

The Role of Zionist Movement Towards the Creation of the State of Israel

Peranan Pergerakan Zionist Terhadap Pembentukan Negara Israel

Mohd Roslan Mohd Nor
m_roslan@um.edu.my
University of Malaya

Article received on 2 January 2012; Article published online on 15 January 2013.

Abstract:

The problem of Palestine has been a subject of much debate not only among scholars but also involved world superpowers as well. As this conflict rages on, there is a need to look at the root cause of the problem which one could argue that, among others, was caused by the ambitions of Zionist Movement. This paper examines the emergence of Zionist Movement and its role in establishing the State of Israel by confiscating Palestinians' territory and land. Zionist controls over the territory has resulted in the expulsion of Palestinians from their homeland. This study was conducted as a library research with textual analysis on the sources of Palestine historiography. The result shows that the Zionist Movement had lobbied the world superpowers, especially Britain and United States of America, until they supported the movement and resulting in the creation of the State of Israel on the Palestinian land.

Keywords: *Palestine, Jerusalem, Conflict, Zionist, Israel*

Abstrak:

Masalah yang melanda Palestin telah menjadi satu topik yang sering dibincangkan bukan sahaja di kalangan para sarjana tetapi ia turut mendapat campur tangan daripada kuasa besar dunia. Dalam keadaan konflik yang terjadi terus berlaku, maka ada keperluan untuk melihat kembali kepada punca berlakunya masalah di mana seseorang boleh menyatakan bahawa antara lain ia disebabkan oleh cita-cita pergerakan Zionis. Kertas ini membincangkan kemunculan pergerakan Zionis dan peranannya terhadap kewujudan negara Israel dengan cara merampas tanah milik rakyat Palestin. Pengawasan Zionis ke atas wilayah Palestin telah menyebabkan masyarakat Palestin terbuang dari tanah air asal mereka. Kajian ini dilakukan secara kajian ke perpustakaan dengan analisa tekstual terhadap sumber-sumber penulisan sejarah Palestin. Dapatan kajian mendapati bahawa pergerakan Zionis mempergiatkan gerakan melobi kuasa besar, terutama Britain dan Amerika Syarikat, sehingga berjaya mendapatkan sokongan seterusnya menubuhkan negara Israel di atas tanah rakyat Palestin.

Kata Kunci: *Palestin, Jerusalem, Konflik, Zionis, Israel*

1. Introduction

Islamic Jerusalem and the whole of Palestine suffer long-lasting conflict which has not been successfully resolved until today. The problem starts when Zionist movement pronounced its aim to establish a Jewish national home in Palestine and targeting Islamic Jerusalem as the capital city of the proposed state. This happened at the end of Ottoman era where the Islamic Caliphate still controlled over Muslims territory including Palestine land.

The Zionist plan to control Islamic Jerusalem and Palestine was to allow Jewish people, who were living in Europe, back to the land where they had been living for some period of times. The Zionist also claims that the land belong to the Jewish people (Nor, 2010).

Nevertheless, history shows that the longest and comprehensive rule of the land, on its entire history was under Muslim hand for at least twelve centuries. Muslim rule over the region began when Islamic Jerusalem was 'liberated' in 16AH / 637AD, under the leadership of Caliph Umar al-Khattab, (El-Awaisi, 2000: 49 – 60; al-Tel, 2003: 211 – 220; Nor, 2008: 166) with the only interruption happened only during Crusaders intervention (1099 – 1187) (Banitelabi, et. al., 2012; Daud, et. al., 2012).

The Muslim rule ended in 1917 when the British under the leadership of General Allenby forcefully occupied the area after Ottoman had been defeated in World War I (Fromkin, 1989). Apart of that, there are several other contributing factors which saw that Muslim rule over the land ended during the Ottoman era. One of them was the debts of Ottoman (Howard, 2001: 71), pressure of internal problems and inefficiency in facing the demand of Zionist Organization. The Zionist Organization always shows its ability in fighting the rights for Jewish people and had won supports from the West.

2. The Demand for National Home of the Jewish People

One could argue that the demand of Zionist Organization to have a national home for Jewish people was influenced by European history in nineteenth century with the rise of nationalism and the progressive self-liberation in Italy, Germany and Balkan that affects their people (Sachar, 1963: 261). This movement in Europe seems to have contributed or influenced the Jewish people who also wanted to be 'liberated' and improve their life and transform to better quality of living.

With events taking place among the Jewish people, some of the Jewish 'thinkers' come with the idea to form an organization which was known as World Zionist Organization. By forming this organization, the Jewish people seems to have more systematic approach to put forward their idea and demand to the world's superpowers especially to establish a national home for them (Nor, 2008: 172). Notwithstanding, their demand was to have 'historic title' of Islamic Jerusalem and Palestine, which means they want this land as theirs.

In another perspective, one could argue that the contemporary geo-political landscape of the Middle East, which saw the existence of Israeli state, is a product of direct colonial

administration, client protectorate system of governance and the Mandate system set up by the League of Nation (George, 2005).

Furthermore, the emergence of European power in the Middle East, at the end of Ottoman era, has changed the demographical and geographical of the region (Catherwood, 2006; Baxter and Akbarzadeh, 2009). This has paved the way to the Zionist Organization to achieve its goal (El-Awaisi, 2012a).

