



The  
Emergence of  
the  
Palestinian-  
Arab National  
Movement  
1918-1929

Y. Porath



# THE EMERGENCE OF THE PALESTINIAN-ARAB NATIONAL MOVEMENT 1918-1929

Y. Porath

*Institute of Asian and African Studies,  
The Hebrew University, Jerusalem*



**FRANK CASS: LONDON**

*First published 1974 in Great Britain by*  
**FRANK CASS AND COMPANY LIMITED**  
67 Great Russell Street, London WC1B 3BT, England

*and in United States of America by*  
**FRANK CASS AND COMPANY LIMITED**  
c/o International Scholarly Book Services, Inc.  
P.O. Box 4347, Portland, Oregon 97208

Copyright © 1974 Y. Porath

ISBN 0 7146 2939 1

Library of Congress Catalog Card No. 72-92976

*All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission of Frank Cass and Company Limited in writing.*

Printed in Great Britain by  
Clarke, Doble & Brendon Ltd.  
Plymouth

# Contents

Acknowledgements	vii
List of Abbreviations	ix
INTRODUCTION	1
The Religious Status of Jerusalem and Palestine in Medieval Islam	
The <i>Filasṭīn</i> as an administrative unit in Muslim history	
The Structure of the Palestinian Population	
Political Trends among the Palestinians on the eve of the First World War	
CHAPTER ONE The Rejection of Zionism and the Crystallization of Palestinian-Arab Ideology	31
The Anti-Zionist Awakening at the End of the First World War and its Causes	
The Palestinian-Arab Ideology	
The Reality of Anti-Zionist Ideology	
CHAPTER TWO From "Southern Syria" to Palestine	70
The Idea of the Unity of Palestine and Syria	
The Organizational Instruments	
The Triumph of the "Southern Syria" Trend	
The Idea of All-Syria Unity in Politics	
The Supporters of Unity at the Peak of their Power	
The Decline of the Idea of "Southern Syria"	
Palestine as the Object of Struggle	
Neglect of the "Southern Syria" Idea	
CHAPTER THREE Confrontation with the British Government	123
Activities in the Country	
The First Delegation to Britain	
The Boycott of the Elections to the Legislative Council	
The Second Delegation—The Appeal to the Turks	
More British Proposals and Their Rejection	
CHAPTER FOUR The Emergence of al-Ḥājj Amīn al-Ḥusayni	184
His Appointment as Mufti of Jerusalem	
Establishment of the Supreme Muslim Council and its Emergence as al-Ḥājj Amīn's Stronghold	

CHAPTER FIVE	The Origin of the Opposition and its Development	208
	The Basic Reasons for the Emergence of the Opposition	
	Political and Organizational Development of the Opposition	
	The Opposition at the Peak of its Power	
CHAPTER SIX	The Turning Point 1924–1929	241
	The Weakening of the Executive Committee and the Change in its Political Position	
	The Agreement with the Opposition	
CHAPTER SEVEN	The Conflict over the Wailing Wall and its Repercussions	258
CHAPTER EIGHT	Organizational and Social Aspects of the Development of the Movement	274
	The Crystallization of the Organizational Framework through- out the Country	
	The Christian Communities and the National Movement	
CONCLUSION		304
NOTES		311
BIBLIOGRAPHY		375
	I Archives	
	II Manuscripts	
	III Official Publications	
	IV Books	
	V Articles	
	VI Journals	
APPENDIX A	The Executive Committees 1920–1934	383
	Notes to Appendix A	388
APPENDIX B	The Composition of the Supreme Muslim Council	389
APPENDIX C	Chronological Table	390
APPENDIX D	Glossary	392
INDEX		394

## Acknowledgements

This book was originally written as a Ph.D dissertation under the supervision of Professor G. Baer of the Institute of Asian and African Studies, The Hebrew University, Jerusalem. I wish to express my sincere gratitude to him for his suggestions throughout all stages of my research. My friend and student Mr David Shulman translated most of this book into English from its original Hebrew (published in Jerusalem in 1971) and my wife Sarah prepared the manuscript. My deep thanks to them is here acknowledged.

I wish to note five people who helped me in writing the book: Mr Y. Lunz, who made available to me his unpublished M.A. thesis, *'The Southern Syria Period in the History of the Arab National Movement in Palestine'* (Jerusalem, 1965) and Mr E. B'eri, Mr Neil Caplan, Dr H. Shaked and Dr E. Sivan who read the manuscript and made various helpful comments.

The following institutions rendered me financial help at various stages of this research: The Hebrew University, Jerusalem; The Friends of the Hebrew University, London; The British Council; The Israel Foundations Trustees; The Jerusalem Van Leer Foundation; and Mif'al Ha-Payis (The Israel Lottery Project). Without their help this book would not have been written, and this fact alone merits all my gratitude.

Yehoshua Porath



## List of Abbreviations

ACS(P)	Assistant Chief Secretary (Political)
AE	Arab Executive Committee
BD	British Documents
CA	Chief Administrator
CID	Criminal Investigation Department
CS	Chief Secretary
DPS	Director of Public Security
EEF	Egyptian Expeditionary Force
HA	Haganah Archives
HC	High Commissioner
Hq.	Headquarters
ISA	Israel State Archives
MCA	The Muslim-Christian Association
M.K.	Mūsā Kāzīm
PD	Palestinian Delegation
PP	Palestine Police
SMC	Supreme Muslim Council
STH	Sefer Toldot Ha-Haganah
YMCA	Young Men's Christian Association
YMMA	Young Men's Muslim Association
ZA	Zionist Archives
ZE	Zionist Executive



## Introduction

### THE RELIGIOUS STATUS OF JERUSALEM AND PALESTINE IN MEDIEVAL ISLAM

The establishment of the sanctity of Jerusalem, and consequently of Palestine, in Islam—an uncontested principle today—was not a straightforward process. Muḥammad at first designated Jerusalem as the direction to which Muslims should turn in prayer (*Qiblah*), but when he discovered that the Jews of the Hejaz did not intend to abandon their faith and to accept his message he did away with the practice of facing towards Jerusalem and established Mecca as the *Qiblah* of the Muslims. It would certainly be correct to conclude that the abrogation of Jerusalem's status as the *Qiblah* did not add to its prestige and holiness in Islam.<sup>1</sup>

However, the opposite occurred with respect to the geographical sense of the verse: "Glory be to Him who made His servant go by night from the Sacred Mosque (of Mecca) to the farther Mosque (al-Aqṣā) whose surroundings We have blessed, that We might show him some of Our signs".<sup>2</sup> Although at first there were contradictory explanations as to where *al-Masjid al-Aqṣā* was located (some put it in Heaven rather than Jerusalem), after a short period the opinion prevailed that *al-Masjid al-Aqṣā* was situated in Jerusalem and it was there that Muḥammad's miraculous ascent to Heaven (*al-Mi'rāj*) had taken place. The belief that Jerusalem would be the scene of the resurrection of the dead at the End of Days also became standard.<sup>3</sup>

A well-known tradition (*ḥadīth*) of the Prophet ordained that "the saddles (of the riding beasts) shall not be fastened (for setting out for pilgrimage) except for three mosques: the Sacred Mosque (in Mecca), my mosque (in Medina) and al-Aqṣā mosque (in Jerusalem)". The purpose of this *ḥadīth* was to prevent pilgrimages to traditional holy sites, but it was understood *a posteriori* as authorizing Muslims to make pilgrimages to Jerusalem and Medina just as they would do Mecca.<sup>4</sup> There were, however, earlier *ḥadīths* which cast doubt on this, and there were therefore '*ulamā*' who doubted Jerusalem's sanctity and the permissibility of going there on pilgrimage (*ḥajj*). These *ḥadīths* prove that in the first half of the second Islamic century some of the '*ulamā*' shrank from recognizing Jerusalem's sanctity and its equal status with Mecca

and Medina. They were apprehensive lest Jerusalem should become a rival to Mecca and thus draw pilgrims away from that city. They were, in fact, successful in preventing Jerusalem from attaining equal status with Mecca, but not in preventing its being considered a holy place worthy of pilgrimage, though of inferior status. This is shown by the fact that the *ḥadīths* which denied the sanctity of Jerusalem or cast doubt upon it were not included in the canonical collections of *ḥadīth* literature. In this way the concept of the sanctity of Jerusalem was accepted in Islam from the middle of the second Hijrite century. The '*ulamā*' tried, after Jerusalem's status was secured beyond doubt, to prevent the imitation there of rites of prayer connected with the pilgrimage to Mecca; they declared such imitation to be *bid'ah* (illegal innovation), but in this, too, they failed. The common people prevailed, transferring to Jerusalem prayers and usages which were originally meant for Mecca alone.<sup>5</sup> The building at this time of the magnificent Dome of the Rock by the Umayyad Caliph, 'Abd al-Malik ibn Marwān further strengthened the position of those who regarded Jerusalem as holy.

Palestine is mentioned only once in the Koran, and then by the designation "the Holy Land" (*al-Arḍ al-Muqaddasah*), which corresponds to Moses' words to his people on their entry into the land.<sup>6</sup> This designation continued to appear in early Muslim literature and there developed the Muslim conception of the sanctity of the land owing to its history as the land of the Prophets and the site of divine revelation. Doubtless, the establishment of Jerusalem's holy status contributed to the development of the conception of the entire land as sanctified. The mystical element in Islam made a most important contribution to this development. It is very probable that some of the Muslim mystics had close ties with Jewish circles and absorbed Jewish traditions, since there are traces of Rabbinic traditions in the Muslim literature on this subject. The sanctity of the land and of Jerusalem in Christianity, the Christian pilgrimages, and the churches and monasteries which were built in the country also influenced the Muslims, both directly, as an example to be imitated, and indirectly, as a possible danger to the status of Islam in the land, a danger which had to be averted.<sup>7</sup>

It seems, then, that in the course of the eighth and ninth centuries, the Muslim view of Jerusalem's status more or less crystallized. However, this conception of Jerusalem as a holy city apparently weakened in the tenth and eleventh centuries. In any case the Crusader conquest of Jerusalem in 1099 did not arouse much of a storm in the Islamic community. It is likely that the growth of Shī'ite-Ismā'īlite influence during this period was responsible for

this; however, it is also extremely probable that here we have an indication that the sanctity of Jerusalem had not yet become axiomatic. There is evidence that the Jerusalem-cult was common primarily among the inhabitants of the area of *Filasfīn* and perhaps in certain parts of Syria as well. In any case the "Eulogies of Jerusalem" literature (*Faḍā'il al-Quds*) was produced in those days solely by Jerusalemites.<sup>8</sup>

Significantly, the Crusader conquest of Jerusalem was initially regarded by the Muslims as merely another link in the chain of political vicissitudes and military conquests which the city had undergone,<sup>9</sup> without any religious significance. To them, the war against the Crusaders was yet another stage in the long struggle with Byzantium, a struggle intermittently halted by peace treaties.

The factor that changed this indifferent attitude and began to foster the conception of the sanctity of Jerusalem was the activity of Zengi, the ruler of Mosul-Aleppo, and his son and successor Nūr al-Dīn, about half a century after the Crusader conquest of the city. These two strove to remove the Frankish-Crusader presence, and the liberation of Jerusalem became their major goal. This development was rooted in two factors: firstly the fact that Jerusalem was the capital of the Crusader kingdom, and secondly Zengi's desire to invest his *jihād* with deep religious significance. To do this he exploited the extent of religious sentiment for Jerusalem, arousing it from its slumber and struggling to win it adherents. With the aid of his propaganda apparatus, he emphasized Jerusalem's importance in Islam as the city in which were located the al-Aqṣā mosque and the site of Muḥammad's ascent to Heaven (*Mi'rāj*) and which was situated at the "hub of the universe". Zengi's son Nūr al-Dīn went still further, stressing the necessity of uniting all Syria behind the fight to liberate Jerusalem. These official propaganda efforts were accompanied by a flowering of the "Eulogies of Jerusalem" (*Faḍā'il al-Quds*) literature, which had first appeared at the end of the eleventh century but had then remained silent until approximately the middle of the twelfth century.

Ṣalaḥ al-Dīn pursued these aims more vigorously and succeeded in retaking Jerusalem in 1187. The reconquest was seen as being of deep religious and historical significance, and its repercussions were felt throughout the Islamic world. The continuation of the struggle against the Crusaders further strengthened this concept, and it was thus that the "Eulogies of Jerusalem" literature reached its height.

