

Soon after the death of Theodor Herzl, the question of publishing his diaries arose. Max Nordau, one of Herzl's disciples, emphatically opposed their publication, saying, "You will ruin Herzl's name if you publish his diaries. Whoever reads them is bound to believe that he was a fool and a swindler."

Nordau did not elaborate on this statement, but possibly it related to Herzl's views, as propounded in his diary, on the appropriate treatment for the indigenous population of the proposed Jewish State.

In mid-1896 Herzl started keeping a diary devoted entirely to the Jewish cause. An early entry reveals Herzl's plans for the non-Jewish population of his proposed "Jewish State."

Herzl wrote, "we shall try to spirit the penniless population across the border by procuring employment for it in the transit countries whilst denying it any employment in our own country."

If the Jewish State were to be established in an area of wild animals or big snakes, Herzl said, "I shall use the natives, prior to giving them employment in the transit countries, for the extermination of these animals."

Herzl also had definite plans for the non-Jewish land owners. He wrote, "We must expropriate gently the private property on the estates assigned to us." However, Herzl realized that both the expropriation and removal of the poor would have to be carried out "discreetly and circumpectly."

He, therefore, wrote in his diary, "Let the owners of immovable property believe that they are cheating us, selling us things for more than they are worth. But we are not going to let them anything less."

Herzl devoted a number of pages in his diary to the methods of expropriation, for which he would appoint "secret agents." Strict precautions were to be taken to ensure that property, once acquired by Jews, could never revert to non-Jews.

Herzl realized that some property owners would, for

Herzl on Transfer of Arabs

By Rabbi Dr. Chaim Simons
Director, The Nansen Institute
Kiryat Arba - Hebron

sentimental reasons, be reluctant to part with their properties. In such cases these people "will be offered a complete transportation in any place they wish." However, in the case of estate owners not accepting this offer, no harm would be done to them.

From the above extracts, it is noticeable that Herzl did not use the words "Palestine" or "Arabs". As can be seen from his book "The Jewish State," which was written at the same period, Herzl had not yet decided on the final location of the Jewish State. Only in mid-1896 did his thoughts focus on Palestine.

It is also noticeable that Herzl's plans for the non-Jewish population of the Jewish State were confined to his private diary alone. These plans are totally absent from his book "The Jewish State". In fact, in his book, Herzl proposed the use of Jews to rid the country of wild beasts, instead of the "natives" of his diary.

Herzl obviously foresaw that the extreme measures he advocated in planning colonization in the Jewish State would temporarily alienate civilized opinion. He, therefore, wrote in his diary, "At first, incidentally, people will avoid us. We are in bad odor." He realized, however, that this would only be a transient phenomenon, and in time world opinion would turn in favor of the Jewish State.

Do Herzl's diaries accurately reflect his thoughts? Harry Zohn, the English translator of his diaries, gives a definite affirmative answer. Zohn wrote that Herzl's diaries are a "remarkably frank record of the incorruptible, outspoken Herzl who detested dissimulation and self-deception."

A few years later, in early 1899, Youssef Zia Al-Khalidi,

the Mayor of Jerusalem, wrote a letter to Zedek Kahn, Chief Rabbi of France, suggesting that the Jews immigrate to a place other than Palestine.

This letter was passed on to Herzl who replied in a weak and reassuring tone, "But who would think of sending them (the non-Jewish population of Palestine) away?"

However, only two years later, in his Draft Charter for Palestine, Herzl was to write of Arab transfer somewhat differently.

It had long been one of Herzl's objectives to achieve a charter for Palestine. At a meeting with the Sultan in mid-1904, Herzl gained the impression that if Jewish finances were to render very substantial aid to the Ottoman Empire, the Sultan would be ready to consider favorably the idea of a Charter for Jewish settlement in Palestine.

Herzl, therefore, drew up such a draft Charter for a "Jewish-Ottoman Land Company." Paragraph 3 of this Charter gave the Company right to acquire certain (Arab) lands in Palestine, giving in exchange comparative plots of land within the Ottoman Empire. The Company would have to pay the emigration costs of the previous owners and give them an advance for their resettlement.

This Charter was unrealistic, since the Jewish bankers whom Herzl approached for the Sultan's loan told him to return when he had a firm agreement with the Sultan. The Sultan told Herzl that he would only negotiate after he had the loan.

Herzl made none of his plans for the non-Jewish population of the Jewish State public during his lifetime. His diary was not published until nearly twenty years after his death, and his draft Charter ten years later still.

(The Nansen Institute, a non-political organization, has as one of its main objectives historical research into proposals which have been made for the transfer of population from Eretz-Israel to the Diaspora. Donations to enable continued research may be sent to The Nansen Institute, c/o Rabbi Dr. Chaim Simons, 306/20 Kiryat Arba.)

Ben-Gurion On Transfer Of Arabs

by Rabbi Dr. Chaim Simons*

The one-hundredth anniversary of the birth of David Ben-Gurion is at present being commemorated by ceremonies, lectures and television programmes. However, one subject which tends to be omitted from these commemorative events is Ben-Gurion's views on the transfer of Arabs from Eretz-Israel.

Broadly speaking, Ben-Gurion's pre-State views on transfer can be divided into three stages. The first, during the First World War when he strongly opposed the removal of the Arabs; the second, during the late thirties when he became an enthusiastic supporter of compulsory transfer of the Arabs from Eretz-Israel; and the third in the early forties, when he modified his views on this subject in his public utterances.