3. The Emergence of Zionist Movement

Zionist movement was formed and launched by Theodor Herzl (1860 – 1904) in 1896 and was recognized in the first World Zionist Congress at Basle on 27-29 August 1897. Herzl is known perhaps by many scholars and publics as the ‘father’ of Zionism. He worked tirelessly to achieve the objective of Zionist Organization and he was gifted as a person full of political strategy and diplomatic skills (Khalidi, 2001: 55). To many, Zionist Organization is an international movement to establish a state for Jewish people in Palestine and later on supports the existing of the State of Israel. The first congress brought together about two hundred Zionists to create a permanent association and agree on a common program. It is reported that the common program and plan of Zionist is as follows:

The aim of Zionism is to create for the Jewish people a home in Palestine secured by public law.

The Congress contemplates the following means to the attainment of this end (Mendes-Flohr and Reinhartz, 1995: 540):

1. The promotion, on suitable lines, of the colonization of Palestine by Jewish agricultural and industrial workers.
2. The organization and binding together of the whole Jewry by means of appropriate institutions, local and international in accordance with the law of each country.
3. The strengthening and fostering of Jewish national sentiment and consciousness.
4. Preparatory steps towards obtaining government consent, where necessary, to the attainment of the aim of Zionism.

It is clearly stated that the main target for the Zionist movement is to have Palestine as the strategic home for the Jewish people. Undeniably, the above aim and objectives of the Zionist movement especially in achieving the home for the Jewish people in Palestine shows that their target was consistent and it was constructed as early as the formation of the Zionist movement. It was then up to the Zionist leader to achieve this goal and make it becomes a reality, which they succeed.

The leader of Zionist movement, Herzl, could be considered a hero for the movement because it was under his leadership that the movement was able to design its long term and

achievable plan. Historians could not give a concrete answer on what motivates him to believe in Zionist idea and later to form a 'success' Zionist Organization.

Herzl was the son of a Hungarian merchant whose family had moved to Vienna. The city was at a time seemed to promise so much to Jewish people who wished to assimilate into mainstream European society and culture. In term of education, Herzl received a secular education who graduated with a doctorate in law.

After a few years of graduation, Herzl went on to become French correspondent for a prestigious Viennese newspaper. This job demanded him to be in France. It is said that while he was in Paris that Herzl became a Zionist, which subsequently involved in planning to establish a national home for the Jewish people (Gelvin, 2005: 49).

Other sources mentioned that Herzl was not actually the original thinker who owned the idea to establish Jewish National Home (Gelvin, 2005: 48; Armstrong, 1997: 366). However, in his book *The Jewish State* (1896) would become a Zionist classic and a masterpiece attributed Herzl with a huge contribution to the establishment of Israeli state. He was not a religious person which allows Armstrong to argue that he had even toyed with the possibility of converting to Christianity (Armstrong, 1997: 366).

Many scholars said that the formal formation of Zionist Organization was part of the reaction to the despicable situation of Jews in Europe and also the growing feeling against them which is well understood as anti-Semitism (Wylen, 2000: 392; Calaprice, 2004: xvi; De Lange, 2000: 30). The notion is maybe different to the anti-semitism post Arab Spring 2011 (Abou-El-Fadl, 2012). In brief, it could be understood that the situation of the Jews was terrible, and they became one of the hated people in Europe. It is a kind of Judeo-phobia as things happened to Muslim which coined another term, Islam-phobia. This may suggest that there were prejudice against the Jews and some people may be hostile towards them (Johnson, 1988: 133; Lewis, 1973; Sachar, 1963). Accordingly, Wylen mentioned the initial idea of Zionists is that "they believed that Jews must have an independent state as soon as possible, in order to have a place of refuge for endangered Jewish communities (Wylen, 2000: 392)."

In achieving its main objective, this organization works vigorously towards securing British support for the plan to colonize Palestine and to establish a state for Jewish people. This means that the Zionist encourages the Jews to migrate and continue their life in Palestine.

It has been reported that the Zionist's first option was not Palestine, but somewhere in Africa. Herzl was shocked at the Second Zionist Conference by the depth of opposition to his proposal by rejecting Uganda as a possible home to Jewish people. Because of his strategy to retain his power, he was forced to abandon his idea and stood by the delegates in choosing Palestine as the home land. Herzl was not impressed during his visit to Palestine in 1898 because of the land was polluted and dirty. That situation forced him to state that:

I would clear out everything that is not sacred, set up workers' houses beyond the city, empty and tear down the filthy rat-holes, burn all non-sacred ruins, and put

the bazaars elsewhere. Then, retaining as much of the old architectural style as possible, I would build an airy, comfortable, properly sewered, brand new city around the holy places (Herzl, 1960: 745; Armstrong, 1997: 366).