This policy bore fruit. Jerusalem's sanctified status was accepted throughout the Islamic world and pilgrimages there (*Ziyārah* and not the term *Ḥajj*, which is reserved for pilgrimage to Mecca and

Medina only) became common. Thus when Jerusalem was again lost by the Muslims in 1229, they reacted strongly, and there were numerous demands for its recapture. The difference between this reaction and the indifference with which the first Crusader conquest of Jerusalem had met demonstrates the variation in Jerusalem's status in Islam.<sup>10</sup>

Following the Ayyūbid's reconquest of Jerusalem in 1245, the Muslims expressed their special relationship to the sanctified city by cultivating the Jerusalem mosques, fostering pilgrimages to the city, etc. The Mamelukes, the Ayyūbids' successors, also did much in this area. Aware of the possibility that the Crusades might be renewed, they did all in their power to give the city a Muslim character. They restored the al-Aqṣā mosque, set up a system of conduits for bringing water into the city, and founded academies (*Madāris*) and Šūfī monasteries,<sup>11</sup> although these institutions achieved little distinction.<sup>12</sup>

This honoured and sanctified status was not restricted to Jerusalem alone. It gradually began to be understood as applying to the entire "Holy Land"—and it is worth inquiring as to the precise geographical area of this "Holy Land". It seems that in general the term comprised the entire area from the Euphrates in the north to the Hejaz, Aqaba and the Sinai desert in the south, and from the desert in the east to the Mediterranean in the west. However, the term "Holy Land" was gradually forgotten, and the name which was used to denote this area was *Shām*. Alongside the literature of "Eulogies of Jerusalem" (*Faḍā'il al-Quds*) there developed the literature of "Eulogies of *Shām*" (*Faḍā'il al-Shām*) and not "Eulogies of Filasṭīn"; and within the "Eulogies of *Shām*" an honourable place was occupied by the "Eulogies of Jerusalem".<sup>13</sup> Nevertheless, there were traditions (*ḥadīths*) which restricted the territorial sense of the "Holy Land" to *Filasṭīn* alone and which applied the name *al-Arḍ al-Muqaddasah* to *Filasṭīn* and *Urdunn* (Jordan) only.<sup>14</sup>

#### FILASṬĪN AS AN ADMINISTRATIVE UNIT DURING MUSLIM HISTORY

The Arabic name *Filasṭīn* was derived from the Latin *Palaestina*, the name which the Romans gave to Judea after they had subdued the last Jewish revolt in AD 132–135. The Roman-Byzantine government divided *Palaestina* into three units: *Palaestina Prima*, comprising Judea and Samaria and the southern part of the eastern side of the Jordan valley; *Palaestina Secunda*, including the Jordan valley, Eastern and Central Gallilee and the northern part of the

eastern side of the Jordan valley; and *Palaestina Tertia*, covering the southern part of Transjordan, the Neggev and Sinai.

The Arab-Muslim conquerors of Palestine basically preserved this administrative division of the Roman-Byzantine period. The area of *Palaestina Prima* became, more or less, *Jund Filasṭīn*, i.e. the military district of *Filasṭīn*, while *Palaestina Secunda*, together with Western Gallilee, became *Jund al-Urdunn*, i.e. the military district of the Jordan.<sup>1</sup> The district (*Jund*) of *Filasṭīn* continued to exist until the Mongolian invasion, although its area increased in the tenth century extending to 'Ammān in the east and the gulf of Aqaba in the south. However, during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries the term *Filasṭīn* was dropped and the territory was known by the combination Al-Quds—Sāhil (Jerusalem-Coastal plain).<sup>2</sup>

Under Mameluke rule the area of the former *Jund Filasṭīn* was divided into a number of districts (Der'a, 'Ajlūn, al-Balqā' and Baniās in Transjordan, and Nāblus, Qaqūn, Jerusalem, Hebron, Ramleh, Lydda and Gaza in Palestine) which were included in the greater province (*Niāba*) of Damascus. In the fourteenth century Hebron was annexed to the Jerusalem District and Lydda and Qaqūn—and on occasion Gaza as well—to Ramleh.<sup>3</sup> The former unit of *Filasṭīn* disappeared as an administrative division. Nevertheless, it would appear that this name was retained to denote the former area of *Jund Filasṭīn*.<sup>4</sup>

The Ottomans, like the Mamelukes, did not re-establish the *Filasṭīn* district. The area of this former district was divided into three *sanjaqs* (districts)—Gaza, Jerusalem and Nāblus (the latter was sometimes divided into the Nāblus district and the Lajun district)—which were included in the Damascus *pashalik* (province). (Galilee, i.e. the Safed district, was also included in the Damascus province at first, but from 1613 it usually formed part of the Saida province.) Two *sanjaqs* were sometimes united under one governor. Thus, for example, the *sanjaqs* of Gaza and Jerusalem were amalgamated in 1525, and in 1533-9 one governor ruled the *sanjaqs* of Nāblus and Safed. From the second half of the sixteenth century the districts of Nāblus and Gaza were sometimes annexed to Jerusalem. The same was done in the 1850s.<sup>5</sup> Thus it appears that despite the division into several districts, a larger district was sometimes established, which approached the former area of *Filasṭīn* of the Arab-Muslim conquerors. The original Arab-Muslim name of *al-Ard al-Muqaddasah* (the Holy Land) was also preserved in the Ottoman language (*Erāzi-i Muqaddesa*).<sup>6</sup>

It is possible to discern additional factors in both the administrative and the social spheres which helped to establish contacts between the Jerusalem *sanjaq* and the neighbouring *sanjaqs* (Nāblus

and Gaza). The area of jurisdiction (*qaza* in Turkish and *qaḏā'* in Arabic) of the Jerusalem *Qāḏi* exceeded the geographical area of the Jerusalem *sanjaq*. There is a strong possibility that this phenomenon resulted from the status of Jerusalem as a holy city, but whatever the reason, there is evidence that the jurisdiction of the Jerusalem *Qāḏi* extended over the *sanjaqs* of Gaza and Nāblus as far as Haifa; he appointed representatives (*nā'ib*) to fulfil judicial functions there, although this was not a permanent arrangement.<sup>7</sup>

It should be mentioned here that in modern times the superior status of the Jerusalem court was demonstrated by the establishment of a court of appeal in the city in 1910 (prior to this date all appeals had been submitted to the court in Damascus). It is interesting to note that the jurisdiction of this new court of appeal included the Nāblus district.<sup>8</sup>

There was also cooperation between the *sanjaqs* of Jerusalem and Nāblus in the military sphere. A feudal army of *Sipāhis* was organized in every *sanjaq* within the framework of an *alāy*, headed by a commander (*alāy beyi*) chosen from among the *Sipāhis*. In addition to their imperial tasks the Jerusalem and Nāblus *alāys* were required to protect the pilgrims, and it appears that this often led to a situation where the tasks of the Jerusalem *alāy* were carried out by residents of Nāblus.<sup>9</sup>

Popular religion and the worship of saints also contributed to the development of ties between the various sections of southern and central Palestine as far as the Jezreel Valley. The religious life of the Arab population of the country involved many pilgrimages to the tombs of saints and sanctuaries and the holding of celebrations and festivals there. These were generally local celebrations, each village or region having its own tombs and sanctuary, although there were instances of tombs with a wider significance (e.g. Nebi Ṣāliḥ in the Ramleh region, and Nebi Hāshim in the Gaza region)<sup>10</sup> But the outstanding event was the celebration of al-Nebi Mūsā, i.e. the annual pilgrimage to the mosque which, according to Muslim-Palestinian tradition, is located on the site of the tomb of Moses near Jericho. This celebration, which was apparently initiated in the days of Saladin, attracted celebrants from all over southern and central Palestine and even from the north of the country.<sup>11</sup> Thus, each year, delegations from Hebron and the south of the country met with Jerusalemites as well as inhabitants of Nāblus and the rural areas of the hills of Judea and Samaria, each delegation under its own banners. The celebrations lasted a week. The annual recurrence of this event, and the importance of the festival in the religion of Palestinian Muslims undoubtedly created a bond between the various parts of the country.

The social order which existed in the rural regions of Hebron, Jerusalem, Nāblus and the Carmel bore a marked resemblance to the regime which developed in Mount Lebanon in the period of the Emirate of Ma'ns and Shihābs,<sup>12</sup> so that uniformity of the social regime does not necessarily distinguish the *sanjaqs* of Jerusalem and Nāblus from the adjacent regions. However, one of the characteristics of this social order was of wider significance: the splitting of the population into two camps: *Qays* and *Yaman*.

This split divided the population of the Palestinian Mount (with the exclusion of Galilee) in such a way that a state of permanent warfare existed between the *Yamanis* of the hills of Hebron, Jerusalem and Nāblus and the *Qaysis* of those areas. The struggle lasted for centuries and was only ended in the second half of the nineteenth century, when the Ottoman administration underwent a process of change and modernization.<sup>13</sup> This phenomenon should be regarded as an important factor in the establishment of ties between the various regions.

Christianity and its institutions played a very important part in the creation of the Arab concept of *Filasṭīn*. The importance of Jerusalem and the Holy Land in Christianity are too well-known to necessitate discussion. But it is important to emphasize that the status of the Holy Land found important institutional expression. The jurisdiction of the Greek Orthodox Patriarchate of Jerusalem—possibly the oldest and most important Christian institution in Palestine—extended over Western Palestine and Transjordan. It should be remembered that this Patriarchate had existed without a break since the Roman period, and apparently, from the very beginning, held authority over the three Roman districts of Palestine: *Palaestina Prima, Secunda* and *Tertia*. The Latin Patriarchate of Jerusalem, re-established in 1847, and the Anglican Bishop of Jerusalem, first appointed at the end of 1841, also held authority over the whole of Palestine.<sup>14</sup>

It is not surprising therefore, that among the Christian population of Palestine, the concept of *Filasṭīn* was of significance. In 1913 Khalīl al-Sakākīni, one of the leaders of *al-Nahḍah al-Urthuduksiyyah* whose diaries are one of the most important sources concerning this movement, published a booklet by the name of *al-Nahḍah al-Urthuduksiyyah fī Filasṭīn*. Since he was dealing with the affairs of the Greek Orthodox Patriarchate in Jerusalem, it is clear that for him the term *Filasṭīn* corresponded to the area over which the authority of the Patriarchate extended, i.e. Palestine and Transjordan. On page 12 of his booklet he differentiated clearly between *Filasṭīn* and Syria.

Two years previously, the two brothers al-'Īsā (Yūsuf and 'Īsā

Da'ūd) had founded the paper *Filasfīn* in Jaffa. They too were leaders of *al-Nahḍah al-Urthuduksiyyah* and their paper dealt extensively with the affairs of the Orthodox Patriarchate in Jerusalem. They made extensive use of the term *Filasfīn* as a territorial denotation, although not always with the same meaning. In many instances it is obvious that, for the editors, *Filasfīn* is identical with the *sanjaq* of Jerusalem, but elsewhere it is obviously intended to refer to all or most of Palestine. In any case, it is clear that the names Syria or *al-Bilād al-Suriyyah* refer to the *vilāyet* (province) of Damascus or, more rarely, to the *vilāyets* of Damascus and Beirut, but never to Palestine.<sup>15</sup>

This concept of *Filasfīn* as a special area, which does not form part of Syria, is found elsewhere. During the First World War, in 1915–16, a young Jerusalemite Muslim kept a diary in which he described his actions and emotions in relation to the events of the period. He described conversations with other young Jerusalemites regarding the war and the future of the Ottoman Empire. The fate of the Arab countries under Ottoman rule was the central theme of these discussions. It is apparent from these conversations that the existence of *Filasfīn* independent of Syria and Egypt was taken for granted. The relevant entries in Khalīl al-Sakākīni's diaries for that period reveal almost the same conception.<sup>16</sup>

A later contribution to the consolidation of the concept of *Filasfīn* was Zionism. Later there will be a discussion of the hostility towards Zionism which developed among the Palestinian population. In this context it should suffice to say that this factor deeply affected the development of the consciousness of the distinctive identity of *Filasfīn* even before the First World War, but more especially after it.

Prior to the First World War, modern Jewish settlements extended over all of Palestine from Galilee in the north to the Judean plain in the south. The hostile Arab reaction encompassed all parts of the country: Galilee, Haifa, Jaffa and Jerusalem. *Al-Karmil*, the Haifa paper, like *Filasfīn*, the Jaffa journal, conducted a propaganda campaign against Zionism and thus created a new factor unifying the various *sanjaqs* of Palestine. It is no accident that one of the principal instances in which *Filasfīn* employed the term *Filasfīn* to denote the whole of western Palestine was in connection with its anti-Zionist stand. On the same occasion the paper called for the establishment of "a patriotic (*waṭaniyya*) Palestinian society" to be composed of the notables of Nāblus, Jerusalem, Jaffa, Haifa and Gaza, to engage in the purchase of state land (*mudawwara* land) before this was done by the Zionists.<sup>17</sup> Thus at the end of the Ottoman period the concept of *Filasfīn* was already widespread

among the educated Arab public, denoting either the whole of Palestine or the Jerusalem *sanjaq* alone.

It has already been noted that the social regime in Palestine during the Ottoman period and even earlier closely resembled that of the Emirate of Mount Lebanon, but without an emir. The area extending from Mount Hebron in the south to the Jezreel Valley in the north was divided into sub-districts (*nawāḥi*; singular—*naḥiah*), headed by local sheikhs.<sup>18</sup> These sub-districts had preserved their identity for generations. They were interconnected by alliances according to the division into *Qays* and *Yaman*. Life and the social order were generally similar. In some at least, there were special judicial arrangements based on rural custom and trial before the sheikhs, according to established procedure.<sup>19</sup> Some of the sheikhs of these sub-districts were Bedouin tribal chiefs and may have achieved their status through the settlement of their tribe in a certain territory.<sup>20</sup> The status of the sheikhs emanated first and foremost from the fact that they were the tax-collectors (*multazi-mūn*) of their regions.<sup>21</sup> This office was hereditary, although it did not necessarily pass down from father to son and there were cases in which the function was transferred from one sheikh's family to another, in a different village.<sup>22</sup>

The sheikh needed an annual authorization from the Ottoman governor of his office. This authorization was granted through the despatch of a cloak (*Khul'ah*) to the sheikh, and the ceremony was carried out simultaneously with the determining of the sum of the annual tax to be paid by the sub-districts in that year.<sup>23</sup> The sheikhs had military forces at their disposal, mobilized in times of need (generally for battles between the *Qays* and *Yaman* camps) from among the fellahin.

