

On 12<sup>th</sup> May 2016 I posted *In Memorium*. One of my regular 'Commentators', 'C', responded. I delayed responding to his 3<sup>rd</sup> comment, of 14<sup>th</sup> May, while I thought and prayed. I could have responded immediately but was inclined to not respond. In any case the specific allegations required I be as sure of my sources as possible. If you're interested enough to get this far you may find the following illuminating. Just to be clear, any apparent imbalance in my blogs is an (usually) intentional re-balancing. The Zionist stories are well-known, because widely reported, usually without regard to immediate context or history. Those of the Palestinians barely exist for many in the West, especially Christians. This is a long document (6 pages) which is why I've not posted as a blog. I hope you can stay with me, the issues are important.

C's unedited comment of 14<sup>th</sup> May follows. My remarks are in *red italics*. *Sadly, 'C' has not referenced his sources. I have done my best to check them and to reference my own. C begins:-*

Hi, I continue to be shocked appalled at the blatant immorality that some people will defend so long as it is Palestinians who are doing it. There is no bar low enough when it comes to what they will allow/excuse/defend/celebrate. Palestinians apparently have no moral agency, cannot be expected to behave as any other human would be expected to. This is condescension and paternalism of the worst kind. *I am accused of condescension and paternalism. I have apparently assumed that Palestinians had/have no 'moral agency'. What I find surprising is that this accusation is made in full knowledge of the reality that Palestinians had no 'actual agency'. This criticism could much more responsibly be directed at Zionists, especially the extremist settlers & Israeli government.*

Your analogy fails in almost every respect. While not central to what I am writing about today, the connection between the Jewish people and the land of Israel, and the continued presence of Jews in that land are important. *No more important, either historically or theologically, and with proper regard for God's purpose in righteousness and justice, than the Palestinians who were and are living there.* Your analogy also totally fails to mention in any way the wider situation at the time. *Anyone who has read my blogs, or attended a Bible study group with me, knows that I pay great attention to context. Sadly, your comment fails in that regard.*

1. You suggest that the Palestinians were not anti-Semitic, they just didn't want their land being over-run by outsiders. *broadly speaking, Yes.*

So, were the Palestinians simply anti-Zionist, or were they anti-Jewish? If the former, then they would have no feelings of ill will towards Jews in general, especially outside of Palestine. Indeed, they would wish for them to be happy and integrated within Europe, so that one of the main motivations for Zionism, the increasingly murderous anti-Semitism of those lands, would be removed. *The first question demands clarification; which 'Palestinians' are referred to? We are surely no more allowed to use 'collective criticism' than to engage in collective punishment, although successive Israeli governments regularly use the latter. In any case the assumed context seems to be 1942 or 1933 when a better baseline could be 1918 when Balfour's 1917 declaration became fully public, following the earlier betrayal of 'Sykes-Picot'. But the broader context must go back to at least the first decade of the 20<sup>th</sup> century and the Zionist Congresses. When the question is asked within the context of say 1914, there is no evidence that Palestinians were either. It is more reasonable to assume an opposition to massive ethnic-religious immigration (Consider Europe, America, Australia, etc. in 2016). Jews had travelled to and from Palestine relatively freely for centuries, what had changed was the intention to create a new, racially determined nation, with the necessity of displacing the indigenous peoples.*

*As to the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> sentences it is worth asking what, in c1933, would be the thoughts and feelings of most people anywhere with regard to other peoples elsewhere? I suspect, ignorance and disinterest in the main, personal survival was the issue, whether in America, Britain, France or Palestine. C's final sentence is mere romanticism. They would have cared no more than the average American did about what was happening in, say, Turkey, (even today the average American may have difficulty in locating Turkey unless it's in the oven).*

There is no question that the Palestinian middle class and leadership were well aware of what was going on in Nazi Germany. *This actually is highly questionable. Even today with 21<sup>st</sup> century media it is remarkable how many UK 'middle class' people are ignorant of their world, (even worse in USA)* Palestinian notables met with the Nazi ambassador in 1933 to learn more about the Nazi boycott of Jewish goods (note they did not protest this, saying please make them feel welcome, as we don't want them here, rather they were energized by it and wanted to repeat it in Palestine). The German Consul also met with the Grand Mufti, Hajj Amin Husseini in Jerusalem on March 31, 1933. He reported back to Berlin that "the Mufti made it expressly clear that Muslims within and without of Palestine salute the new government of Germany and hope for the spread of fascist, anti-democratic governments everywhere." He specifically noted that "contemporary