Ben-Gurion came on Aliyah in 1904. After the start of the First World War he was deported from Palestine by the Turks, who at that time ruled the country. He went to the United States and together with Yitzchak Ben-Zvi toured the country recruiting for a pioneer army (Hehalutz).

In 1916, while touring, Ben-Gurion sent Ben-Zvi some brief notes on Jewish settlement in Palestine. In them he emphasized, "We did not come to expel the Arabs but to build up the land for ourselves."

Two years later, in an article entitled "The Rights of Jews and Others in Palestine," Ben-Gurion asserted that even if the Jews were to be given the power to remove the Arabs, they would have neither the right nor ability to utilize it. "It is not proper nor possible to deport the country's present inhabitants."

In the mid-1930s Ben-Gurion's attitude towards transfer of the Arabs went through a complete turnaround.

At a meeting with the British High Commissioner in mid-1936, Ben-Gurion proposed that the Jews be permitted to purchase land in Transjordan for the resettlement of Palestinian Arabs. During the course of the subsequent year, Ben-Gurion repeatedly put forward this proposal in meetings, in letters and in his personal diary.

His proposals were not limited to transferring Arabs to Transjordan, since at the end of 1937 he proposed in his diary to transfer "large numbers of (Arab) tenant farmers and Bedouins to Northern Syria. The land there is cheap and plentiful."

Ben-Gurion's most enthusiastic comments on transfer came after the publication of the recommendations of the British Peel Commission in mid-1937.

Briefly, this Report recommended the establishment of separate Jewish and Arab States in Eretz-Israel. Under the heading "Exchange of Land and Population," the Report proposed transferring the Arabs of the Plains and the Balcan out of the area of the Jewish State by compulsion if necessary and the Arabs of the Galilee out of the area by voluntary means.

In his first reactions, Ben-Gurion was hesitant. Maybe it was better to forgo the compulsory transfer and to request in its place the addition of the Negev to the area of the proposed Jewish State.

By the following day, however, Ben-Gurion concluded that transfer of the Arabs was more important than any demand for additional land.

Ben-Gurion regarded this compulsory transfer as the most important item in the Report. It outweighed all the deficiencies and drawbacks of the Report. "With the removal of the Arabs from the Plains, we are getting for the first time in our history a truly Jewish State," he wrote in his diary.

He felt, however, that the primary obstacle to the realization of this proposal was a lack of appreciation among the Jewish community of the importance of a compulsory transfer. Any wavering or hesitation on the part of the Zionists as to the justice of such a transfer would be likely to lose the Jews a historic opportunity which would never recur.

Ben-Gurion concluded this diary entry with a reiteration of the need for an immediate implementation of this transfer proposal. "We must do this now - and the first and perhaps decisive step is preparing ourselves to implement it."

The Peel Report recommendations limited the transfer of Arabs from the Galilee to a voluntary basis. From another diary entry we can see that Ben-Gurion would have liked the right to remove these Galilean Arabs compulsorily in the same way as the Arabs of the Plains were to be compulsorily removed.

Ben-Gurion's enthusiastic attitude towards transfer was also illustrated in letters which he wrote at that period to his sixteen year old son Amos.

He felt that since the British were planning to found an Arab State in a part of Eretz-Israel which had previously been promised to the Jews, "it is only fair that the Arabs in our State be transferred to the Arab area."

In a further letter written a few months later, Ben-Gurion displayed more extreme views. "We must expel

Arabs and take their place." This version is to be found in the official Ben-Gurion archives in Eretz-Israel. The published edition of this letter (found in Letters to Paula), omits this phrase!

Ben-Gurion saw nothing immoral in compulsory transfer. To a closed meeting of the Jewish Agency Executive, he said, "I favor compulsory transfer. I see nothing unethical about it."

In the early 1940's, Ben-Gurion's public utterances on the subject were much more restrained. At the conference of American Zionists held at the Biltmore Hotel in mid-1942, Ben-Gurion said that were the Arabs to ask the Zionists to help them transfer Arabs to neighbouring countries, they (the Zionists) would agree. On the other hand, this was not a matter in which the Zionists could or ought to take any initiative.

"Let the Arabs be encouraged to move out (of Palestine) as the Jews move in," resolved the British Labour Party in 1944. Publicly, Ben-Gurion demurred. In private, however, he was pleased that non-Jews had made such a proposal. "It seems to me that we need not be sorry that the word 'transfer' was used by non-Jews."

So long as the British ruled Eretz-Israel, Ben-Gurion could only talk on this subject - he could not act. In May 1945, the British left the country and Ben-Gurion was made Prime Minister.

Following the capture of Nazareth, the Prime Minister visited the city. On asking so many Arabs he asked, "Why are there so many Arabs? Why don't you expel them?"

In the case of Lod and Ramleh, Ben-Gurion met with his Army chiefs to plan the capture of these cities. The Commander of the Palmach, Yigal Allon, asked Ben-Gurion, "What shall we do with the Arabs?" Ben-Gurion retorted, "expel them." This was immediately communicated to the Army Headquarters and the expulsion implemented.

We can thus see that as soon as he had the power to do so, Ben-Gurion put into practice his most extreme stand on the question of transfer of the Arab population - namely, their expulsion.

(To Be Continued)
* The author is the Director of the Nansen Institute, a non-political organization, has as one of its main objectives historical research into proposals which have been made for the transfer of population from Eretz-Israel to the Diaspora. Donations to continue with this important research may be sent to The Nansen Institute c/o Rabbi Dr. Chaim Simons, 306/20 Kiryat Arba.