This shows how the area was not a first choice land and the situation was not welcoming to any newcomers for the terrible condition of the land. On the other hand, this statement of Herzl shows that how he actually designed a plan to get the land into Zionist hand. This plan was done in quite vigilant and careful manner, where some may see what he said did not refer to any plan of conquering Palestine but a disappointed notes from Herzl. However, the writer sees that Herzl's statement was not just a disappointed notes; however it contains some ideas towards conquering the land. This can be noticed when a few days after his first visit to Palestine, Herzl changed his mind in which he would build a secular state and would leave a holy shrine in Islamic Jerusalem in an enclave of their own (Armstrong, 1997: 366).

Herzl worked hard and conducted active diplomatic offensive to win support for this Zionist project. He once reported to offer lucrative financial support to the Sultan Abdul Hamid of Ottoman in exchange of Palestine and to let him establish Jewish state. However, this kind of unethical offer was outrightly rejected and the Sultan should have walked proudly for not taking any bribery from the Zionist Organization (Oke, 1982). The Sultan stated clearly to Herzl through intermediary:

“I advice him not to pursue this matter. I am unable to sell one foot of this land because it does not belong to me, but to my people. My people formed and maintained this Empire by sacrifices and blood, and we will cover it with our blood before allowing its surrender to anyone. Let the Jews keep their billions to themselves. If the Empire is divided they may get Palestine free of charge. But this partition will be over our dead bodies, and I will never allow it for any reason whatsoever (Saleh, 2001: 24).”¹

Although Sultan Abdul Hamid II did not allow request to create the state of Israel in Palestine (Mallison and Mallison, 1986: 20 – 21),² he was unable to preclude this matter because Zionist lobby was strong enough especially in England. Zionist Lobby headed by Dr C Wheizmann (Sachar, 1963: 372; Mallison and Mallison, 1986: 21),³ mobilised Zionist

¹ For an Arabic version of the text, please see Samir Ayyub. 1984. *Watha'iq Asasiyyah fi al-Sira' al-'Arabi al-Sahyuni* (Basic Document on the Arab-Zionist Conflict), Beirut, Vol. 1, p. 128.

² In 1901, the first Zionist leader Theodor Herzl was trying to do direct negotiations with the Sultan Abdull Hamid II of Ottoman Caliphate. He presented the proposal to get permission and allow Jewish immigrants into Palestine with attractive offers of financial assistance to help get the resources and consumer goods for the Ottoman Empire. However, in the strict principle of the Sultan Abdul Hamid II, he does not allow Palestinians to receive the coming of the Jewish mob, even if he got offered the money as bait. And the offer from Herzl was rejected.

³ He was a Jewish scientist, born in Russia, raised in the Jewish tradition in the village of (his native) *shtetl* of Motel, near Pinsk, and studied at universities in Switzerland and Germany. He managed to get a PhD in Chemistry from the University of Freiburg. Appointed as a reader (associate professor) in chemistry in 1904 at the University of Manchester, UK. Because he subscribes to the traditions of Jews during early life, he has been chosen quickly without doubt to join English Zionist movement in Manchester. With his excellence in academic

Movement in Britain and he was Chief Zionist negotiating to obtain support from Britain towards the Zionist agenda.

The Zionist effort to get Palestine was not stopped even though the Ottoman authority and the Sultan did not give an inch to their demand. The Zionist, by all means, wanted to pursue and get Palestine, which has been a long dream to have this land as the home land exclusively for the Jews. Another effort was in contention when the Zionist wanted recognition of historic land of Palestine and wanted to control it entirely as theirs.

5. Zionist Claim to have ‘Historic Title’ of Palestine

The claim to have an historic title to Palestine by Zionist was first put forward in 1919. It was initiated by the Zionist Organization during the Peace Conference after World War I, held in Paris during that time. Since its formation in the late 19th century, Zionist movement has been looking to have a national home for the Jewish people. This was the target to establish a state, and those who join Zionist movement were working very hard to ensure that their target is being fulfilled.

It was during this Peace Conference that a memorandum from Zionist movement sent to the Supreme Council of Allied Powers on 3 February 1919. The memorandum contains the suggestion from Zionist Organization to adopt the resolution and for the Allied Powers to recognize the “historic title of the Jewish people to Palestine and the right of the Jews to reconstitute in Palestine their national home (Hurewitz, 1956: 45).” This was a very significant step considering Zionist who are always making strategies to control Palestine.

Significantly, the title of the memorandum ‘The Historic Title’ has indeed changed the landscape of the area until today, where the Arabs are not living as comfortable as before. In that document, the Zionist tried to justify their claim to this land by stating that they achieved their greatest development in there. They also stated that the life of the Jewish people in other parts of the world especially in Eastern Europe were deplorable. With another few points, the Zionist would like to ensure that they can get control over the land which they wanted as historic to them.

The demand of the Jews with regard to Palestine which was presented to the Peace Conference in Paris is as stated by Cattani (1973) is as follows:

1. The land is the historic home of the Jews; there they achieved their greatest development; from the centre, through their agency, there emanated spiritual and moral influences of supreme value to mankind. By

field, and holds a strong background in the Jewish faith, in less than 10 years he simply became the leader of the Anglo-Zionism. In 1914, he has secured the support of allegiance from the leading group of Jews in England, the support of the influential Rabbi Herz and Gaster, the support of wealthy Lionel and James Rothschild, and support from the intellectual such as Herbert Bentwich and Harry Sacher. According to Mallison, he moved to England in 1904 because he believes that among the countries of the world, only the UK that can provide effective support to the Zionist movement.

violence they were driven from Palestine, and through the ages they have never ceased to cherish the longing and the hope of a return.