Jewish influence on economics and within politics is damaging everywhere, and should be combatted.” After this meeting, the Supreme Muslim Council (run by the Mufti), printed in their official newspaper; “Herr Hitler and his party are the most violent adversaries of the Jews ... the Jews assume that Germany will become a centre of hatred against the Jews, a phenomenon which is called Anti-Semitism. ... As far as the position of the Arabs, ... because the Jews are our enemies, our wish and our hope rests of course on Hitler.”

*This paragraph shows complete disregard for, or ignorance of the political context and historical reality. Politicians (and governments) typically show support for those who agree with them even when other policies may be contemptible. Today, in 2016, Saudi Arabia is a key ally of the USA and UK, and many of us protest this fact! Until the first Gulf war Saddam Hussein was someone 'with whom we can do business'. Israel is regarded as a key ally in the ME despite most of its early leaders having been involved in terrorism, despite its complete disregard for international law and despite the racist and provocative language of successive leaders. Can we have some consistency, please?*

*To the point, Husayni's influence was clearly not great, nothing much happened. And, why would we expect Palestinians to be better informed when even as late as 1941 some German Jews could not believe what was happening in their nation. Then, commencing the story in 1933 ignores the reality in Mandate Palestine. By 1933 the Palestinians had experienced an increase in the Jewish population from less than 10% in 1910 to more than 20%. Further, the writer ignores the fact that, having supported Britain during WWI on the promise of Arab independence, Hajj Amin al-Hussayni had concluded he could no longer trust the British. Germany looked powerful and offered a hope for independence that was not on offer from compromised Britain. In 1931, speaking in Jaffa, Mogannam Mogannam, joint secretary of the Arab Executive said, “We have lost faith in the British. Nobody, not one soul in Arab Palestine and perhaps in all the Arab and Moslem worlds, believes now in England”. ('Filastin' newspaper. Quoted in 'The Mufti of Jerusalem and Palestine Arab Politics 1930-1937'. Yehuda Taggar. Dissertation Thesis at LSE. 1973) (Further Recommended Reading – see Below)*

Aware of what was occurring, in 1936, the Palestinians launched their Arab Revolt, a combination of murder, boycotts and civil disobedience aimed at stopping all Jewish flight to Palestine. The Palestinians would support German anti-Semitism, and at the same time, riot and kill to keep Jewish refugees finding a place of refuge with them. In 1937, in the Mufti, the leader of the Palestinians, called on Muslims to kill all the Jews living in Muslim lands, calling them “scum and germs.” *I've pointed out that the influence of Hajj Amin, the Grand Mufti of Jerusalem, has been significantly overstated, even as it was over-estimated by British officials in Palestine at the time. Emotive language like 'flight' does not aid clarity. Of course the Arab revolt was aimed at preventing 'Jewish immigration', but to claim that is was in awareness of what was happening in Germany massively overstates the case from whatever perspective; see below on the 'Final Solution'.*

*Other nations also closed their doors; Britain, USA, Australia; because of recession – echoes of today. Why should the Palestinians feel responsible for solving a European problem? It is perfectly reasonable to criticize al-Husayni's language and behaviour but only when understood in its context. The competing narratives of the period (1907-1939) include Zionism, Jewish anti-Zionism, Arab nationalism, British & French imperial interests, American isolationism, and Islamic sectarianism together with a general colonialist racism.*

*What about a view from the 'other side'. Chaim Weizmann, in referring to the difficulties facing the 'Zionist project' in early 1936 describes British (the mandatory authority) 'Appeasement of the Arabs'. It did not, he points out, 'at first take the form of limitation of immigration; that, in 1934, 1935 and part of 1936, was more or less regulated by the absorptive capacity of the country. It took, instead, a form which, if allowed to develop, would have led to the complete arrest both of Jewish immigration and of Jewish progress generally: namely, British advocacy of a legislative council with Arabs in the majority.'*

