



Palestine Mandate



Partition Plan



Areas conquered 1949

ISRAELI

EXPANSIONISM

Area occupied 1956



Area occupied 1967



Zionist Plan, 1919



**“Woe to him that buildeth a town with blood
and establishes a city by iniquity!”**

—Habakkuk, 2:12

Palestine's modern history has been filled with the tragic and senseless brutality of war. For more than 20 years the Arab people and their representatives have tried unsuccessfully to open the eyes of the world to a critical situation which has been perpetuated and aggravated to a point where there seems less and less hope for a peaceful settlement.

Yet the Arab countries have not relinquished hope for a just and non-violent solution. It has been their fervent desire to widen the world's knowledge of this problem and the true facts behind it. The truth is on their side. If the world community is strong enough to bear this truth, then there exists a possibility for calming tensions and establishing a just peace.

THE UNIVERSITY
OF TEXAS

JUL 15 1969

THE LIBRARY



Arab Information Center

(This material is filed under the Foreign Agents Registration Act, with the Department of Justice, where the required statement of the Arab Information Center, as an agency of the governments of the League of Arab States, is available for inspection. Registration does not imply approval of the material by the U.S. Government.)

Zionist Ambitions

The World Zionist Organization's original plans as outlined in their proposals to the Paris Peace Conference of 1919, included more extensive territory than the United Nations Partition Plan finally allowed for the establishment of the State of Israel.

In a report to the American Government dated May 3, 1943, General Patrick J. Hurley, President Roosevelt's personal representative in the Middle East, reported: "The Zionist organization in Palestine has indicated its commitment to an enlarged program for:

- 1) a sovereign Jewish State which would embrace Palestine and probably eventually Transjordan;
- 2) an eventual transfer of the Arab population from Palestine to Iraq;
- 3) Jewish leadership for the whole Middle East in the fields of economic development and control." [United States: *Foreign Relations of the U.S.: Near East and Africa*, (Washington, D.C., 1964) Vol. IV, pp. 776-777]

Undaunted by their failure to legally obtain almost all of the Levant's arable land and water supply sources plus a secure outlet to the Red Sea, the Israelis considered the U.N. plan but the embryo of their new empire and have, by various methods and instances of aggression, succeeded in fulfilling almost all the original planners' aims. And all was accomplished in defiance of world opinion and every effort to keep the peace in the Middle East.

Their expansion to date has been in keeping with the Zionist frontiers of 1919, and the recent announcement that Israelis will settle in the newly-occupied areas of West Jordan and Southwestern Syria only confirms what the Arab countries have long asserted: that Israel, in spite of its claims for peace with its neighbors, is bent upon a policy of expulsion and expansion.

Before it is too late, the Israelis must be compelled to give up their policy of militant expansionism and the idea of an Israeli State established in fury and hate upon the bloodstained land of their Arab brethren. The era of colonial expansion is long dead. Yet Israel insists on the outdated and invalid right to expand at all costs. The international community has an obligation not only to the innocent victims of Israeli expansionism, but to themselves and to the future of the world to put a stop to this dangerously immature and irresponsible policy of piecemeal aggression, which so vividly recalls the dark, fear-filled days of Europe in the late 1930's and 1940's.

ZIONIST PLAN TO THE PARIS PEACE CONFERENCE, 1919

The Zionist delegation to the Paris Peace Conference in 1919, circulated an extensive plan in March of that year for the creation of a Zionist State in Palestine. One of the major provisions concerned the delineation of frontiers. (See Ben Halpern, *The Jewish State*, Harvard University Press, 1961, pp. 303-304)

THE BOUNDARIES OF PALESTINE

"The boundaries of Palestine shall follow the general lines set out below:

"Starting on the north at a point on the Mediterranean Sea in the vicinity of Sidon and following the watersheds of the foothills of the Lebanon as far as Jisr el-Karaon, thence to el-Bire, following the dividing line between the two basins of the Wadi el-Korn and the Wadi et-Teim thence in a southerly direction following the dividing line between the eastern and western slopes of the Hermon, to the vicinity west of Beit Jenn, thence eastward following the northern watersheds of the Nahr Mughaniye close to and west of the Hedjaz Railway.