2. In some parts of the world, and particularly in Eastern Europe, the conditions of life of millions of Jews are deplorable. Forming often a congested population, denied the opportunities which would make a healthy development possible, the need of fresh outlets is urgent, both for their own sake and the interests of the population of other races, among whom they dwell. Palestine would offer one such outlet. To the Jewish masses it is the country above all others in which they would most wish to cast their lot. By the methods of economic development to which we shall refer later, Palestine can be made now, as it was in ancient times, the home of a prosperous population many times as numerous as that which now inhabits it.
3. Palestine is not large enough to contain more than a proportion of the Jews of the world. The greater part of the fourteen millions or more scattered throughout all countries must remain in their present localities, and it will doubtless be one of the cares of the Peace Conference to ensnare them, wherever they have been oppressed, as for all peoples, equal rights and humane conditions. A Jewish National Home in Palestine will, however, be of high value to them. Its influence will permeate the Jewries of the world, it will inspire these millions, hitherto often despairing, with a new hope; it will hold out before their eyes a higher standard; it will help to make them even more useful citizens in the lands in which they dwell.
4. Such a Palestine would be of value also to the world at large, whose real wealth consists in the healthy diversities of its civilizations.
5. Lastly, the land itself needs redemption. Much of it is left desolate. Its present condition is a standing reproach. Two things are necessary for that redemption -- a stable and enlightened Government, and an addition to the present population which shall be energetic, intelligent, devoted to the country, and backed by the large financial resources that are indispensable for development. Such a population the Jews alone can supply."

This claim has indeed caused unrest in facing the challenges to promote peace in Palestine. Hence, Colonel Bonsal commented that "if the views of the advanced Zionists prevail there is trouble ahead" (Bonsal, 1946: 45). Meanwhile, Cattán argues strongly that "the Zionist claim of an historic title to Palestine has no basis in law, or in fact" (Cattán, 1973: 48).

6. Some Futile Efforts against Zionist Intention

In denying this fact of Zionist, Lord Sydenham declared in the House of Lord in the British Parliament that Palestine is not the historic home of the Jews. He mentioned:

“I sympathise entirely with the wishes of the Jews to have a National Home, but I say that this National Home must not be given if it cannot be given without entailing gross injustice upon other people. Palestine is not the original home of the Jews. It was acquired by them after a ruthless conquest, and they have never occupied the whole of it, which they now openly demand” (*Hansard's Reports*, House of Lords, 21 June 1922: 121; Cattan, 1973: 49).

Although there was some disagreement from those who were involved in policy making, it showed nothing that prevented the recognition on Zionist proposal. The effort of Lord Sydenham should be applauded, however his voice seemed was not to change anything. His action in the House would also be seen as biased towards Arabs, hence it would not be surprised if it was categorized as anti-Semitism.

The proposal of Zionist Organization to the Supreme Council of Allied Powers in the Peace Conference seems actually was a follow up call. This is according to the fact that the British Government had already ‘approved’ and recognized the demand of the Jewish people to have a national home in Palestine as stated in Balfour Declaration dated 2 November 1917 (Rozali & Kamaruzzaman, 2011). Thus, Cattan states that “the Balfour Declaration has been relied upon by the Zionists as if it were a document of title to Palestine” (Cattan, 1973: 51). Significantly, a leading Zionist, Herbert Samuel interpreted the Balfour Declaration differently where he did not notice of any promise to the creation of Jewish State. In this regard, he mentioned:

“The Jewish State has been the aspiration of the Jewish people for centuries. It is an inspiration which at the present day cannot be realized. It is not contained in the Balfour Declaration ... There was no promise of a Jewish State. What was promised was that the British Government would favour the creation of a Jewish National Home – the term was most carefully chosen – in Palestine. The Declaration did not say that Palestine should be the Jewish National Home, but that it favoured a Jewish National Home in Palestine, without prejudice to the civil and religious rights of the Arab population” (Cattan, 1973; Magnes. 1947).⁴

Indeed, there were not many who argue that there was no direct connotation of Balfour Declaration in having Palestine as the Jewish National Home. Although the Balfour Declaration may be viewed by some people as having envisioned something less than a Jewish State, still it is actually a huge support to the Zionist in having their main goal become reality. With the great supports from British Government, the aim to conquer Palestine is something not impossible anymore.

Islamic Jerusalem and Palestine came under British rule at the end of 1917 which Britain completed its occupation of southern and central Palestine. General Allenby occupied the former Ottoman provinces (Scholch, 1990) following a severe and bloody battle against

⁴ This is from Viscount Samuel’s speech during the Palestine Debate in the House of Lords, 23 April 1947, p. 96, cited from Henry Cattan which earlier cited by Magnes.

Turkish Army under the command of Gamal Pasha. This was a historic moment for British Army who ended the four hundred years of Ottoman rule and nearly a millennium of Muslim domination over the region (Pappe, 1994: 3). General Allenby then quoted arrogantly saying that “now the crusade is over” (al-Ghuri, 1972: 28).