Weizman on Transfer of Arabs

By Rabbi Dr. Chaim Simons

Director, The Nansen Institute, Kiryat Arba-Hebron.

On a British radio programme in December, 1963, following tributes paid to Chaim Weizman, first President of the State of Israel, an argument was conducted in the Letters to the Editor columns of the British Jewish Press on Weizman's professed attitude towards the transfer of Arabs from *Eretz-Israel*.

Boris Guriel, Director of the Weizmann Archives, claimed that Weizmann had favoured transfer. Sir Leon Simon, a leading British Zionist, took the opposite view.

Each side found its own proofs in Weizmann's letters and speeches. An incensed Sir Leon challenged Guriel to produce "much more convincing evidence...in support of so grave an imputation on the character of a leader to whose heritage he (Guriel) claims to adhere."

All that was written in early 1964. Since that time the "much more convincing evidence" demanded by Sir Leon has become available as archives in Israel and Britain have been opened up to historians. Such archival material clearly shows that in the 1930's and early 1940's Weizmann was a strong supporter and proposer of transfer of the Arabs from *Eretz-Israel*.

Prior to this period, however, Weizmann did speak out publicly against transferring the Arabs from Palestine. In an address given to the Zionist Conference in London in late 1919, Weizmann states, "We cannot go into the country like Junkers; we cannot afford to drive out other people."

However, only a decade or so later, Weizmann's attitude to this subject changed.

In October 1930, the British Government published a document popularly known as the "Passfield White Paper." This document, if implemented, would have effectively put an end to the rebuilding of the Jewish National Home in Palestine. As a result of pressure exerted on the British Government, a committee composed of members of the Government and members of the Jewish Agency had several joint meetings to reach agreement on the contents of a new document (the "MacDonald Letter") which would modify the British Government's new policy.

During the course of one of these meetings, Weizmann proposed developing Transjordan for the purpose of "transmigration of Arabs" from the congested area of Western Palestine to vacant land in Transjordan.

A few months later, Weizmann visited *Eretz-Israel* and in a meeting with the High Commissioner again put forward this suggestion.

Weizmann's most enthusiastic response to transfer came after the publication of the Peel Report in mid-1937. Amongst the proposals recommended by the Commission was a transfer of population, compulsory if necessary.

About a fortnight after the publication of this Report, Weizmann had a secret meeting with the British Colonial Secretary, William Ormsby-Gore. Afterwards, Weizmann wrote a document recording the substance of the meeting.

Weizmann attached the greatest importance to the transfer proposal and recorded, "I said that the whole success of the scheme depended upon whether the Government genuinely did or did not wish to carry out this recommendation (on the transfer of the Arabs)."

Ormsby-Gore's minutes of this meeting recorded Weizmann as saying that the Jews "will help in getting Arabs out of Galilee into Trans-Jordan." This indicates that Weizmann was proposing still more extreme measures than those advocated by the Commission, who limited the transfer from Galilee to a voluntary basis.

Incidentally, Weizmann's highly confidential document was purloined from his office and produced at the twentieth Zionist Conference held in Zurich a few weeks later. It was subsequently published in several British newspapers, much to Weizmann's consternation.

Immediately after his meeting with Ormsby-Gore, Weizmann wrote him a letter confirming the points discussed. On the question of transfer, Weizmann wrote, "I was reassured to find that you agree with me about the crucial importance of transfer for the success of a partition scheme."

Weizmann wrote a great abundance of letters—twenty to twenty-five thousand in the course of his Zionist career! In a number of his letters written at the period of the publication of the Peel Report, he naturally referred to this

population transfer proposal.

From these letters we can see that Weizmann was pleasantly surprised by the population transfer proposal. He also cited the very restricted area of the proposed Jewish State as a reason for making a transfer of Arabs "absolutely essential."

In early 1939, the British convened a conference of Jewish and Arab leaders at St. James's Palace in London.

At that period, an American philanthropist, Edward Norman, was working on a plan to transfer Arabs to Iraq. Although requested by Norman to preserve the existence of this plan in strictest secrecy, Weizmann did propose a transfer plan at several unofficial meetings with Iraqi delegates to the Conference.

Weizmann later offered Norman his services and contributed, possibly from his own pocket, the sum of £2500 (English Sterling) in order to bring Norman's transfer plan to fruition.

Towards the end of 1939, a number of Zionist leaders met with the Leader of the British Labour Party.

In putting the Zionist case at this meeting, Weizmann suggested that the idea of population transfer would become more acceptable as the "world would become accustomed to this idea." With regard to a future Jewish State, Weizmann insisted on an area of 'Palestine west of the Jordan, with some transfer of a part at least of the Arab population."

From this, we can see that Weizmann's views on the question of transfer of Arabs had become more extreme. Only two years earlier, he had given the small territorial area allocated to the Jewish State by the Peel Commission as the reason for transferring the Arab population. Now he was demanding a much larger territorial area, yet still insisting on transfer of Arabs.

Furthermore, at the beginning of the Second World War, Weizmann was to put forward this proposal with increasing frequency.

In conclusion, we see that whenever Weizmann put forward his transfer proposals, it was in closed meetings and in private correspondence, a fact commented upon by several historians. In public, however, Weizmann invariably repudiated such ideas!