The Ottoman restoration in Palestine in 1840 led to the commencement of efforts on the part of the Ottoman authorities to undermine the status and strength of the *nawāḥi* sheikhs. The *Khaṭṭ-i sherīf* of Gülhané (1839) announced the abolition of the practice of tax-farming (*iltizām*). It is true that the attempt to abolish this custom only succeeded at the end of the nineteenth century and beginning of the twentieth,<sup>24</sup> but the character of the *iltizām* began to undergo a change. When the Ottoman government first tried to abolish the *iltizām* (1839) it soon discovered that it was incapable of introducing direct collection of taxes by officials. Therefore the *iltizām* was restored three years later,<sup>25</sup> with some modifications. In the past the Ottoman governor had been in charge of the leasing of *iltizām*. With regard to the *nawāḥi* of Palestine this entailed the annual confirmation of the right of the sheikhs to collect their *nawāḥi* taxes. An innovation was introduced whereby

the leasing of taxes and control of their collection was entrusted to the *majlis al-idāra* of the district. According to Gad Frumkin, who, at the end of the Ottoman period worked as a lawyer in the finance department of the Jerusalem District, "the authority of the *majlis al-idāra* included, *inter alia*, the leasing of the tithe and other taxes, which the government did not collect directly, but leased to whoever paid the highest price, in return for a sum determined in advance which the lessee paid into the treasury. Whatever the lessee succeeded in collecting went into his own pocket. He collected the tithe in kind or in cash from the fellahin with the aid of the gendarmes who went out to the villages with him or with his emissaries."<sup>26</sup>

It appears that in areas adjacent to Jerusalem and possibly even Mount Nāblus, this system gradually led to the weakening of the administrative status of the *nawāḥi* sheikhs, and to the removal of the function of tax collection from them and its transfer to urban notables. The village sheikhs were not able to stand up to the competition of the urban notables for this position and abandoned the function, which was taken over by the urban tax-farmers, who collected the taxes directly from the fellahin. These notables manned the *majlis al-idāra* and utilized it as an instrument for strengthening their position and influence. The result was that towards the end of the Ottoman period a situation arose which strengthened the urban notables at the expense of the rural sheikhs.<sup>27</sup> In addition, from 1840 onwards, the Ottoman authorities conducted a vigorous campaign to restrain the military power of the sheikhs, who were also deprived of their judicial powers. They were gradually brought within the framework of the Ottoman administration, becoming *mukhtārs* of the villages, appointed by the authorities. As a result of this systematic policy the power of the rural sheikhs was reduced and at the end of the nineteenth century few vestiges of their former administrative powers remained.<sup>28</sup>

In contrast to the decline of their administrative powers, the social status of the sheikhs and the *nawāḥis* was largely preserved. At the end of 1820 Sheikh 'Abd al-Ḥamīd Abū Ghaush was regarded not only as head of his family and village, but also as the leader of the twenty villages of Nāḥiat Bani Mālik, and the sheikhs of the adjacent *nawāḥi* regarded themselves in similar fashion.<sup>29</sup> Three years later, the villages of the Ramallah sub-district were ordered to establish police stations at their own expense (in accordance with the law for the prevention of crime) because of the proliferation of robberies in the area. The population of the region rallied for action against this governmental step. Their spokesmen were the *mukhtārs* of the villages and their organization for the submitting

of protest petitions was carried out according to the traditional division into *nawāhis*.<sup>30</sup>

At the end of the twenties and beginning of the thirties there were still traces of this division. In 1929, when the Executive Committee of the Palestine Arab Congress organized a financial appeal for the Arabs wounded in the riots and tried to extend the fund-raising to the total areas, it did this through the village sheikhs and again according to the traditional division into *nawāhis*.<sup>31</sup> The participation of the fellahin in the celebrations of al-Nebi Mūsā continued in the thirties to be organized according to this division, the villagers taking part in the event under their various banners.<sup>32</sup>

This preservation of the sub-districts augmented the political power of the sheikhs who headed them, and made them a factor in the struggle for leadership among the Palestinian Arabs.

The gradual decline in the scope of the authority of the rural and sub-district sheikhs did not leave a vacuum. The sheikhs were replaced by a growing social element—the urban notables *a'yān*. In the eighteenth century this stratum had already consolidated its strength and status in Ottoman society. The decline in the power of the central government, the weakening of the *Sipāhi* system, the degeneration of the Janissary force and the struggle waged between its imperial sections (those who continued to be regarded as “servants of the Porte”) and the local units (*yerliyya*)—all these factors greatly weakened the authority of the central government and its representatives (the *vāli*, governor) in the various provinces. This development enabled local factors—local ruling dynasties, Bedouin tribes and urban *a'yān*—to come to power and reach decisive positions of influence and sometimes also of control.<sup>33</sup>

The increase in the power of the urban *a'yān* stratum was accelerated in the nineteenth century. With the commencement of the *tanẓīmāt* period and after the Ottoman restoration in Syria, the Ottoman authorities sought to enlist the support of this class in their efforts to strengthen the central government. They established councils in the various districts (this step may have been taken in accordance with the precedent established by Muḥammad ‘Ali’s regime), which advised the governor, and in which the local *a'yān* was represented, together with the chief district administrative officers.

But the main result of this innovation was the exact opposite of that anticipated by the authorities. The local *a'yān* stratum succeeded in converting the council (*majlis*) into their own instrument. Through the council they exerted influence over local administration and checked the *vāli* when the latter tried to introduce reforms liable to affect their status. The authority of the *vāli* over this stratum was limited. His appointment was for one year only, while

the *a'yān* were local residents well acquainted with district affairs, and it is doubtful whether the *vāli* could have attained the experience and knowledge necessary to handle district administrative problems in so short a time. This policy was intended to prevent the *vālis* from becoming too strong, thus threatening the status of the central government in the provinces, but the result turned out to be exactly that feared by the authorities: the weakness of the *vālis* meant that the central authority was also weak. The central government appreciated this and in 1852 endeavoured to remedy the situation by considerably increasing the powers of the *vāli*, but this step was taken too late, since the local elements were already too strong.<sup>34</sup> The strength of the local *a'yān* decreased slightly after this, but it nevertheless remained one of the important factors in frustrating the reform attempts of Ahmed Shefiq Midhat, the reform-minded *vāli* of the Syrian (Damascus) *vilāyet* in the years 1878-80.<sup>35</sup>

The influence of this stratum over local administration was also strengthened by the fact that it filled many of the local administrative posts. Members of this class, from which emerged the '*ulamā'*' and various religious functionaries, were the first to acquire relatively modern education in the new schools of the Empire, and thus candidates for the new administration in the *tanẓīmāt* period were almost exclusively recruited from this stratum.

The abolition of the hereditary *iltizām*, formerly in the hands of the sub-district sheikhs, and its replacement by the leasing of taxes to whoever paid the highest price, greatly contributed to the strengthening of the status of the urban *a'yān*. Because of their wealth, they could compete with the sub-district sheikhs and win the *iltizām* rights. But along with the economic factor was that of their status in the new Ottoman administration. The leasing of taxes came under the authority of the administrative council (*majlis al-idāra*) of the district and the *a'yān* undoubtedly exploited their influence at these councils to obtain *iltizāms* for themselves.<sup>36</sup>

This development is closely tied up with the result of the faulty implementation of the Ottoman Land Law of 1858. The entrusting of the implementation of the law to the local administration, under the control of the *majlis al-idāra*, made a mockery of the intended effect of the legislation. Instead of strengthening the state's rights over the *mīri* land and the rights of the cultivators, it allowed the *a'yān* to register large stretches of land in their own names—land to which they also held the *iltizām* rights. The heavy debts incurred by the fellahin and their fear of registering their rights in the land registers were to the advantage of the urban notables.<sup>37</sup>

As a result of these processes the urban *a'yān* attained a strong

position in the civil and religious administration of the Empire, as well as extensive land property. A considerable number of the senior district administrative posts were in the hands of the various local élites, and quite a number of the members of this class attained senior positions in the Ottoman administration outside their own areas. For example: 'Abd al-Laṭīf Ṣalāḥ of Nāblus was First Secretary of the Senate at the end of his Ottoman career;<sup>38</sup> Aḥmad Ḥilmi 'Abd al-Bāqī served as Director General of the Ottoman Agricultural Bank in Syria and Iraq;<sup>39</sup> Muṣṭafā al-Khālidi of Jerusalem served as Chief of the Beirut police, Chief Prosecutor and eventually as a judge in that town's court of appeal;<sup>40</sup> 'Arif Pāshā al-Dajāni of Jerusalem held various positions in the Ottoman administration and attained the post of District Governor (*Muteṣerrif*);<sup>41</sup> As'ad al-Shuqayri of Acre was a member of *Sheikhül-Islām's* "Shar'i Inquiries Committee" at Istanbul and, during the First World War, was Mufti of the Fourth Army (under Jemāl Pāshā) which fought on the Egyptian-Palestinian front;<sup>42</sup> and Mūsā Kāzīm al-Ḥusayni, who rose from a relatively humble position in the administration through the post of sub-district Governor (*Qā'imaqām*), District Governor to Governor of Yemen.<sup>43</sup> The establishment of the Ottoman Parliament also helped the *a'yān* to strengthen their position, since all the representatives of the Palestinian districts were members of this stratum and thus won an additional source of political and social influence.<sup>44</sup>

The supremacy of the *a'yān* is clearly evident on examination of the social realities of life in the various Palestinian towns at the end of the nineteenth century and beginning of the twentieth. In Jerusalem the most prominent families were the al-Ḥusayins and al-Khālidis (soon to be superseded by the Nashāshībīs). The Khālidi family mainly fulfilled important functions in the field of religious affairs and its sons traditionally held the position of head of the Shar'ī court in Jerusalem.<sup>45</sup> At the beginning of the twentieth century two of its sons were prominent and respected religious dignitaries: Sheikh Khalil al-Khālidi, who was later to become President of the Shar'ī Court of Appeal in Palestine and Sheikh Rāghib al-Khālidi, founder of the Khālidiyyah Library. But the members of this family apparently did not adapt well to the new Ottoman administration, their numbers dwindled, and as a result their influence was weakened.<sup>46</sup>

The al-Ḥusayni family held the position of Mufti of Jerusalem from the mid-nineteenth century. A municipality was established in Jerusalem in 1877(?), and many members of this family held the post of mayor, although on occasion the Khālidis or 'Alamis also served in this capacity.<sup>47</sup> In the 1880s Salīm al-Ḥusayni held

this position, and in the second decade of the twentieth century his two sons: Ḥusayn Salīm al-Ḥusayni and Mūsā Kāzīm al-Ḥusayni followed in his footsteps.<sup>48</sup> Members of this family also held high posts in the Jerusalem district administration, as sub-district and district governors and in the central government administration at Istanbul.<sup>49</sup>

By holding this position this family was able to win national status. The Mufti of Jerusalem was the central figure at the al-Nebi Mūsā celebrations,<sup>50</sup> and we have already noted that the significance of this event was countrywide. Furthermore, the close ties of the al-Ḥusayni family with this annual event were emphasized even more by the fact that members of this family were the traditional administrators of the *Awqāf* for the al-Nebi Mūsā mosque near Jericho.<sup>51</sup>

The Nashāshībi family advanced in status only in later generations. 'Uthmān al-Nashāshībi, who was a rich property-owner, was elected to Parliament in 1912,<sup>52</sup> while Rāghib al-Nashāshībi served as Jerusalem District Engineer and in 1914 was also elected to Parliament.<sup>53</sup> Members of this family also served on the district administrative council.

It is not surprising, therefore, that the status of these families was high and that the district governor was obliged to settle district matters in accordance with their wishes.<sup>54</sup> In the 1850s, the British Consul, James Finn, described their status as follows:

"It should be mentioned that a close corporation of Arab families, not recognized by law, but influential by position, usurped all the municipal offices among them".<sup>55</sup>

Fifty years later the situation remained unchanged and the Jerusalem District Governor in 1906-8 resented it and tried to change matters. He described the status of the families by saying: "There are various influential people and notables here who have won riches and fame through interfering with the rights of other people. . . . Because of their superiority over the Arab [Bedouin?] inhabitants, most of whom are primitive, the Jerusalem notables have always been renowned for their many revolts against the government . . . When Ra'ūf Pasha was appointed Governor of Jerusalem he introduced a method of abolishing the domination of these parasites over the masses and of making clear to these wielders of influence in the district, bearers of the names of Ḥusayni, Khālidi, Nashāshībi and Da'ūdi [Dajāni], what their limitations were . . ." <sup>56</sup>

In Nāblus, which was also the capital town of a district, the local families also enjoyed special status. For generations the sons

of these families had traditionally held prominent positions in the army and administration of the district and the Empire, but it seems that with the reforms in the Empire their participation decreased. This conservative town apparently did not succeed in adapting itself to new conditions with the same rapidity as Jerusalem. Of the sons of Nāblus families, we find only Amīn 'Abd al-Hādi serving as sub-district Governor outside his home district.<sup>67</sup> Nor is there any evidence to show that the Nāblus families influenced local district affairs to the extent that prominent Jerusalem families did.

The prominent Nāblus families were split into two camps. The source of the split lay in the original division into *Qays* and *Yamani*, but after the Egyptian conquest in the 1830s the split took on a political significance. The *Yamani* faction, headed by the families of 'Abd al-Hādi and Nimr, supported the Egyptian regime and served as governors under it, while the *Qays* faction, headed by the Ṭawqān family, led the rebels.<sup>68</sup> This new alignment made itself felt in the names of the two rival factions: the pro-Egyptian faction named itself *Dār al-Maṣri*, and the rebels *Dār al-Bey*, apparently after the title of Bey borne by the Ṭawqān family. This division and these names were preserved until well into the second decade of the twentieth century.<sup>69</sup>

The situation was similar in the sub-district towns of Gaza and Jaffa. There too the important local positions (mayor, local mufti) were held by members of the prominent families, who had succeeded in gaining control over wide stretches of land.<sup>69</sup> If one recalls that the coastal plain was sparsely populated in the nineteenth century and takes into account the methods of land registration in desolate areas where no claimants were to be found, it will be understood how this development occurred.