In one of the report, known as King-Crane Commission 1919, there was significant evidence that the Palestine Arabs opposed the implementation of Balfour Declaration and the establishment of the envisaged ‘national home’ in Palestine for the Jewish people. The report mentioned clearly that there will be no hope in establishing national home for Jewish people except by force. This means it would involve fire-fighting to push the Arabs further in order to contain the Jews in Palestine. It will not happen had no force been used to suppress Arabs who always in the position of opposing the Zionist plan.

The King-Crane report clearly stated that “no British officer, consulted by the Commissioners, believe that the Zionist program could be carried out except by force of arms. The officers generally thought that a force of no less than 50,000 soldiers would be required even to initiate the program” (Baxter Akbarzadeh, 2009: 19). So the use of force in providing the place for Jewish people was the solution, which until very recently at the moment this style of plan is still running by the regime of Israel towards Muslims.

Although the Jewish people were hardly any in number in Palestine in late 19th century, Islamic Jerusalem and Palestine continuously received Jewish immigrant especially those from Eastern Europe. Jewish emigration from Russia after 1881, for instance, was undoubtedly motivated by the czarist pogrom that their hearts were close to the land. However, it was principally a result of *Hibat Zion*⁵ (Avishai, 2002: 29 – 34) propaganda that some seven thousand Jews departed for Palestine in 1882. The number of immigrant of course were gradually increased, resulted from the movement of Jewish from other areas departed to the land.

The inhabitants among Arabs were not happy with the steps taken by the Jews of this migration process. The Protest began quite early as in 1893 which the Mufti Tahir al-Husayni – one of the leaders of Muslim community in Palestine – began to campaign against Jewish migration and settlement. It was regarded as a direct threat to the Arab community, which the idea has since been shared by many people, especially those members of Husayni family. This disagreement has been shown by the next Mufti Hajj Amin al-Husainy who succeeded his father in 1920 which he subscribed to the ideology and continued the campaign against Zionist.

Despite the Muslim opposition on this issue, there were signs of some concerns on the immigration activity which enlarge the Jewish community in Palestine. One of those concerns came from the Peel Commission⁶ which stated that “the heavy immigration in the

⁵ This was an underground movement which means ‘the love of Zion’ an organization devoted to Hebrew education and national revival.

⁶ The Peel Commission was established at the height of the 1936-39 disturbances between Arab and Jewish. Because of the problem, a royal commission of inquiry came to Palestine from London to investigate the roots of the Arab-Jewish conflict and to propose solutions. The commission, headed by Lord Robert Peel, heard a great

years 1933-36 would seem to show that the Jews have been able to enlarge the absorptive capacity of the country for Jews” (Peel Report, 1937: 300). This connotation may refer to two perspectives: first, it shows the worry of committee on the influx of Jews which may probably cause social imbalance and second, it shows some quarters may feel happy of the development.

7. The birth of the State of Israel

During the World War, the Jews involved in the war were large in number. In that situation, about 119,000 of Jews registered for military services within a month the Second World War took place. By the end of 1942 some 19,000 Palestine Jews – nearly 10 percent of them women – were on active service with the British armed forces. They were part of military forces in Italy and north Africa campaign. Special Jewish commando units fought in Libya and Ethiopia, and also involved in the Allied occupation of Syria and Lebanon in 1941. The Jews expected that their loyal participation would not be forgotten by the British when the war ended and the time came for re-evaluating the question of Jewish immigration to Palestine (Sachar, 1963: 460 – 461).

Because of the situation of anti-Semitism emerged in Europe before the World War II, the Jews were convinced that Palestine alone offered them opportunity to rebuild their broken lives. In 1945, there were huge influx of Polish and other Eastern European Jews into the Western displaced persons camps. This situation happened because upon returning to their homes in Poland, these people had encountered the same venomous Polish anti-Semitism, not excluding physical pogroms that bedeviled their lives in the prewar era.

Many of the Jews, as a result of anti-Semitism, became Displaced Person (DP) and a few congresses had been held to find solution to these people. Some of the Jews, having seen their families led to slaughter by the Nazis, they were less concerned but to focus on bringing the displaced persons into Palestine (Sachar, 1963: 446). Later it was the Palestinian Jew, by his bravery and fighting ability, who successfully established the State of Israel (Sachar, 1963: 470). This establishment received full support of America when American Jews had played an important role in lobbying the government. When Harry Truman assumed Presidency in

deal of testimony in Palestine, and in July 1937 issued its recommendations: to abolish the British Mandate and partition the country into two states of Arabs and Jewish. Only a zone between Jaffa and Jerusalem would remain under the British Mandate and international supervision. The Jewish state would include the coastal strip stretching from Mount Carmel to south of Be'er Tuvia, as well as the Jezreel Valley and the Galilee. The Arab state was to include the hill regions, Judea and Samaria, and the Negev. Until the establishment of the two states, the commission recommended, Jews should be prohibited from purchasing land in the area allocated to the Arab state. To overcome demarcation problems, it was proposed that land exchanges be carried out concurrently with the transfer of population from one area to the other. Demarcation of the precise borders of the states was entrusted to a technical partition committee. The Peel Commission did not believe that Jewish immigration was detrimental to the financial well-being of the Arab population and assumed that the issue of Jewish immigration would be resolved within the Jewish state. The British government accepted the recommendations of the Peel Commission regarding the partition of Palestine, and the announcement was endorsed by Parliament in London. Among the Jews, bitter disagreements erupted between supporters and opponents, while the Arabs rejected the proposal and refused to regard it as a solution.