*One would think that might appeal to a democrat, given the proportion of Arabs to Jews, even after massive Jewish immigration, was still nearly 3 to 1. The proposed council would consist of 14 Arabs, 7 Jews, 2 businessmen, race unspecified, and 5 British officials. Weizmann 'had pointed out (to Sir Arthur Wauchope, High Commissioner for Palestine) that to talk of elected Arabs representing their people was to contradict the democratic principle which it was supposed to further. A legislative council in Palestine would be merely a modernized cloak for the old feudal system, that is, a continuation in power of the family cliques which had held the country in thrall for centuries and ground down the faces of the poor.' This is the language of colonialist racism!*

*To be fair, Weizmann claims to have favoured a balanced representation (equal numbers) with the balance of power held by British officials. It isn't clear whether this was genuine or a reaction to accusations that Zionists were 'anti-democratic'. Clearly, at that time, democracy would have defeated the Zionist state.*

*Democracy must be delayed until the right people are in the majority. It is currently denied to 4.5 million Palestinians in the West Bank and Gaza, not to mention the many more millions of Palestinian refugees throughout the world. (Trial and Error. Chaim Weizmann. Hamish Hamilton. 1949. pp 466-468)*

The Palestinian leadership were clearly anti-Semitic, not simply anti-Zionist. *This conclusion is not warranted. Muslims, Christians and Jews had lived together in the Levant, not just Palestine, for hundreds of years. The al-Husayni family had in the lifetime of Hajj Amin business relations with Jews including the manager for 30 years of their affairs in Jaffa. I have mislaid the exact ref for this but I believe it is in 'Palestinian Leader, Hajj Amin al-Husayni', by Taysir Jabarah.*

*Or this from the Bethlehem Magazine vol 8 April 1921, page 607 by Gen. Ormsby-Gore "No-one in Palestine except the Germans wants or likes the Turks ... Muslims of Palestine and their neighbours like the Christians, but they hate the Jews. To be more specific, they hate the Zionists"*

*Or,*

*'Palestine needs neither fascism nor Nazism in order to rouse the feelings of her sons against Zionism and its designs in the Arab world. This repulsion already exists; it had already taken root in people's minds several years ago, well before Nazism ... What authorizes the Jews to announce sorrowfully to the Arabs that a Nazi movement has sprung up among them? Is it the Arabs who have driven the Jews from their land, or is it rather the Jews who are driving Arabs from their homes and persecuting them to the point of depriving them of human beings' most basic right, the right to life'. From 'Filastin' 1934 quoted in 'The Arabs and the Holocaust', Gilbert Achcar. Saqi 2010*

2. Now, it was possible to be anti-Semitic, but still horrified by the reality of Hitler's genocide. The Polish anti-Semitic writer Zofia Kossak wrote in an underground publication "It is not possible to like the Jews, it is possible to wish that they emigrate from Poland after the war, but as long as they are persecuted, they must be helped even at the risk of ones own life. ... Our feelings towards Jews have not changed. We continue to deem them political, economic and ideological enemies of Poland ... This fact however, does not release us from the duty of damnation of murder ... Whoever among us does not support this protest is not a Catholic."

Did the reality of mass murder likewise awaken the consciences of the Palestinians? Did they say, we too still hate the Jews, but cannot stand by and see them murdered? Did they offer refuge, reluctantly, but because the horrors of the hour demanded nothing less? *A properly balanced comment would include Kossak's actual condemnation, of the silence of England and America and of 'influential international Jewry, so sensitive in its reaction to any transgression against its people, is silent'. As much to the point, if in August 1942 (the date of her publication) England and America, et al, were silent, who was there to tell the Palestinians. It must be noted also that the 'reality of mass murder' simply was not believed, it 'could not possibly happen in a modern, civilised nation'!*

