

Wa
adv

Report on the State of Palestine

Presented to

The Right Honourable Mr. Winston Churohill P.C., M. P.

BY THE

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE THIRD ARAB PALASTINE
CONGRESS .

Jerusalem, March 28, 1921.

War
adve

Report on the State of Palestine

Presented to

The Right Honourable Mr. Winston Churchill P.C., M.P.

BY THE

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE THIRD ARAB PALASTINE
CONGRESS .

Jerusalem. March 28. 1921.

When Palestine emerged from the Great War she found herself tied down and her adversary, sword in hand bending over her. She found herself, too, separated from her surrounding Arab sisters by vast distances which she had covered by running after an imaginary friend. But she found no friend, she found an enemy rather.

This is the story of Palestine, land of miracles and the supernatural, and the cradle of religions. She neither complained nor was unfaithful to her first friend, but when sorrow filled her breast she breathed a sigh and dropped a tear, and lo the Third Arab Palestine Congress was born. The Congress therefore is a true representative of Palestine, her mouth piece. In it all classes are legally represented. Town, village, factory and farm-in fact all the live aspects of the nation - acknowledged its leadership.

But the enemy of Palestine, ever on the watch, has willed to distort the truth, and to paint

Palestine to the Government other than she really is by questioning the representative status of the members of the congress. To such an extent were these intrigues carried that Sir Herbert Samuel became suspicious and would not recognise the congress. It was then that the whole nation rose as one man and from Dan to Beer-Theba cried out backing the congress, and calling upon the Government to recognize it as their true and legal representative. Unfortunately these peaceful demonstrations were powerless to convince the High Commissioner of the good faith of the people of Palestine, so he persisted in ignoring their congress, knowing full well that this was their one hope and their true spokesman; whilst on the other hand he recognized Zionist congresses, congratulated them, encouraged them, and wished them good luck.

The friendship of the Arab for the Englishman is too obvious to require proof. While still a member of the Ottoman Empire the Arabs leaning towards England brought down on them

the wrath of the Turk, who, as soon as the Great War started, used this as an excuse for venging himself on the Arabs who were tortured, persecuted, exiled and killed. This was not all. The Arab suffered on account of his love for England. When the opportunity presented itself to their leader, King Hussein, he rose in revolt against the Turk, and joined Britain and her Allies, heedless of the fact that in so doing he was combating an Islamic Power to whom he was bound by many strong and permanent ties. The tears and the blood of the Arab flowed with the tears and the blood of the allies. More than this, all Arabs. Moslems and Christians alike, were called upon to join this War. And so it came to pass that Arabs who were out of the reach of the Turk proclaimed open war against him, and started a secret propaganda amongst those within his empire. Thousands of Arabs deserted from the Turkish ranks in consequence. To prove this we will quote here the report sent to German Headquarters by General Leman von Sanders.

He wrote : I have come to Palestine and Syria and found everything against us. The country has been poisoned, and its inhabitants have turned their backs on us. We are living amongst enemies, consequently all our efforts are in vain. We are between two foresthe inhabitants of the countre and enemy we are fighting.

The moment demoralization crept into the Turkish Army Palestinians began openly to point out to the invading troops the weaknesses of the Turks, thus making the conquest of the country an easier task than it would have been had the population been hostile. All this was done in good faith, and without any heed to consequences. The Arabs trusted that such fidelity would be remembered by Great Britain who had given such bindidg paths to their leader, King Husssien.

The Arab did not dislike the Turk because he was Turk. neither did he love the Englishman because he was British; he hated the one because he desired complete independence, and he loved

the other hoping and believing that the Englishman would help him to attain this goal. But the Arab was ambitious, he wanted all and lost all. Palestine, one of our most sacred lands, has been isclated for a thought-out purpose, and this has been the reward of the Allies to the Arabs for their fidelity and the blood they sacrificed; nay, this is their reward for having risen in revolt against their Islamic Ruler. This, too, is their punishment for having thrown themselves so confidingly into the arms of Great Britain and her Allies - a punishment not visited even on Germany their greatest foe.