Letter From London 17 August 2005

Liquidation Of The Jewish State

By Rabbi Dr. CHAIM SIMONS

A few months ago, The Nansen Institute wrote a "Letter from Israel" dated August 2002, describing the peace, serenity and happiness existing in Israel, three years after the transfer of all the Arabs from both inside and outside of the "Green Line". Today we will show the alternative to transfer — "Liquidation of the Jewish State". There is no middle path between these two alternatives.

Three years have now passed since the summer of the year 2002 when the Jewish State was liquidated and a P.L.O. state established in Eretz Israel. A few weeks later, in accordance with article 6 of the P.L.O. National Covenant, all Jews and their descendants who had arrived in Eretz Israel since the "beginning of the Zionist invasion" of 1917, were expelled.

Since my family had British citizenship, we were able to go and live in England and together with the tens of thousands of others having British citizenship we arrived in England.

The P.L.O. had allowed for "humanitarian reasons" for every expelled Jew to take one small suitcase of belongings not exceeding \$200 in value. Everything else was confiscated. We therefore arrived penniless in England. In view of the high prices of property in England, the best my family could find was a dilapidated property in a slum area of London. As a result of the dampness of the property, two of my children have been hospitalized with rheumatic fever. The strain of such conditions has brought my wife to the verge of a nervous breakdown.

However, Jews who originated from the U.S. or Western Europe were relatively fortunate. We had a place to go to. In contrast, there were over two million Jews who were expelled

from Eretz Israel, who originated from Arab or communist countries.

A few hundred Jews from Russia, lacking all alternatives returned to that country. They were almost all arrested as Zionist spies and sent to Siberia or even worse. They had obviously been unaware of a group of Jews, who in the late 1920's, had left Eretz Israel to return to Russia in order to establish a kibbutz there! Stalin had had most

of them murdered or sent to Siberia.

Today there are over two million Jews wandering all over the world trying to find a place to live. As in the case of Jews wanting to escape from Hitler in the late 1930's, no country wants to accept them. In those days, President Roosevelt convened an international conference in the French resort city of Evian to discuss their fate, but everyone of the participating 33 countries gave an excuse why not to accept them. Today, there is a slight improvement over the 1930's. The U.S. has agreed to take 2000 Jews and Australia 250. But these numbers are laughable in view of the fact that

the wandering Jews number over two million. Every day one reads of cases of these Jews dying of malnutrition and of others committing suicide.

Will this problem ever be solved?

How did we get ourselves into such a mess?

It began in the 1980's when the Arabs as part of their tactics, began to talk about "peace" in the framework of an "International Conference". The left, who since the Six Day War, had been eager to hand over Judea and Samaria, the heart of Eretz Israel, to the Arabs, jumped on the bandwagon. Groups such as "Peace Now" began to hold rallies and demonstrations with slogans such as "Peace for Territory", and world Jewish "intellectuals", who had never lived in Israel, sent around letters demanding "territorial compromise". They never explained that in view of the fact that over three-quarters of Mandatory Palestine — the area designated as the Jewish homeland — was in Arab hands (i.e. [Trans]Jordan), it should be the Arabs who should be handing over land in Transjordan to the Jewish State in exchange
(Continued on Page 15)

...all Jews and their descendants who had arrived in Eretz Yisrael since the "beginning of the Zionist invasion" of 1917, were expelled.

Letter From London 17 August 2005

(Continued from Page 4)
for peace. The Arabs played their part to try and weaken the resistance of the Jews, by continually throwing stones, grenades and Molotov cocktails at Jewish vehicles and attacking Jews in the street.

International pressure to "withdraw" to the pre-1967

Jerusalem, threatening a "Holy War" from the entire Moslem world should they not do so. Here, even the left balked and joined in the chorus that united Jerusalem is the eternal capital of the State of Israel. But this "unity" was sadly not to last long. The U.S., Western Europe and Japan, fearing for their oil supplies,

Today there are over two million Jews wandering all over the world trying to find a place to live.

borders increased and these were coupled with threats of sanctions. Had the Jews in Israel been united this pressure could have been withstood. But with the left joining forces with the international community, Israel caved in and in 1992 signed an "agreement" with the Arabs to withdraw to the pre-1967 borders, and for removal of all the Jewish settlers who by then had reached over 120,000. The exception was East Jerusalem, and it was agreed that the solution to this "problem" would be "deferred to a later date".

Within three months of signing this agreement, Israel had withdrawn from these areas. There was no money to pay compensation to the 120,000 settlers. All that was available was money to build shacks for these people on the coastal plain. A vague promise was given to build apartments some time in the future, a promise which was never implemented.

A few months later, the Arabs were demanding Israel "return" Arab Jer-

usalem, threatening a "Holy War" from the entire Moslem world should they not do so. Here, even the left balked and joined in the chorus that united Jerusalem is the eternal capital of the State of Israel. But this "unity" was sadly not to last long. The U.S., Western Europe and Japan, fearing for their oil supplies,

argued that since in 1938, Czechoslovakia had had to surrender the Sudetenland for the sake of "world peace", Israel in the 1990's, would not be allowed to endanger world peace for the sake of just an old wall and a few dirty narrow streets in Jerusalem. The subsequent selective sanctions by these countries against Israel caused an erosion of the "consensus" existing in Israel on the Jerusalem question. By 1995, Israel had completely returned to the pre-1967 borders. Within a few months, the Jordanians had, as in 1948, razed to the ground the beautifully restored "Jewish Quarter" including its numerous Synagogues. Tombstones on the Mount of Olives, especially the new ones added since 1967, made excellent latrine covers.