"In the east a line close to and west of the Hedjaz Railway terminating in the Gulf of Aqaba.

"In the south a frontier to be agreed upon with the Egyptian Government. [It has been indicated that the southern border would extend from el-Arish in northern Sinai to Aqaba in the south. (Ben Halpern, *The Jewish State*, p. 304)]

"In the west the Mediterranean Sea.

BOUNDARIES

"The boundaries above outlined are what we consider essential for the necessary economic foundation of the country. Palestine must have its natural outlets to the seas and the control of its rivers and their headwaters. The boundaries are sketched with the general economic needs and historic traditions of the country in mind, factors which necessarily must also be considered by the Special Commission in fixing the definite boundary lines. This Commission will bear in mind that it is highly desirable, in the interests of economical administration that the geographical area of Palestine should be as large as possible so that it may eventually contain a large and thriving population which could more easily bear the burdens of modern civilized government than a small country with a necessary limitation of inhabitants.

"The economic life of Palestine, like that of every other semi-arid country depends on the available water-supply. It is, therefore, of vital importance not only to secure all water resources already feeding the country but also to be able to conserve and control them at their sources.

"The Hermon is Palestine's real 'Father of the Waters' and cannot be severed from it without striking at the very root of its economic life . . .

"The fertile plains east of the Jordan, since the earliest Biblical times, have been linked economically and politically with the land west of the Jordan . . . It could now serve admirably for colonization on a large scale."



World Zionist Organization Plan to the Paris Peace Conference, 1919.

Palestine Under Mandate

The Balfour Declaration

(Policy statement issued by the British Government, November 9, 1917)

“His Majesty’s Government view with favour the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people and will use their best endeavors to facilitate the achievement of this object, it being clearly understood that nothing shall be done which may 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.”

The preceding document, the foundation upon which the Zionists base their territorial claim to Palestine, specifically includes a statement often overlooked: the guarantee of the “civil and religious rights of the existing non-Jewish communities in Palestine.”

When the Declaration was written, the Arabs constituted over 90% of the existing population and owned 97% of the land in Palestine. The Jewish community at the same time numbered 56,000 and owned only about 2.5% of the land. (Sami Hadawi, *Palestine, Loss of a Heritage*, Naylor, 1963, pp. 13-23)

During the period of the British Mandate, the number of Jews rose to 650,000, but their landholdings still amounted to only 5.67% of Palestine. Part of that 5.67% included lands pre-empted from the Arabs by the British and transferred to Zionist groups. The Arab population in 1946 numbered 1,293,000.



Palestine Under British Mandate

The U. N. Partition Plan, 1947

"To develop . . . the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples . . . (and to promote and encourage) respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language or religion."

—U.N. Charter

Ignoring the basic principle of "self-determination of peoples" defined in the U.N. Charter, the General Assembly debated and passed the Palestine Partition Resolution in November 1947. An earlier Arab proposal to submit questions concerning the Balfour Declaration and the Mandate to the International Court of Justice had been defeated in the U.N. Ad Hoc Committee (made up of all U.N. Member States) by a vote of 25 to 18, with 11 abstentions. (Alfred Lilienthal, *What Price Israel*, Regnery, 1953, p. 56)

According to the Partition Plan, Palestine was to be divided into an Arab State and a Jewish State linked by an economic union. It also provided for the creation of an international zone around Jerusalem, Bethlehem and the Holy Places to be under U.N. administration.

The Jewish State was to include 56.47% and the Arab State 42.88% of the total area of Palestine. The international zone would occupy 0.65% of the area.

The Arab population of the Jewish State was to be almost equal to the number of Jewish residents (497,000 Arabs and 498,000 Jews), while the Jews within the Arab State would number only 10,000 as compared to 725,000 Arabs.