The strong position of the Jerusalem *a'yān* families apparently resulted from the special status of the Jerusalem *sanjaq*, based on the sanctity of the Holy City. In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries the *qādi* of Jerusalem wielded extensive judicial authority. In this period there were also cases where the Jerusalem *sanjaq* was elevated to the level of *iyālet* (province) or at least a special *sanjaq*, independent of the Province Governor. The formal expression of this was the appointment of a District Governor on a higher level (*Muteserriif*) to head it.<sup>61</sup>

In the 1850s, after the Crimean War, this higher administrative status was made permanent. It was then determined that the Governor of the Jerusalem *sanjaq* would no longer be subordinate to the Governors of the Saida or Damascus provinces, but would be directly under Istanbul, so that the *sanjaq* would in fact be an

*iyālet*.<sup>62</sup> It was decided that the Governor of this district would bear higher rank than the ordinary District Governor,<sup>63</sup> and when, in accordance with the Ottoman *vilāyet* law of 1864 "general councils" (*mejālis-i 'umūmiye*) were set up in the new *vilāyets* over the "administrative councils" (*mejālis-i 'l-idāre*) of the districts, a "general council" was also established in Jerusalem.<sup>64</sup>

This administrative development, rooted in the international interest in Jerusalem and the dispute between various Christian sects over rights to the Holy Places, constitutes the background for the rise in the status of the prominent Jerusalem families. The equalization of the status of Jerusalem with that of Damascus, for example, also equalized the status of the notables of the two cities and achieved for the Jerusalem notables seniority over the prominent families of Nāblus and other Palestinian cities and towns. The fact that in Jerusalem there developed a class of notables with high social and administrative status, accustomed to a large extent to independent management of their district affairs, exerted considerable influence over the development of events in Palestine even after the Ottoman period.

#### THE STRUCTURE OF THE PALESTINIAN POPULATION

The modern Jewish community of Palestine originated from two sources: the old-established Palestinian Jews, who had settled there before the immigration of the "Lovers of Zion" (*Hovevei Tziōn*) began in the late nineteenth century, and those who arrived in the subsequent waves of Zionist immigration.

The old-established Jews were themselves divided into two categories: the *Sefardim*, who had settled in Palestine prior to the nineteenth century, and the *Ashkenazim*, who immigrated there during this period. The *Sefardim* were the dominant element in the Jewish community; they maintained ties with the Ottoman authorities and were recognized by them and dealt in various economic activities. The *Ashkenazim*, on the other hand, lived for the most part upon charity sent from Europe and consequently their status was much lower than that of the *Sefardim*. However, an improvement in their position came with the great influx of European Jews into Palestine during the nineteenth century. By 1880, the number of Jews in the country had doubled to approximately 25,000, two-thirds of them living in Jerusalem (about 50% of that city's population).<sup>1</sup>

The changes in the Jewish community were not only numerical. Beginning in the 1850s, various elements attempted to abandon

the old way of life by setting up new city quarters in Jerusalem and establishing agricultural settlements (Gey-Oni, Motza, Petah-Tikvah). Although these settlements failed, the new city quarters became the core of modern Jerusalem.

The settlements did not disappear completely. In 1882 there began to appear in Palestine new Jewish immigrants, who came with the express aim of returning to the soil as a basis for the renewal of the Jewish nation and its culture. Most of the immigrants belonged to the *Hibbat Tzion* movement, and in leaving Russia and Rumania they gave expression to their belief that there was no future for the Jews in those countries. Eastern Europe was being swept at this time by a strong wave of anti-Semitism which brought about mass Jewish emigration, and nearly two million Jews left the area prior to the outbreak of the First World War. The overwhelming majority headed for the United States, but some refused to trade one place of exile for another and elected to go instead to Palestine in order to create there a foundation for the re-establishment of the Jewish nation.

As a result of this wave of immigration the number of Jews in Palestine by the eve of the First World War was approximately 85,000; 86% of them in the cities (Jerusalem, Safed, Tiberias, Hebron, Jaffa and Haifa) and 14% in the forty-three settlements.<sup>2</sup> Immigrants in both city and village turned to new livelihoods, abandoning charity as the source of their support. The new settlements, which enjoyed the generous aid of Baron Edmond de Rothschild, practised agriculture; in the cities, the immigrants turned to crafts, building and commerce. In these settlements the foundation was laid for self-organization, modern Hebrew speech, Hebrew education and the labour organizations.

During the First World War the number of Jews declined to about 55,000 because of the tribulations of war, famine, disease and the expulsion of foreign citizens. However, immigration resumed after the war, though on a much smaller scale than the leaders of the Zionist movement had anticipated. The 1922 census showed there to be about 84,000 Jews, while in 1931 the figure had reached 175,000.<sup>3</sup> The extent of Jewish immigration in the years 1919-31 was as follows:<sup>4</sup>

1919—1,806	immigrants
1920—8,223	immigrants
1921—8,294	immigrants
1922—8,685	immigrants
1923—8,175	immigrants
1924—13,892	immigrants
1925—34,386	immigrants
1926—13,855	immigrants

1927—3,034	immigrants
1928—2,178	immigrants
1929—5,249	immigrants
1930—4,944	immigrants
1931—4,075	immigrants

The increase in the number of Jewish immigrants in the years 1924–6 was the product of two major factors: anti-Jewish economic legislation in Poland and a new immigration policy in the United States. Independent Poland from its very beginnings had adopted a policy of hostility towards its Jewish minority (over 10% of the population). This policy found expression in 1924 in legislation discriminating against Jewish merchants and artisans in order to facilitate the entry of Poles into these professions. Until this time Jews had, generally speaking, reacted to such measures by emigrating to the United States, but in 1924 the United States Government adopted a policy of immigration quotas on the basis of the countries of origin of potential immigrants—thus closing its doors in the face of new Jewish immigrants from Poland and the rest of Eastern Europe. The pressure of immigration on Palestine grew accordingly. The flood of immigrants in 1924–6 was concentrated mainly in the cities and settlements and brought about the rapid development of Tel-Aviv. In the settlements the immigrants were absorbed by the rapidly developing citrus industry, while in the cities many of them turned to small-scale commerce and building. The building industry was booming and with it the entire economy; however, when investment in building declined, the result was high unemployment, and soon the entire economy was undergoing a crisis. Urban workers were severely hit and their situation soon became unbearable. Workers in the settlements, who were employed in the citrus groves, were less affected however. The hardship of the unemployed led to a decline in immigration and an increase in emigration. In 1927 the number of emigrants (over 5,000) was greater than the number of immigrants.<sup>5</sup> In 1928 these two opposing trends were balanced, and only in 1929 was there a surplus of immigrants. It must be noted that the phenomenon of emigration was not restricted to the 1927–8 crisis but in fact existed throughout the years of Jewish immigration. The difficulties of living and adjustment in Palestine and disillusionment with the “Jewish National Home” accompanied the process of Zionist self-determination throughout its history.

The main body of Jewish settlement was concentrated in the cities. According to the 1931 census the Jewish rural population was a mere 46,000, i.e. over 26% of the entire Jewish population.<sup>6</sup> Notwithstanding the crisis, the 1920s were years of growth and

consolidation for the "Jewish National Home". Large areas of land were purchased in the Jezreel valley, the Valley of Zebulun and the Haifa Bay, and the Valley of Hefer (Wādi al-Ḥawārith) and many settlements were established there.<sup>7</sup>

Beginning in 1920, the autonomous community organization of the Palestinian Jews, which was recognized by the Mandatory Government, was set up; the Federation of Labour and the *kibbutz* movements were founded; the Hebrew University was established, and the first steps were taken towards organizing an underground self-defence force.<sup>8</sup>

The Arab population also grew, although at a slower rate, due for the most part to natural increase. On the eve of the First World War the Turkish authorities estimated the number of Arab residents in the three *sanjaqs* of Palestine (Acre, Nāblus and Jerusalem) at approximately 600,000.<sup>9</sup> The overwhelming majority were Muslims. A modern study of the urban population in Palestine in the 1880s has put the number of city-dwellers at around 121,000;<sup>10</sup> if one subtracts the estimated number of Jews, then it will be found that the number of Muslim and Christian city dwellers was less than 100,000.

According to the 1922 census there were approximately 668,000 Arab-speaking Palestinians, comprising around 589,000 Muslims, 71,500 Christians, and 7,500 Druzes. In the 1931 census the number of Muslims had increased to approximately 760,000, with about 91,000 Christians and 9,000 Druzes.<sup>11</sup> The largest Christian community—about half the Christian population—was that of the Greek-Orthodox Church, with the Greek-Catholics in second place. In 1931, the Arab population was still overwhelmingly rural. Among the Muslims there were approximately 572,000 rural dwellers, as against 188,000 town dwellers, while amongst the Christians there were about 22,000 rural inhabitants, compared with 69,000 urban inhabitants.<sup>12</sup>

This social structure is reflected in the occupational distribution of the Palestinian Arab population in 1931:<sup>13</sup>

	(Percentages)		
	Muslims	Christians	Arabs in General
Agriculture	63.5	14.6	57.1
Industry, Handicraft and Building	12.6	25.1	12.0
Transportation	5.9	7.2	6.0
Commerce	8.0	10.3	8.2
Liberal Professions	1.6	9.8	2.7
Public Service	2.0	15.7	3.9
Domestic Services	2.3	8.1	3.2
Remainder	4.7	9.2	6.3

In the area of Arab education there was considerable development, as the tables opposite show.<sup>14</sup>

While the literacy rate among the Jews was 72% in 1931, among the Muslims it was 10%, and among the Christians 48%.<sup>15</sup>

#### POLITICAL TRENDS AMONG THE PALESTINIAN-ARABS ON THE EVE OF THE FIRST WORLD WAR

The existence of the Arabs within the Ottoman Empire as a separate group with their own specific identity was by no means a new phenomenon. The existence of linguistic differences within the Empire, the consciousness of common origin from Arab tribes and the special status of the Arabs in Islam—all these factors meant that despite the common Muslim identification, the differentiating factors between the various Muslim ethnic and linguistic groups were not forgotten. The new mood which began to be felt at the end of the first decade of the twentieth century was based on the attribution of subjective ideological and political significance to these objective differences. From the moment when demands for political rights based on these objective factors began to be voiced, it was possible to say that the transition from Arab consciousness to Arab nationalism had begun.

This change, which was far-reaching though limited in scope, occurred first and foremost in Damascus and Beirut and later in student and intellectual circles in Istanbul, Cairo and Paris.<sup>1</sup> This book is mainly concerned with the role Palestinians played in the development of the Arab nationalist movement and the extent to which the nationalist ideology found expression in Palestine itself.

The total number of members of Arab nationalist societies on the eve of the First World War was infinitesimal—126 members and a further 30 who joined either on the eve of the war or during the war itself. According to C. E. Dawn, there were 22 Palestinians in the first category and 10 in the second.<sup>2</sup> According to my calculations, there were only 24 Palestinians.<sup>3</sup> In any case it is clear that the number was very small, and that most of them were young.

Together with these young men who were active members of the nationalist societies, there were others who supported the activities of these groups. When the Arab Congress was held in Paris in 1913, many residents of Arab countries sent telegrams and letters of support. Of the 387 names which appeared as signatories of these expressions of support, 130 were Palestinians,<sup>4</sup> but several of these have already been included as members of the societies.

**THE ARAB PUBLIC SYSTEM—GOVERNMENT SCHOOLS**

1 School Year	2 No. of Schools	3 No. of Teachers	4 Number of Pupils			5 School Age Population	6 Total Arab Population	Remarks
			Boys	Girls	Total			
1914-15	98	234	6,848	1,400	8,248	71,933	604,275	Col. 5: compulsory ages 7-11 under Ottoman Law. Second and last year of British military administration.
1919-20	171	408	8,419	2,243	10,662			
1920-21	244	525	13,656	2,786	16,442	168,000	673,000	} Two years operation of a Four Years' Expansion Scheme (The First). Col. 5: age group 5-14. Col. 6: Official Census.
1921-22	311	639	16,606	3,033	19,639			
1922-23	314	672	16,046	3,285	19,331			
1923-24	314	685	15,509	3,655	19,164			
1924-25	315	687	16,147	3,734	19,881			
1925-26	314	687	16,146	3,591	19,737			
1926-27	315	722	16,488	3,591	20,079			
1927-28	314	733	17,133	4,126	21,259			
1928-29	310	750	17,291	4,345	21,636			
1929-30	310	760	18,174	4,782	22,956			
1930-31	308	744	19,346	4,942	24,288	215,000	860,000	Col. 6: crude figures according to Official Census.
1931-32	305	783	19,658	5,179	24,837			

**THE ARAB PUBLIC SYSTEM—NON-GOVERNMENT SCHOOLS**

School Year	Muslim Schools			Christian Schools			School Year	Christian Schools			Muslim Schools		
	No. of Schools	No. of Teachers	No. of Pupils	No. of Schools	No. of Teachers	No. of Pupils		No. of Schools	No. of Teachers	No. of Pupils	No. of Schools	No. of Teachers	No. of Pupils
1920-21	—	—	—	—	—	—	1926-27	53	184	4,522	192	1,005	14,919
1921-22	42	114	2,287	139	688	11,952	1927-28	73	181	4,525	191	997	13,597
1922-23	38	112	2,477	172	786	13,348	1928-29	75	195	4,719	162	1,023	14,096
1923-24	47	131	3,044	179	843	14,328	1929-30	94	237	5,644	149	1,021	14,124
1924-25	50	—	3,565	184	—	15,321	1930-31	137	271	7,243	181	1,091	14,360
1925-26	45	140	3,445	183	866	14,385	1931-32	157	330	9,127	151	1,061	14,100

It is possible that the small number of Palestinians in the general Arab nationalist movement results from the fact that few Palestinians were then residing in the geographical centres of the movement. The picture must therefore be completed and it is necessary to examine the extent to which the movement had branches or support within Palestine itself.