Due to these selective sanctions, Israel no longer had the money to provide all of the 150,000 Jews who had been living in the suburbs of East Jerusalem, even with shacks. Many were just given tents. What

a traumatic experience it was for residents of Ramat Eshkol to move from their luxurious apartments to tents.

The next stage in the Arabs' campaign was to argue, "You have returned the territory you captured in the Six Day War. Now return us the territory you captured in the War of Independence and we will recognize the 1947 United Nations Partition Plan borders. We therefore demand that you withdraw from Western Galilee, Ramle, Lod, Jaffa, Ashkelon and Beersheba." At this demand even the extreme left-wing Mapam had apoplexy. They had built many of their kibbutzim in these places.

The United Nations went into special session and

argued that just as UNRWA (United Nations Relief and Works Agency) was still financing millions of Arab "refugees" (many of whom were fictitious), she should finance the now over one million Jews who had been displaced as a result of all the Israel withdrawals. This was resoundingly defeated in a vote of the U.N. (1 in favour [Israel]; 184 against; 1 abstention [U.S.A.].)

"The Negev is not really part of Israel," screamed the Bedouins. "It was added as a result of the intervention of President Truman." The State Department accepted this reasoning arguing that Israel had misused President Truman's generosity by building a nuclear station in the Negev and refus-

...by the end of the twentieth century, Israel was confined to the 1947 borders. This also meant the loss of West Jerusalem as the capital which was transferred to Tel Aviv.

mandatory sanctions were applied against Israel. This did the trick and by the end of the twentieth century, Israel was confined to the 1947 borders. This also meant the loss of West Jerusalem as the capital, which was transferred to Tel-Aviv.

Despite this withdrawal, the mandatory sanctions imposed on Israel by the U.N. were never withdrawn. The U.N. "did not have the time" to discuss the question. As a result Israel's financial situation became desperate. She

ing to allow international supervision, and they demanded Israel's withdrawal from the Negev. By this time, Israel had lost all ability to resist and by April 2002, Israel was reduced to a narrow strip of land on the coastal plain and a narrow strip in Eastern Galilee.

Three months later, Arabs armed with just stones, Molotov cocktails and grenades marched on these two narrow strips of land. The regulation commanding soldiers to only shoot in the air and not at

any Arabs, were still in force and so the Arabs had no trouble in conquering the area.

Immediately, a P.L.O. "secular-democratic" state

General of the Arab League threatening the Jews with "extermination and momentous massacre", one can only fear the worst. Near to my damp London

"The Negev is not really part of Israel," screamed the Bedouins. "It was added as a result of the intervention of President Truman."

was declared in the entire area of Eretz Israel and within a few weeks article 6 of the P.L.O. National Covenant, which authorized the expulsion of all the Jews who had arrived since 1917 was implemented.

Those who had arrived before that date, naively believed that they would have equality in this "secular-democratic" state. Their identity cards were marked with a big red "J" (in Arabic) as in Communist or Arab countries. "Only for statistical purposes," commented a P.L.O. official to the world press. Two months later, the Jews in the P.L.O. state (who numbered over a quarter of a million), were sent to the south of the country for "resettlement". Apologies were made for the use of overcrowded cattle-trucks for this "resettlement". No communication has been received from any of these Jews since their "resettlement" three years ago. "Due to communications difficulties," explained the P.L.O. spokesman. When one remembers the cordial meeting between Hitler and the Mufti and their identity of ideas on "solving the Jewish problem", and also the statement made in May 1948 by the Secretary-

apartment, lives a former "Peace Now" activist, who was expelled from Israel at the same time as me. "We were wrong in believing the Arabs," he keeps telling me. How this contrasts from the period following the withdrawal to the pre-1967 lines, when "Peace Now" supporters danced in the streets of Tel-Aviv celebrating and naively waving slogans "Now Peace".

The Festivals should be times of joy for the Jewish people. However, when in the Festival prayers, the words "On account of our sins, we were exiled from our land" are said, great weeping is heard in the Synagogues. Maybe, after another two thousand stateless years of wanderings, persecutions, pogroms and massacres, we will again have a state. Let us pray that next time, we will use the opportunity wisely.

NOTE: This "letter" dated 17 August 2005, was written in 1988.

It was over 17 years later on the **exact date** of this letter, namely 17 August 2005, that the Jews were forcibly evicted from Gush Katif.

Self-Defense Strictly Forbidden

By RABBI DR. CHAIM SIMONS

During the Moslem festival of Nebi Musa in April 1920, the Arabs made a brutal attack on the Jews of Jerusalem, in which seven Jews were killed and two hundred injured. Since the British authorities were unable or unwilling to perform their duty and safeguard the lives of the Jews in the city, the Jews were forced to take action in self-defense. At that time, Jabotinsky was head of the Haganah in Jerusalem. After these Arab riots had subsided, Jabotinsky and twenty of his followers, who had only been acting in self-defense, were arrested by the British and sentenced to terms of imprisonment.

A few months later, the High Commissioner, Herbert Samuel, granted an amnesty to the imprisoned Jews, as well as to the Arabs who had taken part in these attacks on the Jews.