The Resolution also provided for the safeguarding of Arab civil, political, human, economic, religious and property rights, specifically declared that no laws could be made to prevail over or interfere with these stipulations, and that "no expropriation of land owned by an Arab in the Jewish State shall be allowed except for public purposes. In all cases of expropriation full compensation as fixed by the Supreme Court shall be paid previous to dispossession." (Part I, Chapter 2, paragraph 8)

"The Palestine Arabs, supported by the Arab States, rejected the partition for obvious reasons. They maintained that, contrary to what public opinion had been given to understand, the General Assembly of the United Nations was not a legislative or judicial body and, therefore, its resolution on the partition of Palestine was no more than a *recommendation*. It did not have the force of a decision and could not be binding on the majority of the people of Palestine who had opposed it. The action of the United Nations was therefore unconstitutional, since it conflicted with the basic principle for which the world organization had been established, namely, to uphold the right of all nations, great and small, to self-determination. By denying the Palestine Arabs, who formed the two-thirds majority of the country in 1947, the right to decide for themselves, the United Nations was violating its own principles." (Hadawi, *op. cit.*, p. 28)



United Nations 1947 Partition Plan for Israel

Israel Expands Through War: 1948-1949

With the proclamation of the Partition Resolution, Palestine fell into a state of severe distress. Conflict and disagreement between the Arab and Jewish communities led to the death of 1,700 innocent people within a three-month period.

The Security Council, finally aware of the serious crisis which the Resolution had caused, convened in March 1948. It considered recommending suspension of the Partition and establishment of a temporary trusteeship for Palestine under the Trusteeship Council. The Jewish Agency soon informed the Council that it would reject any delay in the establishment of the Jewish State and asserted that upon the withdrawal of the Mandatory Administration on May 15, 1948, a Jewish government would immediately begin to function.

In order to present their case as a *fait accompli*, the Zionists then intensified the implementation of Plan Dalet, their Master Plan for the occupation of Palestine. The Zionists perpetrated brutal killings and spread terror throughout the Arab communities both within the allotted Jewish State and the Arab territories. Israeli forces launched an attack on the village of Deir Yassin on April 9, 1948, slaying more than 250 Arabs. Four days later, they attacked the village of Nasr al-Din, killing all but 40 of its people. On April 18, and 20, 1948, Israeli troops killed 22 Arabs in Karmel. (Documents and Studies: Lebanese Central Office of Information, *The Bulletin*, Vol. 4, No. 55)

Four unwarranted attacks on Arab villages were inflicted in the first week of May 1948. The town of al-Qabu lost 30 people in Israeli attacks. At Beit Daris the entire population was ruthlessly destroyed, and at Beit al-Khoury only the aged were spared to tell of the brutal assault on their village. On May 6, 1948, the people of al-Zaytoun were assembled in their mosque. It was blown up by Israelis with all the villagers still inside. (*Ibid.*)

Countless other Arab villages had been assailed and their people annihilated or expelled in the six months previous to May 15, 1948. Among them were Qazana, Salama, Biyar Adas, Saris, Kastal, Lajjun, Jaffa, Acre, Shefa, 'Ar, Sa'sa', Kafir Kanna, Tiberias, Haifa, Safad and Beisan. There were many more.

This all occurred before the departure of British forces from Palestine and before the end of the Mandate. It also preceded the entry of Arab armies to protect the Palestinians and the outbreak of the Arab-Israeli War. Is it not therefore understandable that the citizens of other Arab countries witnessing the tragic plight of their kinsmen, should feel morally obliged to take up arms in their defense?



■ Areas conquered by Israel in addition to the U.N. Plan, 1949.