April 1945, he was subjected to the full force of the Zionist appeal. The President never deviated in his essential sympathy for Zionist aspirations. He wrote in his autobiography later:

I had carefully read the Balfour Declaration, in which Great Britain was committed to a homeland for the Jews. I had familiarized myself with the history of the question of a Jewish homeland and the position on the British and the Arabs it was my feeling that it could be possible for us to watch out for the long – range interests of our country while at the same time helping these unfortunate victims of persecution to find home (Sachar, 1963: 472).

It was in 1947, the United Nations Special Committee on Palestine (UNSCOP) recommended that western part of Palestine should be partitioned into three categories: first, a Jewish state, second, an Arab state and third, a UN-controlled territory (Corpus separatum) around the city of Jerusalem. This partition plan was adopted on 29 November 1947 with United Nations General Assembly Resolution 181. The term is said to be more favorable to the Jews compared to Peel Commission report (Hudson, 1990: 257). This resolution counted as 33 votes in favor, 13 against, and 10 abstentions. That means there was simple majority to divide Palestinian land into parts. Had the 10 absentees turned up, it would not change any of the support to have a Jewish state in Palestine.

Many of the Palestinian opposed to this plan but it was to no effect except to give more indication to Jewish people that they could have captured the land preserve for Palestinian state altogether easily.

Gelvin mentioned that the first ten years of Israel's existence might be considered as a period of radical demographic change with the proportion of inhabitants among the Jews increased rapidly. The demographic changes were the result of two factors. One of them was the flight of Palestinians who had fled to neighboring border or forced to do in order to find a shelter temporary home. Things become worst by the effort done by the Israel who occupied 94 percent of the property abandoned by the Palestinians who fled and distributed it to Jewish Israelis. It is reported that there were attempt by some Palestinians to reclaim their property in term of harvesting crops or carry away moveable property to their new homes (Gelvin, 2005: 166 – 167).

The second factor of demographic changed in Palestine was the Jews immigration to come into Israel. During the first four years of its existence, about seven hundred thousand new immigrants arrived. This doubled the population of Israel. Some Jews immigrated to Israel because of the urging of Israeli Zionists. Others came because they were persecuted at home (Gelvin, 2005: 168). Cattam mentioned that the Palestine Government statistics indicated that the immigrants largely came from Poland, Germany, Rumania and Czechoslovakia (Cattan, 1973: 96).

In the face of Israel's state birth, cynical psychological warfare conducted against poorly led, unorganized Arab civilian populations was underscored by one of the infamous terrorist acts done by the Irgun. It was on 9 or 10 April 1948 the Irgun massacre over 250

civilians at the village of Deir Yassin. On 26 April the Haganah group launched an attack and driving out all of the inhabitants in middle-class Arab quarters (Hudson, 1990: 258 – 259). These are only two examples out of countless attacked against Palestinians while they were still under British Mandate, until the announcement of Israel had taken place. Armstrong hence argues that during the period of British Mandate, the Zionists were able to established themselves in the country and create a Jewish state (Armstrong, 1997: 371). Since then, there is no assurance of safety to the people as it was during the Muslim rule (El-Awaisi, 2012b).

On 14 May 1948, Ben-Gurion held a ceremony in the Tel Aviv Museum to proclaim the birth of the new state of Israel. Only the next day, after the British finally and officially left, the Irgun group attacked Jaffa and again the specter of Deir Yassin caused seventy thousands of Arab inhabitants of the city to flee (Armstrong, 1997: 386 – 387). What became a morale boost for Israel is that a few minutes after the establishment of this new state, US President, Harry Truman gave his support followed by other countries such as Iceland, Romania and Uruguay. Two days after, some other countries such as Soviet Union, Poland, Ireland and others recognized Israel. The US official recognition came on 31 January 1949. The proclamation of Israel has further broken the heart of Palestinians and it was a confirmation to the new landscape of Middle East will begin (Nor, 2008; Omar, 2011).

Some argue that the emergence of the State of Israel had no basis under the international law. In this regard, Cattani argues that Israel does not fulfill the normal requirements of statehood under international law, which the requirements are: a people, a defined territory and a government. He further argues that in great majority of Jewish inhabitants during that time in Palestine do not belong to the country. There are those immigrants who came to Palestine and displaced the original inhabitants by force and terror (Cattani, 1973: 94 – 95).

Argumentation not in favour of Israeli's existence does not mean that it involves anti-Semitic. The term was used to show the awful behavior of European countries towards the Jews. One should also note that against Zionist is a different subject of anti-Semitism. The two does not match to each other. Al-Qaradawi clearly states that for Muslims, they do not fight the current Israelis because they are Jews, but because they have occupied the land of Muslims and Arabs. So, the Palestinians have their right to claim the land back, however, the injustice against them meant they cannot return to their homeland. They are denied the right to return as enjoyed by the Jews who can 'return' to the Israel's state. Hence, Michael Prior presents a conclusive study on the conflict between Palestine-Israel which throughout his book, he shows that there is a possibility of being anti-Zionist but it does not mean that someone is anti-Semitic (Prior, 1999: 175-183). In contrast, when Muslims rule the land, it was an inclusive rather than exclusive region (Nor, 2011).