Some time before the cultural and national awakening of the Arabs found political expression, it was possible to sense the hostile attitude of the population towards the Ottoman authorities. James Finn, the British Consul in Jerusalem in the 1840s and '50s, noted that a large proportion of the local population hated the Turks, regarded the Turkish Caliphate as a fraud and distorted the title of Khan into *Khā'in* (traitor in Arabic). Nevertheless, he believed that the sense of loyalty to Islam and its rulers was stronger than any other tie.<sup>5</sup> In my view, the hostile attitude towards the Ottoman authorities should be attributed partly to the natural antagonism of a population lacking political expression and partly to the opposition of the Muslims to the innovations of the *tanẓīmāt* period rather than to political motivation.

The first political manifestation of opposition to the Ottoman regime was discernible in 1905 in Nejjib Azouri's book,<sup>6</sup> in which he demanded independence for the Arab nation and the restoration of the Caliphate to a son of the Arab Quraysh tribe. Azouri was a Lebanese Maronite who had served in the Jerusalem district administration until his exile to Paris. His book was published there and it is doubtful whether it had any great effect in Palestine. Nevertheless, it was important that Azouri tried to smuggle into Palestine the Manifestoes of his organization "La Ligue de la Patrie Arabe" established in Paris, and that after the 1908 revolution he was permitted to return to Palestine and very possibly continued to disseminate his ideas there.<sup>7</sup>

Whatever the significance of Azouri's activities, his ideas did not gain widespread support until after 1908 the year of the Young Turks revolt. Until that date there were very few manifestations of Arab nationalist attitudes and Azouri was exceptional in this respect. George Antonius attributed this silence to the repressive regime of 'Abdül-Ḥamīd the Second, who resisted any attempt to undermine his all-powerful authority over the Empire. But this explanation disregards the other side of 'Abdül-Ḥamīd's policy—the return to Muslim orthodoxy following the period of modernization by the reforming politicians who had preceded him. The *tanẓīmāt* policy aroused discontent and opposition among the Muslim population of the Fertile Crescent, and it is almost certain that the reversal of this policy softened this discontent and

strengthened loyalty to the Empire. It should be recalled that it was these very Arab countries which were the main beneficiaries of 'Abdül-Ḥamid's policies in the sphere of the nurturing of Islam, its institutions (mosques, etc) and the 'ulamā' (indeed, some Syrian Arabs in particular reached the peak of the ruling hierarchy). It is not surprising, therefore, that this period is fondly remembered by the members of the Muslim social élite in Jerusalem.<sup>8</sup>

The Young Turks revolution of 1908, and particularly the introduction of more repressive methods of government and the manifestations of their Turkish nationalist policies from 1909 onwards created a snowballing of Arab opposition to the Ottoman regime, which gained momentum in the second decade of the twentieth century.<sup>9</sup>

The Governor of the Jerusalem district, 'Ali Ekrem Bey (the son of Namek Kemal) apparently sensed the desire for change and feared that the introduction of the constitution might be exploited for raising extreme radical demands. He wrote that "the declaration of the constitution and its implementation have gradually begun to arouse feelings of independence among the Arabs. This idea is at present silent and secret, it is true, but according to all the events now happening here, the press and other phenomena, one can feel that the people throughout Syria are tending in this direction."<sup>10</sup> Elsewhere he wrote: "It is my opinion that the concept of freedom will lead here to regrettable misuse. The corrupt gangs of notables, who regard the ignorant local population as their prey, will regard the idea of freedom as an important means of disobedience and revolt, to the extent that the state will be obliged to despatch military force to educate the people of the Jerusalem and the Syrian regions."<sup>11</sup> In order to anticipate this danger he recommended that the District Governor and the senior officials should always be appointed from among the Turks and not the Arabs.<sup>12</sup>

The main manifestations of Arab discontent in the Fertile Crescent were the reform societies (*al-Iṣlāḥ*) which were established in the various towns (especially in Beirut) and which demanded the introduction of a considerable degree of decentralization, the transferring of authority to the indigenous population and the safeguarding of the status of the Arabic language in local administration and education. These societies were affiliated to the Decentralization Party established in Cairo. They were not numerous in Palestine nor was support for their ideas widespread. There were branches of the Decentralization Party in Nāblus, Jenin, Ṭul-Karm and Jaffa<sup>13</sup> but not in Jerusalem. The geographical concentration of those demanding Arab rights in the Nāblus district

is also confirmed by an examination of the identity of the Palestinians who took part in the Arab nationalist movement outside Palestine. Most of these also came from Nāblus, and most of the telegrams of support for the 1913 Arab Congress in Paris came from this district. The Beirut papers took note of this fact and attacked the Jerusalemites for their lack of support for the reform movement.<sup>14</sup> It would appear that the strong status of the Jerusalem élite, its important role in the administration of district affairs and the integration of its sons in the Ottoman administration resulted in the fact that among this group, loyalty to the Ottoman Empire and to its ideology was stronger than in other districts of Palestine.

Further evidence of the mood of the Arab population in Palestine in that period can be found in the sympathy won by the "Liberty and Agreement Party" (*Hürriyyet ve-I'tilâf* or *Entente libérale* to use the French title),<sup>15</sup> which constituted the opposition to the autocratic administrative methods and centralistic policies of the Young Turks. It is true that this was not an Arab nationalist party but an Ottoman liberal party. Nevertheless, one cannot disregard the fact that it brought about political union of the non-Turkish elements in the Empire, and that in its demands for decentralistic policies it resembled the Decentralization Party and other Arab reform movements.

In summing up all these manifestations it would appear that they were the exceptions to the rule. Very few Palestinian Arabs were then attracted by the new ideology of Arab nationalism. An interesting fact is that Tawfiq 'Ali Barū's book, the most detailed study of the development of Arab-Turkish relations in the years 1908-14, hardly mentions reform or nationalist societies in Palestinian towns. However, the difficult situation during the First World War and the repressive measures employed by Jemal Pāshā changed the attitude of the population towards the government and gradually also towards the Ottoman regime itself.<sup>16</sup> Nevertheless, there were no manifestations of revolt in Palestine during the First World War, and even if there were signs of discontent, they did not reach the stage of active opposition to the Ottoman regime.<sup>17</sup> There were even positive expressions of loyalty to the Ottoman Empire. As'ad Shuqayri, the Acre district representative in the Ottoman Parliament in 1912-14, opposed the decentralistic trend and the struggle for Arab rights and remained loyal to the Ottoman-Muslim Empire.<sup>18</sup> Shukri al-Ḥusayni of Jerusalem, who also reached a high rank in the Ottoman administration, also took this stand.<sup>19</sup>

*Al-Karmil*, the Haifa paper, tended to support the reform and decentralistic movement. On the other hand, *Filasfīn*, which was

published in Jaffa, opposed it vehemently, and reflected Ottoman ideology, advocating the partnership of all citizens of the Ottoman Empire in one united state, with full equality for members of all religions and nationalities. The paper opposed the demands for a decentralized regime and for the strengthening of the powers of the administrative councils in the *vilāyets*, since it considered such a step would weaken the unity of the Empire and provide opportunities for foreign intervention in its affairs. It specifically expressed its disapproval of the liberal opposition and the principal expressions of the decentralist and reform movement and Arab nationalism: the activities of Sayyid Ṭālib, *Naqīb al-Ashrāf* of Baṣra, the Beirut Reform Society and the Paris Congress. On the other hand, it supported the rule of "The Society of Unity and Progress" and its ideology.<sup>20</sup>

One of *Filasīn's* arguments against the reform movement was the fear that their leadership might provide the Zionists with opportunities for infiltrating Palestine and gaining further control over it.<sup>21</sup> This argument, voiced in 1913, was not a new development, but had evolved from the hostile attitude to Zionism which had come into being at the end of the nineteenth century.

Modern Jewish settlement in Palestine, from the end of the 1870s, brought to Palestine a hitherto unknown type of Jew. In place of the Jews of the old *yishūv* (community), closed within their own districts and within themselves, there began to appear a new kind of Jew, who broke out of the boundaries of the old settlement areas and the traditional way of life. The educated Arab public took note of this development, and of its significance. Settlement on the land created considerable problems with neighbouring villages and sometimes with former tenants, and the local population regarded the Jews as trespassers. Reaction to the new phenomenon was at first primitive and non-political but over the years it took on the form of organized opposition to Zionism.

The purchase of land by Jews created much cause for dispute with Arab fellahin. The Jewish purchasers were not acquainted with local customs regarding freedom of pasturing after the harvest, and when they tried to prevent such pasturing, disputes broke out. When land was purchased from owners out of disregard or insufficient concern for the tenants, disputes arose which continued unabated for years.<sup>22</sup> But these controversies were not of a political nature—similar disputes occurred among the Arab villagers themselves—and they certainly did not prevent the local Arabs from selling land to the Jews at extremely high prices. As previously noted, in 1908, 'Ali Ekrem Bey, the *Muteserrif* of the Jerusalem District, recommended that the Jerusalem *Qādi* always be appointed

from among the Turks and not the local Arabs, since the *Qāḍi* was a member of the committee controlling land transfer, and there was need for a non-local man who would truly fulfil the government instructions against the transfer of land to Jews.<sup>23</sup>

The first political expression of opposition to Zionism came in 1891. In the spring of that year a number of Jerusalem notables sent a petition to the central government in Istanbul demanding the prevention of further immigration of Jews and purchase of land by them. They claimed that the Jews were taking land out of the hands of the Muslims and gradually gaining control of local commerce.<sup>24</sup> Many years were to pass before this phenomenon was repeated. This did not mean that the apprehension about Zionism disappeared, but it seems that the scope of its activities in Palestine on the one hand, and the level of political consciousness on the other were too weak to arouse any opposition. In a private letter, Yūsuf Diā' al-Khālidi, Speaker of the Ottoman Parliament in 1876, expressed the view that Zionism was just in theory, but for the sake of the peace and tranquillity of the inhabitants of *Filasfīn* it would be better if the efforts to implement it ceased.<sup>25</sup> In the preface to his book, Nejjib Azouri also expressed his fears, which now read like a veritable prophecy of the consequences of the implementation of the Zionist ideal: "Two important phenomena, of identical character but nevertheless opposed, which till now have not attracted attention, are now making their appearance in Asian Turkey: these are the awakening of the Arab nation and the latent efforts of the Jews to re-establish, on an extremely large scale, the ancient Kingdom of Israel. These two movements are destined to struggle continuously with one another, until one prevails over the other. The fate of the entire world depends on the result of this struggle between the two peoples, which represent two contradictory principles."<sup>26</sup> Nevertheless it may be stated that until 1908, manifestations of political anti-Zionist attitudes were sporadic and non-systematic.<sup>27</sup> Public displays of anti-Zionist feeling began only after the Young Turks revolt.

This revolution ushered in the era of the Arab press in Palestine which became the standard-bearer in the struggle against Zionism. Prominent roles were played by *al-Karmil* in Haifa and the Jaffa paper, *Filasfīn*, both belonging to Greek Orthodox owners.<sup>28</sup> With the beginning of the Arab fight for national rights, the Arab press began to regard Zionism as "an enemy who in the future will usurp them in an area which they believe to be purely Arab".<sup>29</sup> This press turned its gaze towards the Jewish immigrants, who were evading the regulations of the Ottoman authorities and remaining in Palestine, and demanded that they fulfil their obligations.<sup>30</sup>

*Filasfīn*, which was hostile to the Arab nationalist trend, severely criticized the Arab Congress in Paris for not taking an unequivocal stand against Jewish immigration.<sup>31</sup>

The anti-Zionist activity of Najīb Naṣṣār, editor of *al-Karmil*, found an echo in Syria and other places and several of the leaders of the Arab movement (Shukri al-‘Asali of Damascus, for example), adopted the same position and made it an important part of their political careers. Najīb Naṣṣār even published an anti-Zionist book, thus publicizing his stand.<sup>32</sup>

The introduction of an Ottoman Parliament also provided an important platform for the expression of anti-Zionist attitudes. Prominent exponents of this view were Sa‘īd al-Ḥusayni and Rūḥī al-Khālidi, two of the three representatives of the Jerusalem District in the Ottoman Parliament in 1908–12. They exploited this platform to propound the dangers of Zionism and the need to prevent its implementation in Palestine.<sup>33</sup>

On the eve of the elections to the Ottoman Parliament in 1914, Rāghib al-Nashāshibi, the candidate elected by the largest majority, declared that “if I am elected as a representative I shall devote all my strength, day and night, to doing away with the damage and threat of the Zionists and Zionism”.<sup>34</sup> The other candidate elected, Sa‘īd al-Ḥusayni, promised to fight against the sale of land to Jews.<sup>35</sup> In his talks with Jewish leaders Sa‘īd al-Ḥusayni claimed that his anti-Zionist attitude resulted only from his desire for popularity “and out of consideration for Arab public opinion”.<sup>36</sup> These remarks seem to cast doubt on the sincerity of the speaker, but they certainly confirm the existence of anti-Zionist attitudes in Arab public opinion, which candidates for the Ottoman Parliament had to take into consideration if they wished to be elected.