It is said that history repeats itself. However, today there is one important difference. The then High Commissioner, Herbert Samuel, released both the Jews who acted in self-defense and the Arab terrorists from prison. In contrast, the President of the State of Israel, Chaim Herzog, released over 1000 Arab terrorists and mur-

derers but has consistently refused to release the Jewish "underground" whose only aim was to defend Jews in the light of the Government's inability or unwillingness to do so.

Today in Israel, Jews are continually being attacked by Arabs. Grenades, stones and Molotov cocktails are being thrown at Jewish vehicles. It is a situation which the Israeli Prime Minister, Yitzhak Shamir, has described as war, "a war against Israelis, against the existence of the State of Israel." However, all the Israeli Government can do is to put on a pantomime. Whenever anyone in Israel wants to take action to stop this Arab terrorism, the Government says that it is the function of the army to maintain law and order. Anyone on the spot, can immediately see that in practice this is not the case, and this can be illustrated by the following two examples.

One of the grocers in Kiryat Arba was bringing supplies from Jerusalem in his van when he was suddenly stoned on the Jerusalem-Hebron road. He called on some soldiers who were nearby, to assist him. Their sole response was to tell him to get out of the area as quickly as possible!

A letter published in the "Jerusalem Post" of 6 March 1988, told of an incident regarding the army who were escorting a school bus in Samaria. Suddenly, an Arab threw a bottle at them and then made an obscene gesture. The soldiers made no appropriate response and this inaction, in the letter writer's opinion, endangered the lives of all the children on the bus.

It should be stressed here, that one cannot blame the individual soldiers. They are acting under the orders of the Government if one can seriously use the term "Government!" A cartoon in a recent Israeli newspaper showed soldiers being issued with toy guns. This aptly, but sadly describes the situation. The grotesqueness of the situation is apparent to anyone watching the news on Israeli television each night. Almost every night, pictures are shown of Arabs throwing stones at soldiers. The soldiers stand there like an "Aunt Sally" at a fairground. Any attempt by the soldiers to take appropriate action would land them in prison.

What the U.S. would do in a similar situation was explained in a letter to the "Jerusalem Post" of 29 February 1988. Here, a retired

American senior police officer wrote that in a situation far less aggravated than that encountered in Israel at the moment, the instructions given to the police of the U.S. are: shoot to kill.

In Israel, however, attempts by Jewish residents to help patrol the roads to ensure the safety of the residents are immediately condemned by the left.

Recently, following one of the many incidents of Arab stone-throwing at Egged buses on the Jerusalem-Hebron road, one of the passengers alighted and bravely caught the stone-thrower whom he immediately took to the police station. In another country, the passenger would have received a citation for his bravery. Here, however, it is different the passenger was charged with kidnapping the Arab stone-thrower!

So remember, should the Arabs throw stones, Molotov cocktails or even a grenade at you, do nothing unless you want to go to jail.

You may end up in a cemetery, but don't worry you will go to Heaven knowing that you have observed the regulations.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

An Open Letter To Shulamit Aloni

Dear Mrs. Aloni:

I feel sure that by this time you will have thanked those who ensured your important position in the Israeli government. These are firstly, the Arab PLO supporting members of the Knesset, with whom Rabin came to an agreement in exchange for their support. Secondly, the fragmented Right-Wing parties whose wasted votes were responsible for at least three additional seats going to the left hence ensured their razor-thin majority. You don't need to thank the Israeli electorate, since the majority did not vote for the Left-Wing (and this includes the votes for the PLO orientated parties).

Now that you are comfortably seated, I trust you will live up to your high ideals of law and order and equality. Please bear with me while I make two suggestions.

Firstly, let us talk about the burning question of Jewish settlement in *Eretz Yisrael*. This is governed by international law. Article 6 of the Mandate, a document issued by the League of Nations, and hence part of international law, gives the Jews (and incidentally **only** the Jews!) the right of settlement **anywhere** between the Jordan and the Mediterranean. When the United Nations took over from the League, this right became enshrined in Paragraph 80 of the UN Charter. This right **still exists** and cannot be extinguished unilaterally. Israel as a signatory to the UN Charter is thus bound to honour

all its paragraphs. I shall therefore expect you, Mrs. Aloni, who is always preaching the importance of observing the law, to raise your voice every time the Rabin government proposes stopping Jews from settling in Judea and Samaria.

My second suggestion concerns equality before the law. At the same time the rabbis are being continually hounded by the police for alleged technical breaches of the law, Arab notables who flagrantly and publicly flaunt Israeli law by appearing on television in meetings with PLO terrorists, are treated to

only the most half-hearted of questionings by the police. As minister, I hope you will do your best to ensure that such practices by the police will be stopped forthwith.

If, Mrs. Aloni, you succeed in guaranteeing Jewish settlement between the Jordan and the Mediterranean, and Arabs start to be treated for law-breaking in the same way as Jews are, then you will have made an important contribution to the government.

Rabbi Dr. Chaim Simons
Kiryat Arba
Hebron, Israel

When Will The Nationalists Learn That Unity Precedes Power?

By Rabbi Dr. CHAIM SIMONS

In 1943, the Revisionists (today we call them the Nationalists), established the "American Resettlement Committee for Uprooted European Jewry." One of its main objectives was to promote a plan for the transfer of the Arabs of Palestine to Iraq. Amongst its first goals was one to recruit former U.S. President Herbert Hoover to be its "Honorary President."