Finding their country thuse torn up the Arabs lost faith in Britain. Their wise men, however, assured them that England was too far-sighted to allow anything to come between her and the Arabs. Further, they believed that Right, though vanquished, for a time, must win in the end.

Confident in the justice of their cause, the Arabs are convinced that this unnatural partioning of their lands must one day disappear. It

would be a grand task for England - the traditional friend of the Arabs, to accomplish this reunion, and thereby gain the Arabs. For the Arabs are the key to the East, and they possess its doors and passes. Arabia on the Red Sea and the Persian Gulf is the way to India, and Palestine on the Mediterranean holds to-day the balance between the Powers.

Fleets and Armies cannot conquer the heart of a nation. England could have conquered the Arabs' hearts by safe-guarding their country's integrity. Then all these huge millions required for the up-keep of her large armies would be saved to her and her taxpayer.

The relation of Turk to Arab should teach England a lesson. Submitting to the Turk from necessity the moment the Great War started the Arab seized his opportunity and threw off the yoke. To-day the Arab's belief in Britain is not what it was. This is to be deplored, For the Arab is noble and large-hearted, he is also vengeful and never forgets an ill-deed. If England does not take up the cause of the Arabs, other

Powers will. From India, Mesopotamia, the Hedjas and Palestine the cry goes up to England now. If she does not listen, then perhaps Russia will take up their call some day, or perhaps even Germany. For though to-day Russia's voice is not heard in the councils of the Nations, yet the time must come when it will assert itself, and then Russia's right to direct the affairs of Palestine might find amongst the Moslems of the world great support.

In the interests of universal peace, therefore, if not for love of the Arab, England should refrain from taking this false step. Zionists can never be true to her, as they can be true to no one, and to this their mischievous work in Austria, Germany and Russia can testify. They have one and only aim in life from which nothing can divert them.

In spite of repeated warnings of the Turks to the Arabs not to throw themselves to confidently into the arms of great Britain which, under the financial stress of the war, had sold their

country to Zionists, the Arabs still clung to their traditional friend, believing that these warnings were inspired by nothing other than jealousy and a desire to sow seeds of strife. And when, before the conquests of Syria, the information that a compact between Great Britain and Zionists was rumoured they refused to believe it. Then when peace was declared, and Arabs saw with their eyes and heard with their ears that Syria and Palestine were to be separated reparatory to the carrying out of the Balfour Declaration they realised that after all the Turks were right. They also then understood that this was done to enable Zionists to gradually become the Majority in Palestine through immigration.

Had Zionists come to Palestine simply as visitors, or had matters remained as before the war, there would be no question of Jew or non-Jew. It is the idea of transforming Palestine into a home for the Jews that Arabs resent and fight against. The fact that a Jew is a Jew has never prejudiced the Arab against him. Before

the war Jews enjoyed all the privileges and rights of citizenship. The question is not a religious one. For we see that Christian and Moslem alike, whose religions are not similar, unite in their hatred of Zionists.

What greatly surprises Arabs, however, is the fact that of all the Powers of Europe England should have been the one to make this promise to the Jews, which also leads one to suspect her disinterestedness in the matter. To the Jew the National Home idea did not appeal much at first, it was England who created it, but life into it, and carried it into execution even before the ratification of the Mandate by the League of Nations. According to the present rate of immigration Jews will in a few years compose a large proportion of the population, and consequently claim a larger share in the government of the country.

England, moreover, disregarding the feelings of the inhabitants, has appointed a Jew as High Commissioner. With every respect to the person

of Sir Herbert Samuel, we cannot close our eyes to the fact that the predominating majority of the people he governs are not of his own race or faith. It would have been a wiser policy to have appointed an Arab to this high post. In Syria France, acting more in sympathy with the inhabitants, appoints natives to fill exalted positions, and reserves to herself the right of counsel and advice.