If the arguments voiced against Zionism at this stage are examined, the fears which developed and the reasons for opposition to this movement can be understood. The land disputes between Jewish settlements and Arab villages and tenants, though intrinsically lacking in political significance, constituted an important factor in consolidating opposition to Zionism among the politically conscious public.<sup>37</sup> The very fact of land purchase by Jews for settlement purposes and their ability to pay extremely high prices for this land aroused fear of their seemingly unlimited economic power.<sup>38</sup> The readiness of the Jewish purchasers to employ various means for overcoming the obstacles placed in their path only strengthened these fears.<sup>39</sup> This development created a firm basis for a radical anti-Zionist attitude: the land disputes aroused anti-Zionist political echoes among the educated urban elite, and as the anti-Zionism of the urban intellectuals increased,

they began to organize the villagers into acts of opposition and sabotage against the purchase of land by Jews.<sup>40</sup> Khalil al-Sakākini wrote then in his diaries: "I would not hate the Zionist movement but for its attempt to build its existence and independence on the rubble of another [people]." In 1914 he went so far as to express his fears that a Jewish inundation of Palestine might split the Arab World in two and thus the Arab nation would be weakened.<sup>41</sup> Thus the seeds of hostility to Zionism fell on fertile ground, and were destined to spring to life in years to come.

Another aspect which, objectively speaking, lacked political significance but which in time contributed to the development of opposition to Zionism, was the social difference between the local population and the Zionist immigrants, particularly as regards the status of women and the relationship between the sexes. I have in my possession a report of a discussion conducted by several young and educated Muslims in Jerusalem in 1915 regarding Zionism. Their only complaint against Zionism was that when the Zionists wished to settle some matter in government offices they sent beautiful women to represent them and thus achieved priority.<sup>42</sup> This phenomenon of women appearing in public was a complete innovation in Jerusalem in 1915. This disregard for convention and other such innovations, increasing with the growth of Jewish immigration, greatly contributed to the hostility towards Zionism.

The Arabs began to see Zionism as a political force even before the First World War, and fear of Zionism soon took on a political character. From time to time anti-Zionist arguments with an economic basis, such as the increase in prices resulting from Jewish immigration continued to be voiced,<sup>43</sup> but the political aspect gradually prevailed. Zionism began to be interpreted as the efforts of the Zionists to tear away part of the body of the Ottoman Empire and turn it into a Jewish state.<sup>44</sup> The Jewish method of self-organization in the new Jewish settlement, the establishment of voluntary courts for civil matters without recourse to the Ottoman courts, the raising of the Zionist flag, the setting up of the Zionist Bank (Anglo-Palestine Corporation), the development of a separate educational network—all these factors were presented as evidence that the Jews were seeking to establish their own governmental framework, in accordance with biblical prophecies.<sup>45</sup>

These propaganda activities were accompanied by the establishment of political organizations with the aim of preventing the implementation of Zionism. At the end of 1910, an association was founded in Haifa, which had as its aim the taking of "forceful steps to persuade the government to prohibit the sale of land to Jews".<sup>46</sup> The moving spirit behind the association was Najib Naṣṣār,

Editor of *al-Karmil*, and Muslims also joined his organization, which was active in the northern towns. His aim was "to organize an economic boycott against the Jews, not to sell to them and not to buy from them and not to rent them houses".<sup>47</sup>

At the same time a similar organization was set up in Jaffa, by the name of "The Patriotic Ottoman Party" (*al-Ḥizb al-Waṭāni al-'Uthmāni*). "We do not deny", one of its members wrote, "that the main reason for its establishment is the feeling of its members and founders that the country is in danger and that a flood threatens to engulf it and has almost put an end to its political and economic life, and that threat is the Zionist Organization."<sup>48</sup> The leader of this party was Sheikh Sulaymān al-Tāji al-Fārūqi, who was then the principal Muslim spokesman against Zionism.<sup>49</sup>

In July 1913, the leaders of the opposition to Zionism in Haifa and Jaffa tried to convene a conference in Nāblus of representatives of all the Palestinian towns so as to organize the struggle against Zionism and against the purchase of land by Jews.<sup>50</sup> This attempt failed, but the very fact that there existed the desire to raise the struggle to a higher level attests to the intensification of anti-Zionist feeling. The fact that the Ottoman authorities did not carry out the regulations aimed at hindering Jewish immigration created resentment among the population.<sup>51</sup>

At the same time it should be reiterated that these views were limited to a narrow stratum of urban intellectuals. The very fact that the bearers of the anti-Zionist standard in the press were then Christians (Najīb Naṣṣār and the two al-'Isā brothers) undoubtedly limited the effect of their propaganda. Furthermore, not all the anti-Zionist groups had reached the same extent of opposition to Zionism which they later developed. *Filasṭīn* sometimes wrote with admiration and esteem, and not without a touch of envy, of the achievements of Zionism. The renaissance of the Hebrew language won the admiration of the editors, as did the agricultural achievements of the Jewish settlements, as demonstrated at the agricultural exhibition at Reḥōvōt.<sup>52</sup> When news of the Beilis trial reached Palestine, *Filasṭīn* reacted in unequivocal fashion, rejecting any possibility that the blood libel could be true,<sup>53</sup> even though it should be noted that several days later the same paper did not hesitate to publish a poem with anti-Semitic undertones.<sup>54</sup>

Was the development of anti-Zionism inextricably tied up with the consolidation of Arab national consciousness or was this attitude also common to all those elements in Palestinian Arab society which remained indifferent to Arab nationalism? It is true that *al-Karmil*, the first paper to raise the standard of opposition to Zionism and the most extreme in its attitude, leaned slightly

towards those elements which supported the decentralistic reform movement, later to evolve into Arab nationalism, but *Filasṣīn*, which supported the unity of the Ottoman Empire and its centralized administration, also opposed Zionism, although with less bitterness and without clear anti-Jewish undertones, out of consideration for Ottoman patriotism.

On the other hand those members of parliament from the Jerusalem district, who were extremely active anti-Zionists, Rūḥī al-Khālidi and Sa'īd al-Ḥusayni, supported the reformist and decentralistic trend of the Arab members of parliament. This was not surprising, since among the Arab societies outside Palestine, opposition to Zionism was much more widespread than among those circles which preached the unity of the Ottoman Empire. Shukri al-'Asali, one of the most prominent leaders of the young Arab nationalist movement in Syria, was a systematic and violent opponent of Zionism, both in the period when he held office as the *Qū'imaqām* of the Nazareth sub-district and after he was elected to the Ottoman Parliament.<sup>55</sup> A study conducted in 1914 by Dr. Nissīm Malūl revealed that Arab papers in Syria and Egypt (but not in Palestine!), which supported the demands for reform and decentralization of administration, displayed much greater opposition to Zionism than those supporting the "Society of Unity and Progress". If we divide these papers into four categories: Muslim decentralistic, Christian decentralistic, Muslim "Unity", and Christian "Unity", we find that the frequency of opposition to Zionism in these groups is 78%, 33%, 16% and nil respectively.<sup>56</sup>

It therefore emerges that outside Palestine there was an obvious connection between the awakening of Arab nationalism and opposition to Zionism, while in Palestine itself opposition to Zionism was common to the two political trends which fought for dominance over the Arab public: the Arab nationalist and the Ottoman Unity movements.

## Chapter One

# THE REJECTION OF ZIONISM AND THE CRYSTALLIZATION OF THE PALESTINIAN IDEOLOGY

### THE ANTI-ZIONIST AWAKENING AT THE END OF THE FIRST WORLD WAR AND ITS CAUSES

If voices were raised in Palestinian political circles in protest against Zionist settlement before the First World War, after the capture of Jerusalem in December 1917, and after news of the Balfour Declaration had reached Palestine, these voices became more vociferous.

British Intelligence and Military Administration officers and even Dr. Weizmann, who arrived in Palestine at the head of the "Zionist Commission", at once encountered this opposition. In their opinion, from the very beginning of British rule Zionist aims met with all-embracing opposition from the local Arab population, including its Christian segment.<sup>1</sup> Because of this opposition, within three to four months after the conquest of central Palestine various parties in the Jaffa-Ramleh area began setting up associations to counter the realization of Zionist goals; several months later this activity spread to Jerusalem.<sup>2</sup> Resistance to Zionism was discussed in the meetings of these groups, and possible ways to prevent the Jews from settling in Palestine and buying land were examined.

The continuing war in northern Palestine in 1918 made it necessary for the military authorities to reduce all political activity to a minimum. For that reason there are few cases, until the final stage of the war, of public expressions of anti-Zionism. Such cases occurred on the occasion of official receptions during which Arab notables delivered anti-Zionist speeches or in the form of publication of anti-Zionist articles in the Arab press outside Palestine.<sup>3</sup> However, the Mufti of Jerusalem, Kāmil al-Ḥusayni, refrained from attacking Zionism in his appearances throughout 1918.

The end of the war in Turkey, and with it the growth of freedom for the populace, and the first anniversary of the Balfour Declaration supplied the first public opportunity for the expression of the Arab community's opposition to Zionist aims.

On 2nd November 1918 the Zionist Commission in Jerusalem

held a parade and celebrations to mark the first anniversary of the Balfour Declaration. The festivities aroused much enthusiasm in the Jewish community but left a bitter impression on the Arabs, who saw in them confirmation of their fears of an early Jewish seizure of control in Palestine. The Arab leaders therefore decided to exploit this event for two purposes: first, to inform the Government of the setting up of the "Muslim-Christian Association", and secondly, to present a petition from the various Arab associations protesting against Zionist policy. The petition was delivered to the Military Governor of Jerusalem, Ronald Storrs, by a delegation composed of the heads of the Muslim and Christian communities and led by the Mayor, Mūsā Kāzīm al-Ḥusayni. It was signed by the heads of the various associations in Jerusalem and by about a hundred Jerusalem and village sheikhs in Judea.<sup>4</sup> A similar note of protest was presented to the Governor of Jaffa by the local Muslim-Christian Association.<sup>5</sup>

The composition of this new body, the Muslim-Christian Association, was similar to that of the delegations which delivered the protest notes to the authorities: it comprised the traditional heads of the community, the heads of the leading families and the religious communities, with the Christian represented over and above their proportional strength in the populace. In Gad Frumkin's opinion it was the Christians who prompted the establishment of the Association,<sup>6</sup> but the many reports, both Zionist and British, which are available do not confirm this.

The MCA appeared first in Jaffa in early November 1918 and about two weeks later in Jerusalem; it apparently constituted a continuation of the associations which had been set up during the spring and summer of 1918 by Muslims and Christians, for the purpose of expressing popular opposition to Zionism.<sup>7</sup> According to the reports of the "Information Office" (the intelligence service) of the Zionist Commission, its establishment was prompted by a British Intelligence officer in the area, Captain Brunton, who was aided by a local notable as his agent, 'Alī al-Mustaqīm (who was to be Mayor of Jaffa twenty years later).<sup>8</sup> Many years later Sir Wyndham Deeds, Chief Secretary of the Palestine Government during 1920-3, claimed in a conversation with H. M. Kalvarisky that "the Association enjoyed support and financial aid from the Government of Palestine from the start".<sup>9</sup> The British material available confirms this, although not completely. The Military Governor of Jaffa wrote: "I suggest that a Palestine Arab Commission be formed for the purpose of keeping the balance of power between the races. What the Arabs fear is not the Jews in Palestine but the Jews who are coming to Palestine."<sup>10</sup> It seems that officers of the

Military Administration, unhappy over Zionist policy because of the opposition it engendered in the local population, supported the setting up of a representative body which would give the Arab population a voice. In this way they hoped that resistance to Zionism would abate considerably. Moreover, we shall see that the MCA was not the only Arab protest body in existence, but the Military Administration preferred to support this body on account of its composition and its moderate political stands. The attitude of the army authorities to the MCA can be seen in the words of Major-General H. D. Watson, the second Chief Administrator of Palestine: "The Moslem Christian Association is not officially recognized except in so far as Public Notice No. 131 which requires the registration of all political and philanthropic societies and clubs given their official recognition. The main object of this society is to oppose the Zionist aims and they claim to be representatives of the majority of the population. The Society has up to the present always been moderate in its action and I am inclined to think should be of assistance to the Administration rather than the reverse, and that when they know the extent of the Zionist policy to be adopted will tend to moderate public opinion rather than excite it so long as they feel that the inhabitants of the country are not to be deprived of their land and put at a disadvantage commercially and economically in relation to the Jews. I consider too that if this Society was prohibited, a great deal of harm might ensue. We are able now to keep a close eye on its doings which are open to view. On taking this Administration I was advised to keep the balance of all parties, and in view of the fact that the Administration is known to be in close touch with the Zionist Commission, it is as well to be in touch with the body representing the other parties in the country, although the body is not officially recognized beyond registration."<sup>11</sup>

The various Muslim-Christian Associations formed a country-wide network with its headquarters in Jerusalem.<sup>12</sup> However in reality there existed no central system of organization, and each association evolved its own policy. Its statutes emphasized the Association's social, economic and educational roles, while in reality the Association concerned itself with political matters only (see the chapter on social and organizational aspects).