Ben-Gurion himself frankly stated in September 1950, that:

"Until the British left, no Jewish settlement, however remote, was entered or seized by the Arabs, while the Hagana . . . captured many Arab positions and liberated Tiberias and Haifa, Jaffa and Safad. So, on the day of destiny (May 15, 1948) that part of Palestine where the Hagana could operate was almost clear of Arabs." (Ben-Gurion, *Rebirth and Destiny of Israel*, Philosophical Library, 1954, p. 530)

On May 14, 1948, the General Assembly adopted a resolution which, in effect, suspended the implementation of the Partition Resolution. It also empowered a U.N. Mediator to "exercise the functions of promoting a peaceful adjustment of the future situation of Palestine." (Hadawi, *op. cit.*, p. 34)

In terror and fear of further Israeli brutality, hundreds of thousands of Arab Palestinians continued to flee their homes and begged assistance from their Arab brothers when the Israeli State was proclaimed on May 15. The Arab States intervened, and fighting ensued for a few weeks. The United Nations then called for a cease-fire, and the Arabs, hoping for a just peace, laid down their arms.

Count Folke Bernadotte, the U.N. Mediator in Palestine, prepared a peace plan which included the surrender of Israeli-held territory outside the areas allotted by the Partition Plan and the return and compensation of Arab refugees. He was assassinated by Israelis on September 17, 1948.

Armistice lines were finally demarcated between the Arab States and Israel in July 1949. The Armistice Agreement specified that these lines were "dictated exclusively by military considerations" and were "not to be construed in any sense as a political or territorial boundary." In the agreement, certain "demilitarized zones" and "no man's land" areas were defined. The extent of these areas was approximately 100,000 acres. The Israelis have since incorporated almost all these zones into their territory.

The Zionist State not only occupied territory which had been designated by the United Nations for the Arab Palestinian State. It also invaded the Jerusalem area which the U.N. had defined as an international zone. On April 29, 1948, two weeks before the Arab-Israeli conflict began, it attacked and occupied the Katamon quarter of Jerusalem. As a result of the Armistice Agreement with Jordan, Israel gained control of a major part of the New City and a total of 80.8% of what was supposed to have been international territory. (Hadawi, *op. cit.*, p. 47)

The Trusteeship Council's recommendation that Israel refrain from hindering the implementation of internationalization measures (December 20, 1949) was classified by Ben-Gurion as a "wicked counsel" (Ben-Gurion, *op. cit.*, p. 362). The Israeli response to the U.N. request was to make Israeli Jerusalem their seat of government.

1956: Another Attempt at Expansion

Israel was eventually granted membership in the United Nations on the condition that it would comply with the U.N. Resolution of December 11, 1948, which reads as follows: "... the refugees wishing to return to their homes and live at peace with their neighbors should be permitted to do so at the earliest practicable date, and that compensation should be paid for the property of those choosing not to return and for loss of or damage to property, which, under principles of international law or in equity, should be made good by the Government or authorities responsible." To date, Israel has made no effort toward an equitable solution of the refugee problem and has even aggravated it.

Since the Zionist State came into existence in 1948, it has been condemned six times by the Security Council (Resolutions of: May 18, 1951; November 24, 1953; March 29, 1955; January 19, 1956; April 9, 1962 and November 25, 1966) and 25 times by the General Assembly, whereas no Arab State has ever been condemned by any organ of the United Nations for military attacks against Israel. The countless instances of organized attacks on Jordanian and Syrian villages and on the Gaza Strip since 1949, have been thoroughly documented and amount to over 60 serious assaults. The Joint Armistice Commission condemned Israel 15 times for aggressive acts against Jordan between March and June 1954.

The attack launched on Gaza and the Sinai Peninsula in 1956, in collusion with the French and British was, therefore, in the Israeli tradition of expansion at any cost. At the time of the invasion, Ben-Gurion declared: "The armistice with Egypt is dead, as are the armistice lines, and no wizards or magicians can resurrect these lines." (New York Times, November 8, 1956) The Israeli Foreign Ministry said on November 4, 1956, that Israel had "no intention" of leaving the Sinai Peninsula. (*Facts on File*, Oct. 31-Nov. 6, 1956)

President Eisenhower, who had warned the Israelis up to the last minute that the United States would oppose any state's aggression across the armistice lines, was firm in his commitment to Arab territorial integrity. The U.S. therefore joined the Soviet Union and world opinion in condemning the Israeli attack, and through the United Nations, they compelled the Israelis to withdraw from Sinai. Israel would still not allow the U.N. Emergency Force to move freely within its borders, but President Nasser permitted them to do so on Egyptian territory.