Again to the most important post of justice in Palestine, namely that of Legal Secretary, or Minister of Justice, a Jew has been appointed. And what is worse, this official is an out and out Zionist. In a book he recently wrote he strongly advocates the quite persecution of the Arab in order to force him finally to quit the country.

We will now proceed to dissect the Balfour Declaration and to show how to the Arab, the Palestinian and the Britisher it is strongly prejudicial.

(A) From a legal point of view.

1. Before drawing a contract with Zionists for the sale of Palestine England had drawn a contract with King Hussein by virtue of which he was to be given Arab lands. Consequently the contract with king Hussein annuls that with the Jews. In the eye of the Law the first is valid and the second is not. Shall it go down to History, then, that England was false to her plighted word through Mr. Balfour? and was it not for the sake of a plighted word to the Belgians that she unsheathed her sword in the Great War?

2. King Hussein paid a price for his contract by rising against the Turks. This was his part of the contract. England's contract with the Jews, therefore, can have no legal value as long as king Hussein is ignorant of it. So far,

then, as the Arabs are concerned the Balfour Declaration is not valid.

Besides, there were understandings with France and Russia before this Declaration was made; consequently, though France was influenced to include it in the Mandate international law cannot give it a legal status.

3. Countries with their civil and other rights and privileges are the property of their inhabitants and constitute an heirloom of the nation, handed down from father to son. Now the people of Palestine inherited this country from their ancestors, as these did from those who had gone before them. Palestine, therefore, with its air, water, lands and roads, commerce, industry and agriculture, is an inalienable possession of the nation, and neither England nor any other Power can bring a foreigner in to share this inheritance. But Palestinians are gradually losing their birthright through Jewish immigration, and thanks to Mr. Balfour's Declaration, which was denounced in the Press, from the

Pulpit, and before the American Commission.

But it might be argued that Mr. Balfour spoke on behalf of the British Cabinet of which he is a member. But even this does not give his Declaration any legal validity, since Great Britain, though occupying the country, does not possess it. Putting aside for one moment Mr. Wilson's Fourteen Points and the repeated assertions of the Allies that they were not out in this war for colonisation or self-aggrandisement, we find in international law that a conquering people can lay hands only on the personal possessions of the defeated Power and on its rights and privileges, but that it has no right to touch anything that belongs to private persons.

In the light of international law, then, Mr. Balfour's Declaration is an act of modern bolshevism, pure and simple.

4. One of the great laws governing international treaties is that the two parties should possess the quality of government. A treaty

between a governing Power and an individual cannot have international forces.

Now the contract between Great Britain and Zionists over Palestine is one between a Great Power and a company of men who are neither a Power nor a Nation. In fact, it is a contract between England and a collection of history, imagination, and ideals existing only in the brains of Zionists who are a company, a commission but not a Nation. Is it right or just, then, that a treaty concluded with King Hussein should be made null and void by one made with Zionists.

For thousands of years Jews have been scattered over the earth, and have become nationals of the various nations amongst whom they settled. They have no separate political or lingual existence. In Germany they are Germans, in France Frenchmen, and in England Englishmen, Religion and language are their only tie. But Hebrew is a dead language and might be discarded. How then could England conclude a treaty

with a religion and register it in the League of Nations ?

Nay, rather, how could the Jews themselves agree to this treaty. For if there exists a Jewish Power and a Jewish Nation, what is the status, amongst others, of those high Jewish officials who are serving England to-day? Are they Jewish nationals or English nationals? for it is obvious they cannot be both at the same time.

Sir Herbert Samuel and Lord Reading are Englishmen and jews. Now if jew-ism is a nationality what about their English-ism? One -ism must be sacrificed for the other, but which for which ?

Besides, this promise was made long before British troops came into possession of Palestine, and since this victory was an Allied one, France, Italy and the Arabs having taken active parts in it, the consent of all should be secured before any gift is made. But the Arabs have not been consulted, and never will consent.

and Russia, when it wakes up, will have a word to say,

5. There can be no question that Palestine belongs legally to the Arabs. They inherited it from their ancestors, and have been occupying it for more than twenty centuries. The jews saw, knew, and accepted this fact. Now, had they any right to own Palestine they would have contested our occupation of it long ago, or, at least lodged a protest against us. But they did nothing of the kind, knowing full well they had nothing to claim.