In the organizational stage two men stood out in the Jerusalem MCA—the Mayor, Mūsā Kāzīm al-Ḥusayni, and the General Administrator of the *Awqāf*, ‘Arif Ḥikmat al-Nashāshibi. However, the Jerusalem Governor, Ronald Storrs, subsequently forbade these men, both public office-holders, to engage in politics and forced them to choose between an administrative or a political

career; both chose administration.<sup>13</sup> In this way a path was cleared for Jerusalem's second Pasha and the head of the Dajāni family, 'Ārif Pāshā al-Dajāni, to move into a position of leadership. And indeed we see that in January 1919 'Ārif Pāshā appears as the President of the Jerusalem MCA, and by virtue of the senior status of the Jerusalem Association, as overall President of the MCA.<sup>14</sup>

The presentation of protest notes to the authorities became the principal mode of action of the Arab associations in 1919, and even spread to other cities such as Nāblus and Haifa.<sup>15</sup> Rejection of Zionism took on a more organized expression on three occasions: during the first MCA Congress in the latter part of January 1919; when the American commission of investigation, the King-Crane Commission, toured the country; and after Major-General L. Bols, the third Chief Administrator of OETA(S) [Occupied Enemy Territory Administration (South)] was forced officially to announce, in February 1920, Government policy on Zionism, which was based on the Balfour Declaration. There will be a discussion of these three significant occasions in the next chapter, but here it is important to state that despite the differences of opinion which existed at the Congress and during the appearances before the King-Crane Commission with respect to the political future of Palestine, as far as opposition to Zionism was concerned, there was complete agreement among the various Palestinian political groups. Moreover, Zionism appeared to many as the greatest danger threatening the Arabs of Palestine. Even in June 1920 at the height of the anti-French struggle in Syria, when war with France was imminent, 'Izzat Darwaza of Nāblus declared to the Syrian Congress that the Zionist danger was more serious than the danger from the French, since the French saw themselves as strangers, while the Zionists saw themselves as true natives of the land.<sup>16</sup>

On the surface, this was a surprising phenomenon. In 1918-9 Zionism in Palestine was still largely a matter of theory. Jewish immigration had not been resumed; transfers of land were prohibited by order of the Military Administration and the Jewish population not only did not grow but even diminished significantly, from 80,000 before the war to 50,000 at its end, for the reasons already outlined. What then caused the Arab population to be so anxious and to give so unequivocal an expression to its rejection of Zionism? It appears that several factors combined to cause the growth of hatred for Zionism.

First of all, Zionism was familiar to the Arab political community and as we have seen was rejected by it even before the First World War. Then, however, Zionism was connected with the

Jews alone; now Great Britain had publicly committed itself, in the words of the Foreign Secretary Balfour, to "view with favour the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people". News of this Declaration spread quickly in Palestine. What is more, it would seem that in those days of 1918 and 1919 the Balfour Declaration aroused exaggerated expectations among the Jews and exaggerated fears among the Arabs that a Jewish state would soon come into being. Even a moderate Zionist and a sober and experienced statesman like Herbert Samuel expressed himself in 1919 to the effect that Zionist policy should strive to create conditions which would enable the establishment of an independent state under the control of a Jewish majority.<sup>17</sup> There is Weizmann's well-known statement before the Peace Conference in Paris that Zionism's goal was that "Palestine become Jewish as England is English".<sup>18</sup> All the complex interpretations which Weizmann later attached to this saying did not dispel the bitter and powerful impression it left on the Arabs in those years. Even more moderate expressions sufficed to create the impression among the Arabs that Palestine was about to become "the National Home of the Jews"—for example, Weizmann's remarks in one of his speeches that the Jews "return to Palestine and not just come to it".<sup>19</sup> Also in 1918, after years of suffering and distress, the Jews of Jerusalem at last saw cause for rejoicing and "the word passed in the camp of Israel and the nations that the Balfour Declaration was like unto the creation of the state of Israel."<sup>20</sup>

Just as the Jews were caught up with enthusiasm, so the Arabs became agitated. In February 1918 the Muslims of Jerusalem had already begun to be disturbed by the idea that the Jews would become "masters of the Holy City and the whole of Palestine".<sup>21</sup> General Sir Gilbert Clayton, Chief Political Officer and policy-maker of the Military Administration, claimed that on the basis of his connections with the leaders of the Arab community and his direct contact with the population he could see that Jewish predominance in Palestine would be a nightmare for both Muslims and Christians;<sup>22</sup> yet the Arabs had begun to fear that soon a Jewish majority would be established in Palestine and a Hebrew government would be set up.<sup>23</sup> Such a far-reaching interpretation was not without foundation. The precise meaning of the Balfour Declaration was not known to anyone and it is doubtful if its formulators knew themselves exactly what they had declared. This lack of clarity left much room for interpretation.

Above all, the Arabs were convinced that they faced a danger of Jewish rule on account of the change in the status of the Jews. There is no doubt that the joy over the issuing of the Balfour

Declaration brought about a complete change in the conduct of the Jews in Palestine, and in their self-respect and pride. The Jews, who had previously considered themselves to be second-class citizens lacking almost any representation in local administration, began to see themselves as equals and perhaps even as the future masters of the country. No wonder, then, that the Arabs began to complain of "the arrogance and aggressiveness of the Zionists".<sup>24</sup>

The improved status of the Jews in the administration and the arrival of the Zionist Commission in April 1918 symbolized more than anything else the change in the Jews' position and were important factors in the growth of Arab anti-Zionism. The Military Administration took pains to explain to the population that it was only working on a temporary basis until the peace settlement (in accordance with the Hague Treaty of 1909 which dealt *inter alia* with the administration of occupied territories) and that it would work as much as possible within the framework of the legal and administrative *status quo*. The Zionist Commission and the heads of the Jewish community, on the other hand, felt it incumbent upon them to begin laying the foundations for the Jewish National Home—which was completely contrary to the *status quo* of the Ottoman period.<sup>25</sup> The military authorities were requested to equalize the status of Hebrew and Arabic, to bring Jews into the ranks of government officials, to appoint a Jewish mayor of Jerusalem and to see that at least half the members of the council were Jewish.<sup>26</sup> The latter demands were not met, but the first two were largely carried out. What is more, the Zionist Commission acted as a semi-official organization recognized by the military authorities. It received concessionary rail travel for its members and was allowed telephones for its offices at a time when the war still raged and the whole transportation and communication system was still subordinate to military necessities. The Commission, which saw its role as the furthering of Zionist interests, would come to the heads of the Military Administration with various requests and used its influence in Palestine and in London in order to abrogate certain decisions it thought unfavourable.<sup>27</sup> Since the salaries which the Military Administration paid its local employees were quite low, the Zionist Commission began, with the permission of General Money, the Chief Administrator [i.e. head of the Military Administration of OETA(S)], to increase the pay of Jewish administrative employees with the aim of encouraging Jews to enter government service.<sup>28</sup> This arrangement was likely to create embarrassing situations of dual loyalty and immediately aroused the wrath of the Arabs.

The contrast between this situation and what was customary in

the Ottoman period, when there were hardly any Jews in the administration, was striking.<sup>29</sup> The Arabs contested all these changes, claiming that the Zionist Commission was a government within a government and noting bitterly that the Zionists were allowed to fly the Zionist flag while they, the Arabs, were prohibited from flying their national banner. Jewish self-defence in the April 1920 disturbances supplied the Arabs with another argument, namely that the Zionist Commission was concerned with military preparations and was arming the Jews.<sup>30</sup> All this was happening, argued the Arabs, while the Jews were but a negligible minority in Palestine; what, they asked, would happen when they became a majority?<sup>31</sup> British Intelligence was also of the opinion that the presence of the Zionist Commission and its activities did much to foster the belief that Britain was about to give the Jews far-reaching privileges in the Holy Land.<sup>32</sup>

This change in the status of the Jews was an important issue in Turkish propaganda. It should be recalled that in early 1918 only southern Palestine as far as Jerusalem was in British hands while the northern parts of the country were still held by the Turks. The latter did everything they could to arouse anti-British feelings among the Arabs throughout the Fertile Crescent. The publication of the Sykes-Picot Agreement by the Bolsheviks provided them with an excellent propaganda tool. In Palestine they fell avidly upon the changes in Jewish status and made them their principal propaganda weapon in central and northern Palestine. They spread stories to the effect that the Jews in British-held areas had become the lords of the land and now treated the local Arab population with contempt. The Turks told the Arabs that Britain had sold out to the Zionists for money. This propaganda was so effective, according to 'Adil Zu'aytir of Nāblus, that the Arabs started to prefer the famine and cruelty of Turkish rule to the possibility that after conquest by the British they would be put under Jewish rule.<sup>33</sup> Probably this description was exaggerated and the effect of Turkish propaganda less powerful; still, it can be assumed that especially in Samaria, where the Zionist Commission was not active even after the British conquest, such exaggerated accounts gained a certain credibility among the inhabitants who had never witnessed the activities of this body.

There is no doubt that Arab bitterness over the new situation was an important factor in the formation of their anti-Zionist attitude. However, there were other reasons also. The Military Administration emphasized many times its purely temporary nature and the fact that the fate of Palestine had yet to be decided. The Anglo-French Declaration of November 1918 promised the popula-

tion of Syria and Iraq that it would decide its own future. Indeed, it is reasonable to assume that the Arab leaders in Palestine believed that by demonstrating their opposition to Zionism they would contribute to the final shaping of the country's destiny and would prevent the realization of the Balfour Declaration.<sup>34</sup>

On various occasions British army personnel expressed the opinion that Britain should win Muslim sympathies by "doing away with the scarecrow of Zionism"; they helped establish the MCA in order to keep the "balance" between the different factions of the population. It was even alleged that on one occasion, Ronald Storrs, the Military Governor of Jerusalem, had encouraged the local MCA to demonstrate against Zionism.<sup>35</sup> It was the belief among many leading military personnel that "if we want to avoid troubles and general dissatisfaction then we must show concrete proof of a preferential attitude to the local element" (i.e. the Arab population).<sup>36</sup> The heads of the Military Administration rejected the idea of the publication in Palestine of an official announcement which would validate the British government's Balfour Declaration policy, and several of them were doubtful if this policy would ever be realized.<sup>37</sup> General Clayton did not oppose Zionism completely but pressed for a Zionist policy with limited aims which would not arouse the anger of the Arabs.<sup>38</sup> Major-General H. D. Watson, the second Chief Administrator, told a delegation from the Jerusalem MCA in September 1919 that Britain would undoubtedly receive the mandate over Palestine and would then certainly fulfil her promise to set up a national home for the Jews in the country. But the task of governing would be entrusted to a ruler appointed by Britain and served by a representative council and an executive council which would be chosen from among the inhabitants in proportion to the various races. There was no question of immediate immigration of millions of Jews and the Arabs would not be forced to sell land to Jews. In these words General Watson did not reject Zionism, but it was clear that the governmental system he claimed would be set up in Palestine would give the Arabs decisive control and defeat Zionist aims. No wonder, then, that the Arab delegation heard his words with satisfaction.<sup>39</sup>

Thus the Arab leadership was familiar with the prevailing mood among the heads of the Military Administration in Palestine and even admitted this.<sup>40</sup> It is likely that this knowledge strengthened its determination to demonstrate its opposition to Zionism, in the hope that the leaders of the Military Administration would be able to bring about the abrogation of Zionist policy, or at least its limitation. Immediately after its arrival in Palestine, the Zionist Commission attempted to allay Arab fears and met several times

with Arab notables in Jerusalem. Weizmann delivered a speech to them, and his moderate explanations of Zionist aims, his lack of desire for a Jewish government and his sympathy for the Arabs made a favourable impression on his audience.<sup>41</sup> The Mufti of Jerusalem, Kāmil al-Ḥusayni, was apparently impressed by these sessions and showed sympathy for various aspects of Jewish activity, and not until after the April 1920 disturbances did he give his support to the anti-Zionist movement.<sup>42</sup> But this man was the only Arab public figure willing to accept the assurances of Weizmann and his colleagues. For the rest, the inherent threat of Zionism was not diminished.<sup>43</sup>

It would be incorrect to claim that the entire Arab population was united in an anti-Zionist position. There were large sections of the population, mainly villagers, who lacked any political consciousness and who were organized to sign pro-Zionist petitions.<sup>44</sup> There were also several urban public figures who tended towards a sympathy with Zionism, such as Ḥasan Shukri, Mayor of Haifa.<sup>45</sup> But it appears that the anti-Zionist stance was dominant among the urban population who were more enlightened and politically conscious.

The petitions delivered to the Military Administration by the Arabs during this period, the memoranda they sent, the decisions taken at various congresses and the subsequent speeches at meetings, newspaper articles in the Arab press and nationalist publications, all presented the claim that there was no room for Zionism in Palestine and that the country belonged to its Arab inhabitants. The arguments put forward to support this claim were many and varied, but taking the definition of ideology as a system of views and beliefs accepted by a given community and constituting the basis for its political activity, there is justification in calling the summary of these arguments the Palestine-Arab ideology.

#### THE PALESTINIAN-ARAB IDEOLOGY

The following is an attempt to summarize the complex nature of Arab arguments on Palestine, as expressed by individuals and groups. In general the emphasis is on memoranda, petitions and decisions of bodies which were connected to the organizational framework of the nationalist movement—*al-Nādi al-'Arabi*, the various MCAs and the Arab Executive Committee. Occasionally statements from articles or books are quoted when these reflect more or less accepted positions.

The Palestinian ideology had two faces: a positive one attempt-

ing to show why the Arabs of Palestine were justified in claiming the country as theirs, and a negative one consisting of a refutation of Zionism and the Balfour Declaration.

