentially local in character.

There is much that I have omitted, the most important being the Arab Summit of January of this year, and the Jordan water scheme. I shall only go as far as explaining the Arab stand in this issue by the following quotation from the Koran: ... "and hold fast by the covenant of Allah all together and be not disunited and remember the power of Allah with you when you were enemies, then be united in your hearts so by his power you become brothers".

While in the United States on his recent visit, my brother King Hussein met members of the central rabbinical council, and in Parkes's words "it is a reasonable expectation that we Gentiles — Muslims, Christians, humanists and others — whom the Jew has thus far encountered, may in turn encounter the Jew and profit by the meeting".

Yet, to return to politics and my immediate case, I should like to put the views of a notable Palestinian. He says: "It should be remembered that in Nazi Germany and in all European countries overrun by Germany, a number of laws were passed to legalize the robbery of Jewish properties. But with the destruction of Nazism all those Nazi laws were rescinded by all the governments of Europe when Europe was freed by the allies. The conscience of Europe and the European peoples was moved in respect of Jewish property, and restitution was the remedy. The question now is: *Will the conscience of mankind and of the United Nations and its members be moved and awakened to see that justice is done to the Arabs, to protect the property of Arab refugees, just as Jewish property was protected?*"

Here my case rests, and if I have got as far as to interest you I shall be satisfied. For this is the dilemma of the Holy Land: every man, whatever his creed, respects, "Vere, scire est per causas scire".

*Harrow School
July, 1964*

Printed in
THE HASHIMIEH PRINTING PRESS
Amman — Jordan