Moreover, in the days of the Turks the jews the great majority of whom were nationals of European Governments, and consequently protected by the Capitulations, could have used their privileges and the weakness of the Turkish Government to extort at least some official recognition of their claim to Palestine. In fact, some European Powers would have abetted and encouraged them in their demands. But no claim was made, and native Palestinians rema-

ined undisturbed in the possession of their country.

After all this can any one doubt that Palestine belongs to the Arabs, and that the Balfour Declaration is a gross injustice.

(B) Historical point of view.

Zionists and Great Britain appeal to History in confirmation of their claim. Because at one period of history the jews conquered this land and lived in it, hence, it is argued, they should possess it for ever.

The argument contains more of poetry in it than logic. According to it the Arabs should claim Spain since once upon a time they conquered it and there developed a high civilization. Why then should Palestine be given back to the jews and Spain remain in the hands of Spaniards. The Turks, too, at one time conquered all the Balkan States right up to Vienna, why does Europe then keep these back from them ?

Even while in possession of Palestine for about 400 years the jews' right to it was always contested by their neighbours, Wars, revolts, religious and political agitations and internal troubles filled the whole period; and it was only during the reign of King Solomon that peace prevailed. But the Arabs' reign in Palestine was undisturbed for a long time until the Crusades arrived and then they bought the country again, for the second time, after having once bought it from the Romans, by shedding rivers of blood. Besides, they were always at peace with their neighbours - an achievement which the Israelites cannot claim.

It might be argued, too, that the Jews' claim to Palestine rests on the monuments and buildings which their ancestors built and left behind them. As a matter of fact no nation in History has left less behind it than the Jews; and those temples and monuments established by them in their golden age disappeared before the nation was scattered.

But if ancient monuments establish a claim what about Arab and Turkish monuments in Europe to-day; and does not every ruin in Palestine bespeak Arab origin.

It is surprising to think that students of ancient Jewish history interest themselves in the religion and kingly glory of this people and neglect that other part of it dealing with revolts, mutinies internal troubles and those wars with their neighbours which finally led to their expulsion from the land. Have statesmen ever found out the reasons why the Israelites could not get on with their neighbours, or why they were so detested by all surrounding tribes? We believe that such a study would reveal points that may prove very helpful to modern Diplomacy and Statecraft.

Arabs on the other hand have lived here for centuries at peace with all their neighbours, and even the very long reign of the Turk was not able to change the character of the land or to Turkify its inhabitants.

(C) Moral point of view.

Jews have been amongst the most active advocates of destruction in many lands, especially where their influential positions have enabled them to do more harm. It is well known that the disintegration of Russia was wholly or in great part brought about by Jews, and a large proportion of the defeat of Germany and Austria must also be put at their door. When the star of the Central Powers was in the ascendant Jews flattered them, but the moment the scale turned in favour of the Allies Jews withdrew their support from Germany, opened their coffers to the Allies, and received in return that most uncommon promise.

We have seen a book entitled « The Jewish Peril » which should be read by every one who still doubts the pernicious motives of the Jews towards the Powers that be and towards Civilization. It is a collection of the minutes of a

secret society of prominent Jews who meet from time to time to discuss world affairs in relation to Judaism. The book is replete with an overflow-
flowing hatred of mankind and Christendom in particular. It points out in detail ways and means for upsetting the present order of things so that out of the ensuing chaos Jews might come out masters of the world.

Looking into the ranks of socialism, we find Jewish names such as Carl Marx, Becknin and Trotsky topping the list, besides a host of others as pernicious, if not as renowned.

The jew, moreover, is clannish and unneighbourly, and cannot mix with those who live about him. He will enjoy the privileges and benefits of a country but will give nothing in return. The jew is a jew all the world over. He amasses the wealth of a country and then leads its people whom he has already impoverished where he chooses. He encourages wars when self-interest dictates, and thus uses the armies of the nations to do his bidding.