8. Conclusion

From the above discussion, one may notice that the Zionist Organization has made an enormous effort to claim Islamic Jerusalem and Palestine to be part of the home for the Jewish people. This has become more apparent when the Zionist throws its claim to Palestine as having a 'historic title' and connected to them. This proposal which was given to the Peace Conference has a big impact to the Jews. It enabled them to migrate to the land and for a long

term mission which was to establish a home for Jewish people, in term of establishing state that is legal by law. This claim of historic title was given a kind of huge support especially from British during the time where administration of the land was under British Mandate. The Balfour Declaration and the start of British occupation of Palestine under General Allenby, both events took place in 1917, were truly giving huge advantage to the Jews at the expense of Arabs which they were somehow demoralized by the support given to the Jewish people who come and occupied Arabs land by all means. This proposal of historic title was only an additional matter as a following up of the Balfour Declaration and indeed it seems does not give any significant impact had the Paris Peace Conference rejected the proposal. At least during this time around, the Zionist Organization is in a success mode striving for the Jewish community, fighting for the rights of the Jews after they have been living dreadfully for hundreds of years in Europe.

Some would argue that politically, the future of Israel-Palestine conflict is in the hand of world super power, US and the UK. There are a number of peace solutions proposed or backed up by the US and its modern ally such as Road Map and the peace conference in Annapolis held in Nov 2007 however these solutions so far failed to stop the conflict. As a consequence, now there much hope has been put on the US President Barrack Obama to continue finding solution on this matter especially in terms of changing the policy towards Middle East and justice to the Palestinians. For the Arabs, they will continuously seek justice by all means they can. To recognize Israel as a legitimate state would be a different subject to Arabs and it seems very unlikely at the moment. The recent conflict of Gaza for instance, shows the way and the spirit of Arabs to protect their land. The conflict shows nothing about the strength of Arabs, which could be easily beaten by Israeli force. Nevertheless, the Palestinian Arabs still survived and at the other side of the conflict it is a clear evidence to the world of how cruel the Israel by demolishing a university, a few of UN schools, mosques, killing innocent people, women and kids, including animal whenever they found during the operation. Is this the way that the Israel wants to reclaim the life of the Jews who was terribly assassinated by European countries in the past? This is a big question. One need to carefully analyze this and the world need to pressure Israel from being so cruel to the Palestinian Arabs at the moment. The Zionist brutality needs to be stopped. Justice needs to be restored. In this regard, Armstrong has every right to argue that there will be no peace without justice especially in that particular region in the Middle East.

9. References

- Abou-El-Fadl, R. (2012). The Road to Jerusalem through Tahrir Square: Anti-Zionism and Palestine in the 2011 Egyptian Revolution. *Journal of Palestine Studies*, 41(2): 6-26.
- Armstrong, K. (1997). *A History of Jerusalem One City Three Faiths*. UK: Harper Collins Publishers.
- Avishai, B. (2002). *The tragedy of Zionism: How Its Revolutionary Past Haunts Israeli Democracy*. New York: Hellios Press.

- El-Awaisi, A. F. (2000). Umar's Assurance of Safety to the People of Aelia: A Critical Analytical Study on the Historical Sources. *Journal of Islamic Jerusalem Studies*, 3(2): 1 – 50.
- El-Awaisi, A. F. M. (2012a). A Critic of the Orientalist Approaches Towards Islamicjerusalem. *Middle-East Journal of Scientific Research*, 11(8): 1143-1152.
- El-Awaisi, A. F. M. (2012b). Umar's Assurance of Aman to the People of Aelia (Islamicjerusalem): A Critical Analytical Study of the Greek Orthodox Patriarchate's Version. *World Journal of Islamic History and Civilization*, 2(3): 128-136.
- Ayyub S. (1984). *Wathā'iq Asāsiyyah fī al-Sirā' al-'Arabī al-Sahyūnī* (Basic Document on the Arab-Zionist Conflict). Beirut, Vol. 1.
- Banitelabi, M., Yusoff, K., and Nor, M.R.M. (2012). The Impact of Islamic Civilization and Culture in Europe during the Crusades. *World Journal of Islamic History and Civilization*, 2 (3): 182-187.
- Baxter, K. and Akbarzadeh, S. (2009). *US Foreign Policy in the Middle East: The Root of anti-Americanism*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Bonsal, S. (1946). *Suitors and Suppliants at Versailles*. New York: Prentice-Hall.
- Calaprice, A. (2004). *The Einstein Almanac*, US: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Catherwood, C. (2006). *A Brief History of The Middle East*. London: Robinson.
- Cattan, H. (1973). *Palestine and International Law: The Legal Aspects of the Arab-Israeli Conflict*. London and New York: Longman.
- Chisholm H. (1911). *Encyclopedia Britannica*. UK: Encyclopaedia Britannica.
- Daud, B. C., Nor, M. R. M., and El-Awaisi, A. F. (2012). Nur Al-Din Mahmud Zanki's Plan for Liberating Islamicjerusalem: A Historical Analysis. *Middle-East Journal of Scientific Research*, 11 (8): 1161-1170.
- De Lange, N. (2000). *An Introduction to Judaism*, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Fromkin, D. (1989). *A Peace to End All Peace: The Fall of the Ottoman Empire and the Creation of the Modern Middle East*. New York: Owl.
- Gelvin, J. L. (2005). *The Israel – Palestine Conflict: One Hundred Years of War*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- George, A. (2005). *Jordan: living in the crossfire*. London & New York: Zed Books.