Although Hoover was a strong supporter of transfer, having proposed it (together with Hugh Gibson) in their book **The Problems of Lasting Peace**, he declined the offer. His reason: The depth of "division and conflict" in the Jewish organizational world — "the different organizations seem to be busy trying to destroy each other." The result was sadly simple — this very praiseworthy group, the "American Resettlement Committee" never got off the ground, solely because of the petty squabbling between various Jewish groups.

In the recent past, we have seen that the leftists have learned from the disastrous results that can come about from infighting. Parties as diverse as Mapam, Shinui and Citizens' Rights Movement came together and formed a joint list for the Knesset. As a result of this "unity," Israel now has a left-wing government. It can hardly be said that the Israeli electorate opted for a left-wing government, since the total number of votes cast for right wing/religious parties exceeded those cast for the left-wing parties (and this includes those supporting the "PLO-oriented parties"). However, when translated into Knesset seats, we obtain the following: Right wing-religious parties 59 seats, left-wing parties 56 seats, "PLO-oriented parties" five seats.

The Israel Labor Party will do anything to get into power and their spokesmen said several times on television (of course after the elections!) that if necessary they would form a coalition with these Arab parties (i.e. the "PLO-oriented parties"). This wasn't just talk — the Labor Party indeed made agreements with them in exchange for their support. What a turnabout from before the elections when they specifically promised that they would not form a coalition with these parties.

How then did it happen that the left with less votes than the right became the government? It is simply the result of squabbling between the right-wing factions. There is a saying that for every two Jews there are three *shuls*, and this illustrates what happened with the right-wing candidates to the Knesset. Why could not Moledet, Tehiya, Modai, Rabbi Levinger and Rabbi Eliezer Mizrahi, who have identical views on the future of *Eretz Yisrael*, have submitted a joint list? The reasons are puerile in the extreme. ■

Rabbi Chaim Simons is director of The Nansen Institute, Kiryat Arba, Hebron, Israel.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

BUSH SHOULD BE TRIED

Sir, - "Since the Palestine Mandate conferred the right to settle in the West Bank on the Jews, that right has not been extinguished, and under Article 80 of the UN Charter, cannot be extinguished unilaterally."

Who made such a bold statement? Gush Emunim? Tehiya? Likud? No - it was the former U.S. assistant under-secretary of state, Eugene Rostow, professor of Law at Yale University. Needless to add, this right of settlement applies equally to Russian olim as to veteran Israelis.

Thus, should an American president try to stop the settlement of Jews over the "Green Line," he would be in flagrant breach of the UN Charter to which his country is a signatory.

Despite this, George Bush glibly illegally linked guaranteeing a \$40 million loan, to Israel's agreeing not to settle Russian olim over the "Green Line," and is now attempting to link a \$10b. dollar loan guarantee to Israel's completely stopping settlement of Jews over the "Green Line."

Mr. Bush's activities seem to be illegal, and the time has come for a public outcry by the Israeli government and the American Jewish community, and for Bush to be brought to trial.

(Rabbi) CHAIM SIMONS

Director

Nansen Institute

Kiryat Arba.

Indigenous Palestinian Population

By Rabbi Dr. CHAIM SIMONS
Director of The Nansen Institute

For over two decades the UJA and the JNF have consistently refused to hand over any funds collected from U.S. Jews to any place over the "Green Line." This of course includes the Old City of Jerusalem. All their excuses that various U.S. Government departments would cause them to lose their tax-exempt status have recently been shown by Mrs. Hadassah Marcus to be completely without foundation.

It is true that the U.S. State Department for solely political reasons does not "encourage" transfer of such UJA and JNF funds over the "Green Line." However, they have no jurisdiction to stop such transfers.

With regard to U.S. Government Funds, the policy is only to hand over such funds over the "Green Line" to assist the "indigenous Palestinian population." For political expediency, the U.S. State Department would define any Arab living over the "Green Line" as "indigenous Palestinian population," whereas any Jew living in the same area would be described as an "obstacle to a peaceful resolution of the Arab-Israeli dispute." All this is a complete distortion and a rewriting of history and we shall attempt to put the record straight.

Just over 40 years ago, the eminent jurist Ernst Frankenstein concluded that "75 percent of the Arab population of Palestine are either immigrants themselves or descendants of persons who immigrated into Palestine during the last hundred years, for the most part after 1882."

With regard to the Jews, we know that a Jewish community existed in the Old

City of Jerusalem (i.e. over the "Green Line") from time immemorial. In the late 19th century, there were in fact more Jews than Arabs in the entire Old City of Jerusalem. [All this "quarterisation" of the Old City has no basis in reality and is today being used as a tool by many people, including the Mayor of Jerusalem, to try and prevent Jews settling in the "Moslem Quarter."] As a result of the Arab terrorism of the 1920s and 1930s, the British concentrated the Jews in the "Jewish Quarter" of the Old City. In 1948, they were forcibly driven out by the Arabs.

Hebron, City of the Patriarchs, also has a long history and tradition of Jewish settlement. Following the terrible pogroms and massacres of 1929, the Jews were forced to leave Hebron. In 1931, 35 families returned, where they remained until they were removed by the British in 1936, due to the resumption of the Arab riots.

The Biblical city of Shechem in the center of Samaria, also had a Jewish community for a period of hundreds of years extending until the early part of the 20th century. They then experienced great difficulties due to Arab fanaticism and the Arab riots of 1929 ended attempts to live in Shechem.

The Jewish population over the "Green Line" prior to the establishment of the State of Israel was not limited to the ancient cities.