Palestine suffers in this manner from her Jewish colonies. Wherever these exist the surrounding peasant population has had to sell out and migrate. Because of their clannishness Jews will, as far as they can help it, not employ a native or buy at his store or benefit him in any way; on the contrary, they will watch every opportunity to harm him if this can be done with impunity.

In commerce and finance they are pitiless foes. Since Palestine opened its doors to them its trade has gradually drifted into their hands. They depreciate the value of land and property and at the same time manipulate a financial crisis in order that landlords, under the stress of need, should sell out at ruinous prices.

Can Europe then expect the Arab to live and work with such a neighbour? Had not England better find a country for them in the vast uninhabited regions of her great Empire.

If Russia and Poland with their spacious countries were unable to tolerate them how could

Europe expect Palestine to welcome them? Can the Arabs carry the burden which Europe is unable to support; or will the Jew, on coming to Palestine, change his skin and lose all those qualities which have hitherto made him an object of dislike to the nations?

(D) Economic point of view.

1. But there are economic difficulties in Mr. Balfour's Declaration which render it valueless in our view.

Under Turkish rule the whole Empire was one big field for the trade of the Palestinian. From Constantinople to Mesopotamia and from the Red Sea to the Indian Ocean there was one system of customs, and coinage. To-day all this has changed. Goods sent to Damascus or Beyrout are charged double customs, merchants going north or east must have passports which entail delays, expense and worry. All this is had for business.

Now the Palestinian merchant is comparatively poor, while Zionists have wealth; consequently they will be able soon to compete with him, crush and drive him out of the market. This done they will turn on the consumer and force him to accept their prices. To say trade is free does not help matters. In Europe governments endeavour by laws and taxation to protect their trade; why does not the Government here do likewise?

2. Palestine is an agricultural country and depends largely on her export of cereals for a living. Now Jewish immigration has raised the cost of living, and the Government, in order to keep prices down in the interest of the Jewish consumer, has prohibited the export of certain cereals, with the result that the granaries of the land are stocked with products, and merchants cannot find an outlet for their trade. Consequently a financial crisis set in and hundreds of merchants were bankrupt. Now if this is the policy of Zionists while they still form a small

minority what will it be when they become more numerous.

Again, Palestine was ruined by the war, and is in dire need of money. The Jews started their campaign of advancing money on land and property. This can have one and only conclusion: Jews will finally buy up these mortgaged lands, oust the owners and rule in their place.

3. Again, in order to bring Palestine up to the level of European countries the Government, in spite of the poverty of the people, has started a series of innovations and improvements which though useful, are not so keenly needed at the present moment. It has opened up new unnecessary roads, repaired old ones which fully served their purpose, widened some railway lines and created public gardens. The poor tax-payer has been charged with costs. On the other hand needs of more vital importance such as public education have been grudged their due budgets. Recognizing the benefits of these improvements, we would like our treasury not to exceed its

financial capacity but to go slow, putting what is vital and essential before that which is a comparative luxury.

The above-mentioned works, too, are undertaken more in order to give employment to the thousands of Jewish immigrants than because they are immediate necessities. The Jewish labourer on these works is paid double the amount given to the native, though he does less work.

Ever since the High Commissioner took the reins of office he has been considering the floating of a loan for public works, or, in other words, he wants to borrow money in the name of the native tax-payer in order to help out Jewish immigrants. Is it not enough that the highest posts with fat salaries are given to the Jews, while the native official who is more conversant with local needs is relegated to a third class position with a salary too little for his needs and out of all proportion with his work.

(E) Expense to the British Government.