During the war, the Palestinian political/Islamic leadership sided with the Nazis explicitly because of their Jewish policy, and asked for death camps to be set up in Palestine once the Nazis had conquered it. Having been personally briefed by Eichmann on the final solution, Husseini later wrote that Eichmann was "a rare diamond" and "the best redeemer for the Arabs." *I can find no independent corroboration for these quotes so they should be treated with extreme caution. Who were these leaders, al-Hussayni apart, what could the 'Palestinian leadership' do? Husayni wasn't even in Palestine, having fled arrest by the British. But; having due regard to historical context, when did the 'Palestinians become aware of the mass murder, see above. The 'Final Solution', the genocide, did not become policy until the failure of operation Barbarossa. Begun in June 1941 it was obvious by early 1942 that Hitler's plan to 'export' the majority of Jews to the East could not be carried out, the routes had been closed.*

*'Before the invasion of Russia ... the Nazis had only vague and shifting objectives about the final goal (Endziel) for the growing number of Jews (by 1942 it was 11 million) under their control. 'The History of an Obsession' by Klaus P.Fischer. Constable 1998.*

*We should also note the role of the Jewish Agency. Most Jews wanting to escape persecution, including from the Nazis, preferred America to Palestine. At the 1938 conference America refused to increase its immigrant quota, but pointed out that the current quota had not been taken up. The Jewish Agency was only interested in those Jews, able and/or wealthy, who wanted to go to Palestine. See also the Havaara agreement [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Havaara\\_Agreement](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Havaara_Agreement)] Husseini indeed personally visited a concentration camp, where, according to Nazi diplomat and his personal liaison officer, Fritz Grobba, "the visit lasted about two hours with very satisfying results ... the Jews aroused particular interest among the Arabs, ... it all made a very favourable impression on the Arabs." *I'd be interested in the source for this quote. I've seen similar that are disputed. I have no intention of being an apologist for al-Husayni. It is possible that he or**



*an aide did visit Sachsenhausen. However, the single source of evidence seems to be the Wisliceny testimony that was used at Eichmann's trial but is much disputed (evidence that should not have been allowed and would not be allowed in a court in UK. It was second hand, not witnessed, and undertaken with a man under pressure and facing trial for war crimes by Zionist agents with an agenda to undermine Arab demands for self-determination)*

*Amid claim and counter claim can we remember it is never right to blame a whole people group for the actions or beliefs of an individual, and, can we not learn from this history? As Max Kortepeter writes in his preface to 'Palestinian leader Hajj Amin al-Husayni: Mufti of Jerusalem' by Taysir Jabarah, "Helpless people with their backs to the wall have always been forced into pacts with the devil to defeat their oppressors. In a nutshell this has been the story of Palestine, both for Jews and the Palestinian Arabs" In 1943, in his Voice of Free Arabism broadcast from Berlin, Husseini declared that; "The world will never be at peace until the Jewish race is exterminated." At the same time, the Mufti declared that the Jews were "parasites among the nations, sucking their blood, embezzling their property, corrupting their morals." He urged the Muslims to work for "the expulsion of the Jews from all Arab and Muslim countries. It is the only remedy, it is what the Prophet did 13 centuries ago" and declared that Muslims everywhere should follow the example of the Germans who had found a "definitive solution to the Jewish problem." *As to the prophet, I am not aware of any evidence that he did anything of the sort. Any Muslim with even a passing familiarity with the Qu'ran would know that Jews were 'people of the Book'. These statements, assuming them to be accurate, are appalling but placing them in proper context they were not unusual, the British equivalent was 'Lord Haw Haw'. We might note allied attitudes to 'the Hun', and racist attitudes in US, UK, Australia, South Africa, not to mention, as we must, Zionist attitudes towards the Palestinians. Let us not demand a higher morality from persecuted people than from their persecutors. And the Arab's sense of betrayal was justified.* Given then that Husseini both knew of and approved of the Holocaust, it is both shocking and unsurprising that he repeatedly intervened with the Nazi government to make sure Jewish children were not allowed to immigrate to Palestine, pressing rather that they be sent to Poland and murdered. On May 6, 1943, he wrote to the Bulgarian Foreign Minister arguing against a British proposal to allow 4,000 Jewish children access to Palestine "send to a place such as Poland ... and you will render a great service to the Arab people." *Again no reference is given so I'm unable to check the source, and the 1<sup>st</sup> sentence is an assumption, not a 'given', (an assumption may be well-founded but that doesn't make it certain). And in fact no Bulgarian Jews were deported to Poland or Germany.* Writing on the same topic to the German Foreign Minister, he stated that the Arabs were "deeply hurt" by such a betrayal, and again insisted the children be sent rather to Poland. He likewise protested plans to send Jewish children from Hungary and Romania to Palestine. German Foreign Office Counsellor Wilhelm Melchers wrote concerning the Bulgarian child rescue plan, "the Mufti kept cropping up all over the place and lodging protests: in the Minister's office, in the Undersecretary of State's waiting room, the Press Office, the broadcasting service, and also the SS ... the Mufti was a sworn enemy of the Jews and made no secret of the fact that he would rather see them all killed." Later, the Mufti wrote "My letters had positive and useful results for the Palestinian problem." In a broadcast on March 1, 1944, he stated; "Kill the Jews. Kill them wherever you find them. This pleases God, history and religion. This serves your honour; God is with you." He worked to ensure that Jewish children died in Poland rather than lived in Palestine. This is utter evil! *If true, I agree, but again sources not referenced, altho' they appear to come from Klaus Gensicke's 'The Mufti of Jerusalem and the Nazis: The Berlin Years. Reviewers (I've not read it) seem to regard it as factually accurate but, as one puts it 'narrowly focussed'. To focus on the years 1941-1945 and sideline the previous 30 (on which see below & recent blogs) is poor history. And, it must be noted, the criticism applies to 'Husseini', NOT to 'all Palestinians', not even their leaders. Certainly these sentiments, even made in time of war, are dreadful. Dreadful as they are will we hear similar condemnation in respect of Israeli Zionist statements of which Netanyahu & Ayelet Shaked are only the most recent exponents? I simply refuse to condemn all Jews for the views of sick people such as Bibi. Didn't we have our own 'Lord Haw Haw' in Berlin? One difference is that Zionists are actually in position to carry out their threats, as they do.**