The evacuation of Israeli forces was achieved with "no promises or concessions whatsoever from the United States in return for the withdrawal pledge, said Secretary Dulles on March 1, 1957. He made it clear that the U.S. had rejected Israeli demands for "conditions." (*Facts on File*, February 28-March 6, 1957)

On March 10, 1957, Israeli Foreign Minister Mrs. Golda Meir tried to place Israel outside international law by declaring that the International Court of Justice "was not competent to rule on matters affecting Israel and states that 'do not recognize Israel.'" She thereby rejected the Court's ruling on Israel's right to free navigation through the Gulf of Aqaba. (*Facts on File*, March 7-13, 1957)

Ten Years After: A Renewed Effort to Expand

Spring of 1967 produced a violent and devastating conflagration in the Middle East, occasioned by Israel's well-prepared offensive against her Arab neighbors.

Now Israel occupies vital areas of Syria and all of Palestine and the Sinai Peninsula. The illegal annexation of Jordanian Jerusalem has been condemned by the United Nations, and Israel has been requested to cease its attempts to annex the Old City. (Resolutions of July 4 and 14, 1967) Israel's answer has been to proceed with the integration of Arab and Israeli Jerusalem, the arrest of hundreds of Arab civilians, the expulsion of the inhabitants of the west bank and the systematic destruction of Arab homes and villages.

The areas of the Banias Ridge in the Golan Heights in Syria, around Hebron and Bethlehem on the west bank and the southern Gaza Strip are obviously being prepared for Israeli settlers, and Israel has publicly announced that settlements will be established in these places. (Levi Eshkol, September 24, 1967. See *New York Times* and *Washington Post*, September 25, 1967) The United States Government has declared its opposition to this Israeli policy in the realization that peace cannot come to the Middle East if Israel is allowed thus to profit from its unscrupulous measures to gain territory by force. A State Department spokesman called the move "inconsistent with the Israeli position as we understand it," and other administration officials "expressed their disappointment over Israel's action." (*New York Times*, September 26, 1967)

Israel's boundaries as outlined in the Zionist proposals to the Peace Conference in 1919 are clearly the objectives of the present Israeli regime. Israel has forced her way out of the frontiers established by the United Nations and has proven to be a catalyst for conflict in the Middle East by insisting on a policy of irresponsible expansionism.

The inhabitants of Palestine have been denied the basic right of all people to self-determination as outlined in the U.N. Charter. As the years pass their cause grows more desperate and the need for a solution more urgent.

But it must eventually be realized that a peace settlement in the Middle East will not be dictated by the use of force and the issuance of ultimatums.



■ Area occupied by Israeli troops in 1956.



■ Areas occupied by Israel in 1967 aggression.

Expansionist Aims of Israeli Leaders

Israeli officials are thoroughly versed in the art of duplicity. A sampling of recent statements, before the outbreak of the war and after, proves beyond any doubt that what they claim to be their objectives and what the Israeli Government actually is aiming for are two completely different matters.

The *Washington Post* reported on May 23, 1967, that Premier Levi Eshkol, in an address to the Knesset, "told Arab countries that Israel has no aggressive designs." In an Israeli radio broadcast on June 5, 1967, Moshe Dayan said, "We have no invasion aims. Our only target is to foil the Arab armies' aim of invading our country." The *New York Times* of the same date quoted Dayan as saying, "Soldiers of Israel, we have no aims of territorial conquest."