Thanks to the back-sliding efforts of Zionists the Government has come to consider natives as enemies with whom she should be always on her guard. Consequently a huge army is maintained in order to keep them quiet. Seven millions a year have been quoted as a moderate estimate for this army. Who is to pay? Certainly not the Palestine Treasury as its whole income does not come up to one third of this amount. Is it to be accumulated as a debt on the country to be paid when better days set in? We do not think the British Government would ever do such a thing. But if England pays what would her tax-payer say? If Zionists lent this amount the interest on the money would be enormous. The British tax-payer could hardly be expected to pay willingly seven millions a year for something which is valueless

to him .

Yes, the British Army in Palestine is of immense value to the Jews, and it is to their interest and safety that it is kept.

(F) Political effects.

We would call the attention of Great Britain to the following three points : —

1. Zionists are ambitious. If to-day they accept the mandate of England they may not do so tomorrow. Their one aim is to establish a Jewish kingdom, bring back the glory of Israel in the « Land of Promise », and gradually control the world. This ideal is expressed by their leader Mr. Herzl and by other Jewish writers. Already they complain that England has given them less than she promised. Here is their first word of ingratitude. They propose that a Jewish army be created to take the place of British troops. In this we have a foretaste of what is to come, for, once they are strong enough, they will turn

their backs on England as they did on Germany and Russia.

2. If England goes out of Egypt how would she like to see the keeping of the eastern side of the Sues Canal in the hands of a Jewish State .

3. Egypt, India, Mesopotamia, Arabia and Palestine, all these countries are a chain in the East, what takes place in the one finds an echo in them all, since not only have they similar customs and habits but also the same religion. Now, as soon as this National Home is realized there will migrate into Palestine the undesirables of Russia and Poland - men and women imbued with bolshevism, poor and uneducated. As soon as Zionists cease to aid these they will revolt against them, against the Government and against society.

Economic troubles in which natives of Palestine were invited to take part have actually occurred many a time already, and it was only through the assistance of the Government that

they were not allowed to spread. Now if such things can happen to-day when the number of immigrants is small, how will it be when they number hundreds of thousands, and who can guarantee that during some future trouble the natives who are poor and ignorant will again refuse to join.

Once bolshevism spreads in Palestine it will quickly extend to other Arab peoples who are free and democratic by nature, and who possess little more than their swords and emotions.

Will England, who should be the greatest foe of bolshevism be pleased to see it grow in Palestine and from it spread into Arab lands?

Observations on the Mandate.

When the Great War was over the Allies, in conformity with Mr. Wilson's Fourteen Articles, recognized the principle of self-determination for smaller nations. An American Commission was sent out to the East to learn the wish of the people. All declared in favour of independence and national government. But statesmen saw differently and, in spite of the Fourteen Articles, created the novel principle of Mandate. The nation, however, has not departed from its original purpose, and protests most strongly against the terms of the Mandate as they appeared in «The Jewish Chronicle». Though we reserve to ourselves the right of claiming the carrying out of our demands as expressed to the American Commission, we will here discuss certain essential aspects of this Mandate.

1. The Mandate is based on Article 22 of the League of Nations which gives certain rights to smaller peoples who are divided into 3 classes according to their progress in civilization and their capacity for self-government. Nations of the first class can be self-governing, the Mandatory Power rendering only counsel and help; while Mandates of the second class give the Mandatory Power the right to share in the internal administration of the nation.

Palestinians do not know to what class

they were not allowed to spread. Now if such things can happen to-day when the number of immigrants is small, how will it be when they number hundreds of thousands, and who can guarantee that during some future trouble the natives who are poor and ignorant will again refuse to join.

Once bolshevism spreads in Palestine it will quickly extend to other Arab peoples who are free and democratic by nature, and who possess little more than their swords and emotions.

Will England, who should be the greatest foe of bolshevism be pleased to see it grow in Palestine and from it spread into Arab lands?

Observations on the Mandate.

When the Great War was over the Allies, in conformity with Mr. Wilson's Fourteen Articles, recognized the principle of self-determination for smaller nations. An American Commission was sent out to the East to learn the wish of the people. All declared in favour of independence and national government. But statesmen saw differently and, in spite of the Fourteen Articles, created the novel principle of Mandate. The nation, however, has not departed from its original purpose, and protests most strongly against the terms of the Mandate as they appeared in «The Jewish Chronicle». Though we reserve to ourselves the right of claiming the carrying out of our demands as expressed to the American Commission, we will here discuss certain essential aspects of this Mandate.