Bet Arava, north of the Dead Sea, was established

as a kibbutz in 1939. However, the area was conquered by the Arabs in 1948 and the kibbutz razed by the Arab Legion.

Two villages, Atarot and Neveh Yaacov, were established north of Jerusalem in 1920 and 1924 respectively.

An important region of settlement in modern Zionist history is the Ezyon block (Gush Ezyon), which is situated half-way between Jerusalem and Hebron. The first settlement in this region was Migdal Eder which was established in 1926/7, but had to be abandoned in 1929 due to the Arab pogroms. In the 1940s, four kibbutzim were established in the area, but they were forced to surrender to the Arabs a few days before the establishment of the State of Israel. In one of these kibbutzim, Kefar Ezyon, many of the residents were massacred after they had surrendered.

One should also note that a number of the Jews today living over the "Green Line" lived in the very same places prior to 1948, or are the children of those living in those places.

All the above shows that even according to the State Department policy of only handing out U.S. Government funds over the "Green Line" to the "indigenous Palestinian population," many Jews over the "Green Line" should be receiving such assistance, and many Arabs should not be eligible. The U.S. Government should therefore re-investigate who are the TRUE "indigenous Palestinian population" living over the "Green Line."

It goes without saying, that irrespective of the results of an investigation regarding U.S. public funds, the UJA and the JNF can and must allocate their funds to all Jews both inside and outside of the "Green Line."

Jailed For Writing A Rabbinical Thesis

About a month ago, Rabbi Ido Elba was sentenced to a term of imprisonment for publishing a scholarly rabbinical paper. This was despite the fact that he clearly wrote that this paper was a purely theoretical study.

I have waited, but sadly in vain, for the university professors and the rabbinical authorities to issue a protest at the incarceration of somebody for publishing a research paper.

It could happen tomorrow that someone will publish a scholarly article on "The Biological Effectiveness of Nerve Gas against Civilian Population" and, like Rabbi Elba, find himself in jail! Would anyone then still remain silent?

*Rabbi Dr. Chaim Simons
Kiryat Arba
Israel*

Letters to the Editor...



(Note: Letters, in order to be considered for publication, must be typed and double-spaced. All letters must be signed, although names will be withheld upon request. Due to the large volume of mail, we regret that we cannot acknowledge or return any letters.)

Racial Discrimination In Jerusalem

Two events involving racial discrimination recently occurred in Jerusalem - unnoticed. There was not so much as a murmur from the left. The reason was sadly simple - it was discrimination against Jews.

The first event involves monuments. Near to the Western Wall, Rabbi Shlomo Goren built his Idra Yeshiva. On the roof of this Yeshiva, he erected a monument to the six million Jews murdered by the Nazis. This monument did not find favor in the eyes of the Mayor of Jerusalem, Mr. Teddy Kollek and a legal suit is currently being brought against Rabbi Goren to make him remove it.

Not far from this monument is another monument. This was erected on the Temple Mount by the Arabs "in memory of Sabra and Shatilla." Needless to

say, the Arabs erected this without a permit, and again needless to say, Teddy Kollek is not bringing this matter to Court. He has even said that he does not intend making an issue of the matter.

The second event concerns the Jerusalem City Council's decision to grant cheaper library facilities to children in Jerusalem. However, this will not apply to all the children in Jerusalem - only the Arab children. Jewish children will continue to pay the full library fees!

When it was recently suggested that students who had served in the Army should receive a reduction in their University tuition fees in recognition of the years of their life that they had devoted to the security of the nation, there were outcries from the left - "Discrimination against Arabs." Why are these same voices not crying out about discrimination against Jewish children on the issue of library fees?

Rabbi Chaim Simons
Kiryat Arba

Jewish Chronicle

MARCH 11, 1994 — ADAR 28, 5754

Letters to the Editor

Dr Baruch Goldstein was a neighbour of mine and davened regularly in my shul. For 24 hours each day, he carried his walkie-talkie with him, so that he could deal immediately with any medical emergency that might arise.

On Shabbat, Yomtov and Yom Kippur, he would sit in shul with his walkie-talkie beside him. How many doctors with such devotion to duty can there be?

The thousands of people from all over Israel who attended his funeral, despite the torrential rain, are sufficient testimony to his noble character.

The killing of Arabs in the Cave of Machpelah cannot be viewed in a vacuum. Since the signing of the Oslo agreement, there have been brutal murders of Jews every few days. On a number of these occasions, Dr Goldstein personally tried to save their lives, and last month he was highly praised by the Israeli Army for his services in this field.

What is the Israeli government's response to all these murders of Jews? It has released hundreds of Arab terrorists from jail.

Much has been made of the fact that the Hebron attack took place during a prayer service. However, it is during these very same prayer services in their mosques, especially on Fridays, that the Arabs incite their people against the Jews.

On the night before Purim, the Arabs present in the Cave of Machpelah started shouting threats to slaughter Jews, but, sadly, the army did nothing about this.

Confirmation of this intended massacre of Jews comes from reports that, when soldiers searched the area after the killings, they found three automatic weapons. It is probable, therefore, that Dr Goldstein's actions on that Purim morning saved the lives of many Jews.

Despite its "solemn undertaking," the PLO has done nothing to amend its infamous charter, which calls for the destruction of Israel. The danger that loomed over European Jews in the 1930s today looms over the five million Jews living in Israel.

(Rabbi Dr) Chaim Simons,
Kiryat Arba, Israel.