Israeli Permanent Representative to the U.N. Gideon Rafael read the following statement by the Israeli Defense Minister to the Security Council on June 5, 1967: "We have no aim of conquest. Our sole objectives are to put an end to the Arab attempt to plunder our land and to suppress the blockade."

On the same day Israeli Prime Minister Eshkol said in a radio broadcast from Jerusalem that "we do not demand anything except to live in tranquility in our present territory."

Reversals of all previous statements denying territorial aims came soon after Israel occupied Arab areas in the June attack.

"A new political reality in the Mideast" has been created, declared Premier Levi Eshkol on June 8, 1967. (UPI Dispatch, June 9, 1967) Israeli Information Minister Yisrael Galille said that, "Israel cannot agree to return to the *status quo* before this (conflict) happened." (UPI Dispatch, June 10, 1967)

General Dayan's statements on CBS' *Face the Nation* program included the following:

"There are about a million Arabs which we don't want, I should say, as citizens of Israel, in the Jordanian part.

"... We certainly don't want Egypt to go back to Gaza Strip. This is the same story like Sinai.

"... I don't think that we should in any way give back the Gaza Strip to Egypt or the western part of Jordan to King Hussein."

Asked whether there was any possible way that Israel could absorb the huge number of Arabs whose territory Israel now occupies, he said: "Economically, we can; but I think that it is not in accord with our aims in the

future. It would turn Israel into either a bi-national or poly-Arab-Jewish State instead of the Jewish State, and we want to have a Jewish State . . . We want a Jewish State like the French want a French State.”

Israeli Labor Minister Yigal Allon declared on June 12, 1967, that, “We must have depth, especially in the central part of the country and the vicinity of Galilee and Jerusalem.” In a letter to Israeli newspapers, Ben-Gurion stated that there were “no grounds for Israeli negotiations on Old Jerusalem.” (UPI Dispatch, June 19, 1967)

A UPI dispatch dated June 17, 1967, reported that Israeli Foreign Minister Abba Eban had stated that “Israel will, under no circumstances, return to the 1949 Armistice Agreements.”

Israeli Defense Minister Moshe Dayan told a news conference in Gaza that Israel should keep both the Gaza Strip and the entire west bank of the Jordan. “The Gaza Strip is Israel,” he stated, and “The status of the west bank is the same.” (UPI, July 5, 1967) He later declared in a political rally in Tel-Aviv, “On no account will we force ourselves to leave, for example, Hebron. This is a political program, but more important it is a fulfillment of a people’s ancestral dreams.” (UPI, August 9, 1967)

Abba Eban, in a July 5, 1967 interview on West German television said, “Sometimes you cannot gain peace and security without territorial gains.” He had previously stated: “If the General Assembly were to vote by 121 votes to 1 in favor of Israel returning to the armistice lines . . . Israel would refuse to comply with that decision.” (New York Times, June 19, 1967)

Israel is now openly pumping oil from Sinai, calling for increased immigration (“at least 40,000 immigrants a year”—Levi Eshkol, August 9, 1967, UPI) and establishing paramilitary settlements in the Galon Heights in Syria, the Jordan Valley, the Hebron Hills in Jordan and the southern Gaza Strip.

In a message to his troops, General Dayan said the Arab Nations must be convinced they would not be able to move Israel one inch from the cease-fire lines established after the June war and stated that Israel would discuss the cease-fire lines on the basis of translating them into permanent borders. (Journal of Commerce, September 19, 1967)

Israel in Perspective: 1919-1967

Israel presents one face to the world and another to the Arabs. While loudly insisting on peace, it pushes its frontiers in every direction in an obvious attempt to obtain all the land the Zionist planners had originally desired.

It is significant that prior to World War II, the plan was able to muster little support, but after 1945, the project made great headway. Since that time Israel has not ceased to expand. Having been refused the right of self-determination, the victims of that expansion ask for peace, justice and the right to live without fear.



THE ARAB INFORMATION CENTER
405 Lexington Ave. (Suite 3711)
New York, N. Y. 10017