1. The Mandate is based on Article 22 of the League of Nations which gives certain rights to smaller peoples who are divided into 3 classes according to their progress in civilization and their capacity for self-government. Nations of the first class can be self-governing, the Mandatory Power rendering only counsel and help; while Mandates of the second class give the Mandatory Power the right to share in the internal administration of the nation.

Palestinians do not know to what class

they were not allowed to spread. Now if such things can happen to-day when the number of immigrants is small, how will it be when they number hundreds of thousands, and who can guarantee that during some future trouble the natives who are poor and ignorant will again refuse to join.

Once bolshevism spreads in Palestine it will quickly extend to other Arab peoples who are free and democratic by nature, and who possess little more than their swords and emotions.

Will England, who should be the greatest foe of bolshevism be pleased to see it grow in Palestine and from it spread into Arab lands?

Observations on the Mandate.

When the Great War was over the Allies, in conformity with Mr. Wilson's Fourteen Articles, recognized the principle of self-determination for smaller nations. An American Commission was sent out to the East to learn the wish of the people. All declared in favour of independence and national government. But statesmen saw differently and, in spite of the Fourteen Articles, created the novel principle of Mandate. The nation, however, has not departed from its original purpose, and protests most strongly against the terms of the Mandate as they appeared in «The Jewish Chronicle». Though we reserve to ourselves the right of claiming the carrying out of our demands as expressed to the American Commission, we will here discuss certain essential aspects of this Mandate.

1. The Mandate is based on Article 22 of the League of Nations which gives certain rights to smaller peoples who are divided into 3 classes according to their progress in civilization and their capacity for self-government. Nations of the first class can be self-governing, the Mandatory Power rendering only counsel and help; while Mandates of the second class give the Mandatory Power the right to share in the internal administration of the nation.

Palestinians do not know to what class

they belong. England has kept us out of the first class entirely, though she does not say so in plain terms. The words of the Mandate do not mention the article of the League from which this Mandatory power is derived. Plainness here would have been more to the purpose.

It can be shown, however, from the very terms of the Mandate that we belong to the third class. And here are the proofs :—

In article « I » we read that the Mandatory Power has the right to exercise the power inherent in the Government of a Sovereign State. We would ask what power? and how is the exercise of this power compatible with self-government?

Again in article « II » it is stated that the Mandatory power shall have full powers to provide for public ownership or control of any of the natural resources of the country. Are these powers, again we ask, in keeping with self-government granted to nations of the first category? We have gone carefully through the Mandate but can find in it no hope. There is some encouragement for self-government, but how to harmonize this with what is actually taking place is the problem.

Further we find that the Mandate refers to what is congenial to it in the League of Nations, and leaves out entirely what is favour

able to the Arabs. But the article allows much to depend on the wish of the nation. Has Great Britain learnt our wishes? She knows them, but refuses to carry them through. We have made these wishes known to the American Commission and to Great Britain through various protests and Congresses. Has the Government or the League of Nations removed this conditions from the Article, or is it valid for all countries excepting Palestine?

Lord Curzon declared that the People of Palestine would certainly reject the principle of a National Home and all that this involves.

Besides, the failure of the Government to declare the nature of this Mandate must give birth to endless troubles in the future with the League of Nations. Palestine should be treated like Syria and Mesopotamia at least, for she is not below them in her capacity for self-government.

France, by the mouth of M. Poincaré and others has made plain her position in Syria, She is to give counsel and advice. Is England to be less liberal than France and usurp powers in Palestine which her great Ally has so generously left in the hands of the natives of Syria?