Husseini was the leader of the Palestinian community in 1948. This was the man who, with the overwhelming support of his people, rejected every peace offer. *Again, no sources. I have searched in vain for evidence of a plebiscite of the Palestinian people on 'Peace offers', on which see below.* In the West, no political party would celebrate Hitler, or Mussolini, or Vichy or Horthy, *NPD, Pegida,* yet the Palestinians honour Amin al-Husayni as if he were not a Nazi abomination, or rather, because he was a Nazi abomination. And no one objects! In 2013, the Palestinian president Abbas said the Mufti was a great man whose ways should be emulated by all PA Arabs, and was worthy of great praise. *Sadly we have some leaders in 'the West' (which I take to include Australia) who come dangerously close to Hitler or Mussolini*

*in their pronouncements. Is it possible that Palestinians identified with Husayni because he represented their desire for independence and their fears, substantiated, about Jewish immigration. Did Husayni begin life as an unpleasant person, or did he, as many others, end up disgruntled, frustrated, angry and powerless?. Are we to assume that every Palestinian, including every other Palestinian leader, emulated him? Where is the evidence? These attitudes are as racist as anti-Semitism. As for Arafat and Abbas it is my inexpert view that Israel doesn't mind factional and incompetent leaders because they can manipulate them. Israel's control over the Palestinian leadership is a commonplace among Palestinians. It is what, inter alia, enabled the rise of Hamas.*

Nazism has become a synonym with total evil, and the Palestinians freely identified with it at the very point of its greatest evil. *An illogical and racist conclusion based on assumption and presumption.*

While other lands were sacrificing hundreds of thousands of their own lives to end it, Palestinians, behaving in the most venal and selfish way imaginable, are excused. Imagine a row boat near the Titanic, almost empty, and its passengers are beating the survivors with oars as they drown, to keep them from getting on board. This is what the Palestinians did. *Their views as a community on the morality of Nazism cannot be assumed from the behaviour of a few in leadership, that is paternalistic and racist. Their power to act was and is severely limited. The 'Titanic' analogy is ridiculous. 'C' seems to assume that WW2 was waged to 'save the Jews'. That it never was.*