- Al-Ghuri, A. (1972). *Falastin 'Abr Sittin 'Aman* (Palestine over 16 Years). Beirut.
- Hansard's Reports*, House of Lords, 21 June 1922.
- Herzl, T. (1960). *The Complete Diaries of Theodor Herzl*, (ed. R. Patai). London and New York: Herzl Press and T. Yoseloff.
- Howard, D. A. (2001). *The History of Turkey*. London: Greenwood Publishing Group.
- Hudson, M. C. (1990). The Transformation of Jerusalem 1917 – 1987 AD. In K. J. Asali (ed.), *Jerusalem in History*. New York: Olive Branch Press.
- Hurewitz, J. C. (1956). *Diplomacy in the Near and Middle East*. Vol. II. Toronto, New York & London: Van Nostrand.
- Johnson, P. (1988). *A History of the Jews*, UK: HarperPerennial.
- Khalidi, M. A. (2001). Utopian Zionism or Zionist Proselytism? A Reading of Herzl's Altneuland. *Journal of Palestine Studies*, 30(4): 55 – 67.
- Lewis, B. (1973). Semites and Anti-Semites. In *Islam in History: Ideas, Men and Events in the Middle East*, UK: The Library Press.
- Magnes, J. L. (1947). *Palestine – Divided or United*. Jerusalem: Ihud (Union) Assn..
- Mallison W. T. and Mallison S. V. (1986). *The Palestine Problem in International Law and World Order*. UK: Longman Group Limited.
- Mendes-Flohr, P. and Reinhartz J. (1995). *The Jew in the Modern World: A Documentary History*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Nor, M. R. M. (2008). Islamicjerusalem Under Muslim Rule: A Study of the Implementation of Inclusive Vision on the Region. *Journal of Al-Tamaddun*, 3: 162 – 181.
- Nor, M. R. M. (2010). Konflik Israel - Palestin dari aspek sejarah moden dan langkah pembebasan dari cengkaman Zionis. *Journal of Al-Tamaddun*, 5: 73-92.
- Nor, M. R. M. (2011). Protecting Non-Muslim: Its Implementation During Early Muslim Rule of Islamicjerusalem. *Al-Bayan – Journal of Quran and Hadith Studies*, 9: 209-222.
- Oke, Mim Kemal. (1982). The Ottoman Empire, Zionism and the Question of Palestine. *International Journal of Middle East Studies*. 14: 329 – 341.
- Omar, A. M. (2011). Israel, Jerusalem, and the Identity Crisis (Arabic). *International Journal of West Asian Studies*, 3(1): 111-134.

Palestine Royal Commission Report (the Peel Report), 1937. London.

Pappe, I. (1994). *The Making of the Arab – Israeli Conflict 1947 – 51*. London & New York: I.B. Tauris & Co Ltd.

Prior, M. (1999). *Zionism and the State of Israel: A Moral Inquiry*. London: Routledge.

Rozali, E. A., and Kamaruzzaman, A.F. (2011). Perang Dunia Pertama, Deklarasi Balfour Dan Kesannya Terhadap Palestin. *International Journal of West Asian Studies*, 3(2): 19-39.

Sachar, H. M. (1963). *The Course of Modern Jewish History*. New York: A Delta Book.

Saleh M. M. (2001). *The Palestinian Issue: Its Background and Development Up to 2000*, (trans. by Hassan A. Ibrahim), Kuala Lumpur: Fajar Ulung.

Scholch, A. (1990). Jerusalem in the 19th Century (1831 – 1917 AD). In K. J. Asali (ed.), *Jerusalem in History* (pp. 228 – 248). New York: Olive Branch Press.

Al-Tel, O. I. (2003), *The First Islamic Conquest of Aelia (Islamic Jerusalem): A Critical Analytical Study of the Early Islamic Historical Narratives and Sources*. UK: Al-Maktoum Institute Academic Press.

Wyllen, S. M. (2000). *Settings of Silver: An Introduction to Judaism*. New Jersey: Paulist Press.

About the author:

Mohd Roslan Mohd Nor (Ph.D) is a Senior Lecturer at the Department of Islamic History and Civilization, Academy of Islamic Studies, University of Malaya. Currently he is appointed as the Deputy Director of Research and Development at the Academy (2012-2014). He received his Ph.D in Islamic Jerusalem Studies from University of Aberdeen, where his research was mainly carried out at Al-Maktoum Institute in Dundee. He can be contacted at m_roslan@um.edu.my.