2. Again we do not see where the Jews come in in the Mandate, and where the Government derives her right of handing over to them Crow-

nllands which are not her own. Nor can we see why the Zionist Commission should be appointed as the Government's advisory body on all economic questions and public works. These crown lands are the property of the nation, and belong to the tenants who from time immemorial have lived on them and cultivated them. The Government, therefore, cannot give them over to the Jews.

Further, by what right did the Government appoint the Zionist Commission to share with it the execution of public works to the exclusion of all other bodies?

3. The Mandate is replete with the assurance that our civil and religious Rights would be strictly observed. This is quite superfluous as no government on Earth, however low its ideals, dare interfere with religious tenets of a people. Consequently the assurance grants nothing new. The Turks who are an Islamic Power never interfered in the religious exercises of other communities. Nay more, they went to a great deal of trouble and expense to safeguard the due exercise of these religions, and demanded no recognition of gratitude from them, believing this to be her bounden duty as a Government.

As to our civil rights these two mean nothing more than that equality and justice will be given us before the law. Obviously no privilege is contained in this. On the other hand the Jews

have been granted a true advantage namely that of becoming our rulers. We are to have equal rights of justice with them before the Law, but they are to have in addition to this the preference in politics and in the economic life of the country, of which the Mandate has seen fit to deprive us.

4. Then again the country is called upon to share in the up-keep of a large army for which there is not the slightest need, since all the neighbouring states are Arab and friendly, except to safeguard the principles of a National Home, and to burden the country with a load of debt under which it can never aspire to independence in the future.

The whole country awaited the coming of the English with boundless joy, but as soon as these arrived and their policy began to unfold itself disappointment reigned everywhere.

Under the Turks we governed ourselves through our representative parliament, and the only Turkish official in our midst was the Wali or Mutasarrif who had his advisory native elected council to help him. In the majority of cases even these officials were from amongst ourselves. In the courts too all the judges and members of the Bench were natives, and each one of us could work up to the highest legal position. There were schools for each branch of civil activity, whose graduates were employed in their several specific departments. Governors under-

stood the language of the people they governed, taxation was low. We had the right to criticise the Government in the Press, at public meetings and from Pulpits.

Now all this has changed. We have no voice or say in the government of the country, no representative parliament. The Legal Secretary with few under him are the source of our laws and legal system, in spite of the fact that the treaty with Turkey has not yet been signed and the Mandate not ratified. The highest posts are given to foreigners. The Legal Secretary and the Director of Commerce are Jews. Fabulous salaries are allowed to officials incompetent to do the work, while competent natives are granted a mere pittance. Unnecessary posts are created to give employment to officials, while others, vital to the running of the country, are suspended. The native Press is tied down to a narrow circle, and for the most innocent expressions of opinion fines are imposed, often followed by imprisonment while Zionists carry on their daily campaigns against the natives with impunity. Travelling in the country and out of it has been so hemmed in with difficulties and expence, and the export trade has been so regulated that men prefer to stop where they are and accumulate their stocks of cereals rather than submit to unreasonable worries.

For all the above reasons we ask in the name of Justice and Right that : —

First. The principle of a National Home for the Jews be abolished.

Second. A National Government be created which shall be responsible to a parliament elected by the Palestinian people who existed in Palestine before the War.

Third. A stop be put to Jewish immigration until such time as a National Government is formed.

Fourth. Laws and regulations before the War be still carried out and all others framed after the British occupation be annulled, and no new laws be created until a National Government comes into being.

Fifth. Palestine should not be separated from her sister states.

*For the Executive Committee
of the*

*Arab Palestinian Congress
Moussa Kazem El Asussaini
President*

1 — 13 Introduction

General Observations.

The Arab Congress Representative
of the Nation.

The Arab an Ally.

The « National Home » Idea
Criticised.

13 — 19 From a Legal Point of view.

19 — 21 From a Historical Point of view.

22 — 25 From a Moral Point of view.

25 — 28 From an Economical Point of view.

29 — 30 Expense to Great Britain.

30 — 32 Political Effects Resulting from the
Realization of a Jewish Kingdom.

33 — 39 Observations on the Mandate.