So, after the war, when the full cost of what had happened was made known, did the Palestinians, in grief and repentance, cry out “we shut our doors to you when you were dying, please, let your survivors come home, come live with us, we will never turn our backs on you again”? No, they murdered as many of the survivors as they could, rejected all peace plans, and fought a war to keep them out. So much for Palestinian “honour” and “hospitality”! *Well, I am appalled and disgusted at this twisting of history to convict of guilt by association! Why should it be demanded of the Palestinians they repent for an evil that was committed by others, on a different continent and over which they had no influence. They did not invent Christo-European anti-Semitism; they did not cause the war that devastated Europe in 1914-18 and led directly both to the Second World War and the Zionist-Palestinian problem. And at no time during these events did they have more than minimal control of their destiny.*

*We do well to remember (or learn) that the 'Palestinians' of 1915 included Muslims, Christians, and Jews. The commonplace that the Palestinian leadership have refused every offer of peace may not be ignored. It is, in fact, a lie. No offer of peace has been made that they could reasonably be expected to accept and, as much to the point, which could have been delivered. Most of the discussions are simplistic; a well-reasoned view using negotiation theory can be found at <http://www.hnlr.org/2012/03/why-camp-david-ii-failed-a-negotiation-theory-perspective/>. An interesting perspective may be found in 'The General's Son: The Journey of an Israeli in Palestine' by Miko Peled, also, for a more recent view, 'An Israeli in Palestine: Resisting Dispossession, Redeeming Israel', by Jeff Halper.*

Where else would anyone support murder and mayhem to protest taking in people fleeing lethal persecution? If your neighbor is beating up his family, do you cheer him on and bolt your own door against any of them fleeing for safety? *A ridiculous analogy. Palestinian Arabs at around 1.3 million in 1940 constituted 75-80% of the population (as against 92% in 1910). Were they to welcome the 8-11 million Jews at risk in Europe? How would the Jews get there, who would pay, how could they be fed? Some rational thinking is required here. As to the first question Australia has tightened rules on immigration. The EU & Britain, whilst making soothing noises has done little to help the refugee crisis in Syria-Turkey and the present republican candidate for US President has campaigned vigorously against immigration from anywhere.*

The Land of Israel has been the Jewish homeland for 4,000 years. There has always been a Jewish community there, *The land of Israel has **not** been 'the Jewish homeland for 4,000 years'. This common belief is both biblically and historically inaccurate, at best an unhelpful anachronism. On which see my Pages on 'Ethnicity Problem' and 'Exile'.* yet when Jews are being mass murdered elsewhere, and the doors of the world are shut against them, was it reasonable and moral for Palestinian Arabs to murder and riot to refuse sanctuary to those Jews? Was it OK that they sided with the Nazis because they both hated Jews??

*Let us use a different analogy. Assuming an Australian population of 20 million and a massive refugee crisis, would they countenance an influx of 120 million Chinese? Responsibility for the Holocaust lies with Hitler's Nazi regime. We don't hold all Germans responsible for Hitler, neither should we hold all Palestinians for al-Husayni. Nor may we regard the situations in Germany and Palestine as in some way parallel.*

*Further, the PLO charter of 1964, as amended in 1968 protected the status of Arab Jews, Article 6: 'The Jews who had normally resided in Palestine until the beginning of the Zionist invasion will be considered Palestinians'. That certainly presents problems, but, in the historical context, it does not sound*

unreasonable. 'C' ignores proposals made by the Arab League in 2002, repeated in 2007, and rejected by Israel because it would involve giving up territory, (as required by UN Resolution 242) and the return of Palestinians Refugees. Can we see parallels?

'mideastweb', an online Zionist propaganda source writes; 'The charter speaks for itself. It calls for destruction of a member state of the UN, in violation of the UN charter.' Presumably unaware of the irony that the creation of Israel was in violation of the UN charter.

*And Finally: from 'The Arab Awakening' by George Antonius. Published 1938.*

*"Once the fact is faced that the establishment of a Jewish state in Palestine, or of a national home based on territorial sovereignty, cannot be accomplished without forcibly displacing the Arabs, the way to a solution becomes clearer. It is not beyond the capacity of British, Jewish and Arab statesmanship to devise one. There seems to be no valid reason why Palestine should not be constituted into an independent Arab state in which as many Jews as the country can hold without prejudice to its political and economic freedom would live in peace, security and dignity, and enjoy full rights of citizenship. Such an Arab state would naturally be tied to Great Britain by a freely-negotiated treaty which should contain provisions for the safeguarding of British strategic and economic interests, for ensuring the safety and the inviolability of the Holy Places of all faiths, for the protection of all minorities and minority rights, and for affording the Jewish community the widest freedom in the pursuit of their spiritual and cultural ideals.*

*A solution on those lines would be both fair and practicable. It would protect the natural rights of the Arabs in Palestine and satisfy their legitimate national aspirations. It would enable the Jews. to have a national home in the spiritual and cultural sense, in which Jewish values could flourish and the Jewish genius have the freest play to seek inspiration in the land of its ancient connexion. It would secure Great Britain's interests on a firm basis of consent. And it would restore Palestine to its proper place, as a symbol of peace in the hearts of Judaism, Christianity and Islam.*

*No other solution seems practicable, except possibly at the cost of an unpredictable holocaust of Arab, Jewish and British lives. The relief of Jewish distress caused by European persecution must be sought elsewhere than in Palestine, for the country is too small to hold a larger increase of population, and it has already borne more than its fair share. It is for Great Britain who has taken the lead in this work of charity at Arab expense to turn to the vast resources of her empire and to practise there some of the charity she has been preaching. It is also for the other countries that pride themselves on being civilised and humane to revise the niggardly decisions of the Evian Conference and consent to some of the sacrifices which Arab Palestine has been bullied into making on a scale that has taxed her capacity.*

*The treatment meted out to Jews in Germany and other European countries is a disgrace to its authors and to modern civilisation; but posterity will not exonerate any country that fails to bear its proper share of the sacrifices needed to alleviate Jewish suffering and distress. To place the brunt of the burden upon Arab Palestine is a miserable evasion of the duty that lies upon the whole of the civilised world. It is also morally outrageous. No code of morals can justify the persecution of one people in an attempt to relieve the persecution of another. The cure for the eviction of Jews from Germany is not to be sought in the eviction of the Arabs from their homeland; and the relief of Jewish distress may not be accomplished at the cost of inflicting a corresponding distress upon an innocent and peaceful population.*

*The renunciation will not be easy. Jewish hopes have been raised to such a pitch that the non-fulfilment of the Zionist dream of a Jewish state in Palestine will cause intense disillusionment and bitterness. The manifold proofs of public spirit and of capacity to endure hardships and face danger in the building up of the national home are there to testify to the devotion with which a large section. of the Jewish people cherish the Zionist ideal. And it would be an act of further cruelty to the Jews to disappoint those hopes if there existed some way of satisfying them, that did not involve cruelty to another people. But the logic of facts is inexorable. It shows that no room can be made in Palestine for a second nation except by dislodging or exterminating the nation in possession."*

*A Select and limited Bibliography:*

*The Rise and Fall of the Third Reich. William L. Shirer.*

*Hitler's Holocaust. Guido Knopp.*

*The Holocaust and Collective Memory. Peter Novick.*

*The Arab Awakening. George Antonius*

*The Arabs and the Holocaust. Gilbert Achcar.*  
*Palestine Conference 1939. (Cmd.5974) GB Archive. British Library (on the correspondence between Sir Henry McMahon and Sharif Husayni.*  
*The Mufti of Jerusalem and Palestine. Yehuda Taggar.*  
*Palestinian Leader, Hajj Amin al-Husayni. Taysir Jabarah.*  
*American Zionism and US Foreign Policy 1942-1947. Richard Paul Stevens.*  
*Decision on Palestine. Evan M. Wilson.*  
*Ordinary Men. Christopher Browning.*  
*The Transfer Agreement. Edwin Black.*  
*America and the founding of Israel. John W. Mulhall.*  
*Bitter Harvest: Palestine between 1914-1967. Sami Hadawi.*  
*The Fate of the European Jews, 1939-1945. Jonathan Frankel.*  
*The Arabs, Myth and Reality. Gerald Butt*  
*Fulfilment: the Epic Story of Zionism. Rufus Lears (Note the surname!)*  
*The Diaries of Theodor Herzl (Edited & Translated). Theodor Herzl.*  
*(Various British Government memoranda & documents from the BL Archive).*