A basic claim in this argument was the historical continuity of Arab settlement in Palestine. The Arab population of the country was composed "of the stock resident in Palestine since its earliest history with an admixture of Amorite, Hittite, Phoenician, Philistine and other elements".<sup>1</sup> The First Palestinian Delegation claimed at one time that Palestine had a local population even before the Jews came to the country, and that this population was preserved throughout the generations and never assimilated with the Jews, who were always a closed society. The Arabs, according to this line of argument, had been living in the country more than 1,500 years and were now in the ascendant.<sup>2</sup> The official Arab organizations were not prolific in the use of this argument, which completely contradicted the traditional Muslim historiographical conception. However, others saw the continuity in an even more unequivocal manner: "Our Canaanite ancestors dwelt in this land before your ancestors (the Jews). Can you deny this?"<sup>3</sup> In this spirit the author of the following lines addressed Winston Churchill on the eve of his visit to Palestine in March 1921: "An experienced statesman like you can hardly be unaware that the first to settle in Palestine in the earliest antiquity were none other than the Amalekite Arabs, our early ancestors. Abraham, the father of the Jews, may he rest in peace, did not move to this land from Babylon until many centuries afterwards".<sup>4</sup>

Although this argument extended the duration of Arab settlement in Palestine, the Arabs tended to ascribe the beginning of their settlement to the Muslim conquest of AD 634. They emphasized that from then onwards, except for the Crusader and Ottoman periods, they ruled the country, lived there continuously and made their language and culture predominate, leaving no trace of other cultures.<sup>5</sup> This historical continuity of 1,300 years was in the opinion of the Arabs the decisive factor in establishing their attachment to the country, and they emphasized it on countless occasions.<sup>6</sup>

A second basic argument involved the numerical relation between Jews and Arabs in Palestine. According to the data of the Military Administration, in 1918 there were 512,000 Muslims, 66,000 Jews, and 61,000 Christians in the country.<sup>7</sup> The Arabs were of course aware of these facts and took pains to stress them. Although occasionally they cited other figures for the percentage of Jews in the total population, they usually quoted 7%. In this context they claimed that the percentage of property owned by Jews in the country was even smaller, indeed much less than 1%. They there-

fore contended that it was ridiculous to make so small a minority predominant over the vast majority of inhabitants.<sup>8</sup> Moreover, it was sometimes argued that some of the Palestinian Jews had been Arabicized and indeed become Arabs, or at least their native tongue was Arabic, and they should therefore not be counted as Jews.<sup>9</sup> On another occasion, in 1922, it was stated that "a large proportion of these [Palestinian Jews] are hostile to the Zionist movement, while the great majority of Jews are either antagonistic or indifferent to it".<sup>10</sup>

Both these arguments came close to the fundamental principle of the nationalist movements in Europe towards the end of the First World War, the "right of nations to self-determination". That is to say, a group of people speaking a common language, dwelling in unbroken territorial continuity and possessing a common consciousness of their unique historical development, constituted a nation, and by virtue of this fact possessed the right of self-determination, which for the most part was interpreted as meaning a right to have a state of their own.

This conception was generally accepted in Europe in these years, and its echoes reached the Middle East. However, the Palestinian nationalists did not content themselves with these two abstract arguments. Other arguments, some religious and some drawn from contemporary political developments, were no less prominent in their ideology.

In the latter part of 1918, when the Palestinians began to voice their claim to the country, they were conspicuously moderate when basing their claims on religious grounds. In those days it was emphasized that Jerusalem (and in parentheses, the entire country) was holy to all religions, while the number of Jews in the world was no more than 14 million as opposed to 350 million Muslims and 750 million Christians. Why then, they asked, should the religion of the few take precedence over the religions of the many? On the contrary, they maintained, it was necessary to secure the right of immigration to Palestine for members of all religions, Muslims, Christians and Jews.<sup>11</sup> Later, however, a more extreme viewpoint developed from this, with the claim that "the religious association of the Jews with Palestine is not equal to those of Christians and Moslems all over the world".<sup>12</sup> Proofs of this assertion were presented in abundance: the Jews had no ancient places of worship (*ma'ābid*) in Palestine, while the Arabs had *al-Masjid al-Aqṣā*, "the first direction of prayer (*al-Qiblah*) and the third holy site" (after Mecca and Medina); the mosque of the second Caliph 'Umar; "the cradle of Jesus, may he rest in peace"; "the Church of the Resurrection (the Holy Sepulchre) which is the site of

Christian hopes" and additional Christian Holy Places in Jerusalem, Nazareth, Bethlehem, Mount Tabor, Mount Carmel and others.<sup>13</sup> Moreover, each year Muslims and Christians came on pilgrimage to Palestine "in a spirit of devotion and prayer; thus even though the Jews have religious feeling for Palestine, the feeling of the Christians and Muslims for this land is stronger".<sup>14</sup> The Palestinians saw themselves as responsible before Allah and the Islamic and Christian worlds "for the keeping of this holy land for the hundreds of millions of Muslims and Christians".<sup>15</sup>

An important factor in this argument was that Palestine had been the birthplace of Christ. In one of the petitions it was stated that the land in which Christ had lived and been crucified could not be a national home for the Jews who had persecuted him. Another read that it was forbidden to deliver Jerusalem into the hands of the crucifiers of the Messiah.<sup>16</sup> However, this argument, based as it was on the importance and sanctity of the country for Christianity, was used primarily to persuade the English and other Western Christians, and not necessarily in articles for internal propaganda.

The argument which eventually became of over-riding importance was that Palestine was the site of the first *Qiblah* and the third Holy Place of Islam, and Zionism constituted a danger to this Holy Place. This argument, which was related to the serious conflict over the rights of the Jews at the Wailing Wall, will be discussed later in the book at length.

The political arguments presented by the Palestinians were closely tied to events arising from the First World War. Firstly, the Palestinians emphasized that the Allies, and particularly the American President, Wilson, had promised that the peace which would be established following the war would be based on the free will of nations, and that the purpose of their fight was "to liberate the weak peoples" and to help them set up governments of their own. No longer would a solution be imposed upon smaller nations by the great powers. What, then, was the will of the Palestinians? They gave their answer in their appearances before the King-Crane Commission.<sup>17</sup>

A special place in the Allied pronouncements belongs to the Anglo-French Declaration of 7th November 1918, which announced that Britain and France would help in "the establishment of government and administration deriving their authority from the initiative and free desire of the native population".<sup>18</sup> Despite the fact that this declaration did not specifically mention Palestine, the Palestinian spokesmen were quick to see in it an official promise of the right to self-determination.<sup>19</sup> Such promises of national liberation at the end of the war were not given lightly, at least so

the Arabs believed. Palestinian spokesmen emphasized and re-emphasized that the Palestinians had been sympathetic to the Allies during the war and had even aided them and as a result had suffered at the hands of the Turks.<sup>20</sup>

The Covenant of the League of Nations, which was agreed upon in June 1919, supplied another valuable argument to the Arab case. Paragraph 4 of Article 22 stated: "Certain communities formerly belonging to the Turkish Empire have reached a stage of development where their existence as independent nations can be provisionally recognized subject to the rendering of administrative advice and assistance by a Mandatory until such time as they are able to stand alone. The wishes of these communities must be a principal consideration in the selection of the Mandatory".<sup>21</sup> In the opinion of the Arabs, "this article clearly contemplates and applies to Palestine and the people of Palestine, who confidentially rely upon the compliance by the nations constituting the League with the letter and spirit of Article 22".<sup>22</sup> However, in reality the governmental arrangements set up in Palestine were in contradiction to the letter and spirit of this article. Palestine was being ruled as a British colony and not as a Class A mandate run according to Article 22 of the League Covenant.<sup>23</sup>

What gave rise to this situation? The British answer was that a special situation existed in Palestine by virtue of the Balfour Declaration and the policy of implementing that Declaration. This policy did not contradict the provisions of Article 22 of the League Covenant, since the main powers behind the agreement interpreted this Article, insofar as it applied to the lands liberated from Turkish rule, in Articles 94-7 of the Treaty of Sèvres, and in these articles only Syria and Iraq were mentioned as lands temporarily recognized as independent.<sup>24</sup>

The Palestinians accepted this reply in part, since they themselves claimed that the Balfour Declaration and Britain's Zionist policy were the source of their discontent, and had it not been for these two obstacles the status of Palestine, with regard to its governmental arrangements, would have been no worse than that established in Iraq, Transjordan and Syria. On the other hand, they refused to accept the interpretation that Palestine was not included in the area of validity of Article 22 of the League Covenant. They argued thus in 1921 and early 1922 when the fate of the Treaty of Sèvres still hung in the balance,<sup>25</sup> and with redoubled energy in 1923 after the Lausanne Conference when that treaty was discarded.

It seems that the British Mandate was not in itself a product of Zionist policy. However, the difference between the Palestinian

version of the Mandate and that adopted in Syria and proposed (though later enacted in a different constitutional form) for Iraq, undoubtedly resulted from the necessity of implementing the Balfour Declaration. As we shall see later, the total absence of representative bodies was a product of Arab refusal to participate in setting them up, but even this fact was, according to the Arab argument, an inevitable result of the Zionist character of the Mandate.

It must be noted that during the twenties the Palestinians argued rarely, if at all, on the basis of the more serious contradiction between the provisions of Article 22 of the League Covenant and the mandate system as it was implemented in the Middle East. Only in a few cases<sup>20</sup> was mention made of the fact that the mandates had been distributed among the Allied powers without consulting the population of the mandated territories and without waiting for the decisions of the League of Nations which was about to be set up. Only years later was the British Mandate itself challenged as contradicting the provisions of Article 22 and therefore invalid from the beginning.<sup>27</sup>

In order to give force to the claim that Palestine and its inhabitants fell within the area of validity of Article 22 of the League Covenant, the Palestinian spokesmen came forward with various data which were intended to prove that the Palestinians deserved the status which this article bestowed; independence limited only by the giving of aid and advice. The first claim was that the inhabitants of Palestine were no less worthy of independence than the inhabitants of Iraq and Transjordan, who had attained a more independent form of government, or than the peoples of Europe who had attained independence with British help, such as Greece, Serbia, Montenegro and Poland. All this was based on a claim that 45% of the inhabitants of Palestine were literate, and more than a thousand had completed advanced studies in the fields of medicine, law, engineering, agriculture, and various branches of industry. These exaggerated claims appeared in a memorandum which was presented to the Colonial Secretary Winston Churchill, and probably did more harm than good.<sup>28</sup>

Last in this chain of arguments was the claim that Palestine had been promised to the Arabs in McMahon's famous letter of 24th October 1915 to the *Sharif* Ḥusayn. I shall not be concerned with lengthy analysis of the text of this letter. George Antonius has done this with great skill<sup>29</sup> and proved, in my opinion, that according to the sense of the letter, Palestine was not excepted any more than Syria from the area in which, according to McMahon, a confederation of Arab states would be established, although serious

doubt still remains whether even Syria, an area in which Great Britain was *not* free "to act without detriment to the interests of her ally, France", was included in McMahon's promise. I shall merely summarize the Arab arguments as to why the section saying "... portions of Syria lying to the west of the districts of Damascus, Ḥimş, Ḥamāh and Aleppo cannot be said to be purely Arab, and should be excluded from the limits demanded"<sup>30</sup> does not exclude Palestine from the promised area.

Palestine is situated to the south of the territory lying to the west of the Aleppo, Ḥimş, Ḥamāh and Damascus regions; there is no justification for seeing in the word "districts" the meaning *vilāyets*, since there never existed *vilāyets* of Ḥimş or Ḥamāh, proof that the word "district" here means "region" and not *vilāyet* is the fact that the letter speaks of the area to the west of the "district" of Aleppo, since the *vilāyet* of Aleppo extended all the way to the sea; if it is clear with respect to Aleppo, Ḥimş and Ḥamāh that the meaning is "region" and not *vilāyet*, then it is clear that this is also the meaning with respect to Damascus—in which case the area west of the Damascus region lies north of Palestine and does not include it. In a letter to Fayşal of 19th September 1919 Foreign Secretary Curzon wrote explicitly that the intention was to refer to the four cities and not the *vilāyets*; Fayşal declared in 1921 that neither he nor his father believed that Palestine was excluded from the promised area, and that it was impossible to understand the text as stating such a thing.<sup>31</sup>

It is of little importance for the subject in hand to analyse Britain's objective intentions underlying the phrasing of this letter, which indicate that by virtue of her policy in the Middle East she was unable to promise Palestine to the Arabs.<sup>32</sup> Moreover, it is doubtful whether there would be any advantage in checking, for the purpose of a better understanding of Arab arguments on Palestine, the various memoranda, interchanges, and numerous files which were written on this question in the British Foreign and Colonial Offices: these show that British officials suffered from a great lack of clarity on this subject, and that British officers, clerks and statesmen were far from having an unequivocal opinion as to whether or not Palestine was included in the area of the future Arab confederation.<sup>33</sup> What is important for an understanding of this issue's contribution to Arab arguments on Palestine is what meaning the Arabs ascribed to the famous letter and how much importance they attached to it.

As far as the meaning of the letter is concerned, we have already seen that the Palestinians understood it to mean that Palestine *was* included in the area of the future Arab confederation, and indeed

referred to this countless times in their petitions, letters of protest, memoranda, articles and books.<sup>34</sup> However, there exists of course another problem—to what extent was the McMahon-Husayn correspondence binding? The Palestinian answer was unequivocal; in a statement sent to the High Commissioner on 18th December 1920 by the Third Palestinian Congress, which assembled in Haifa that month, the demand for the establishment of a national (*waṭaniyyah*) government was based on “the covenant (*‘ahd*) contracted by Great Britain with Her Ally His Majesty the King of Hejaz in the year 1915”.<sup>35</sup> Moreover, elsewhere it was emphasized that the Covenant was made by “Sir Henry McMahon, as the representative of Great Britain, with Sherif Hussein of Mecca, friend of Lord Kitchener and representative of the Arab People”. This argument was repeated in all the Arab petitions. In 1915 a “treaty” (*mu’āhadah*) was signed by Great Britain and King Ḥusayn and the Arabs. King Ḥusayn and the Arabs fulfilled their obligations to the treaty by joining the war on the side of the Allies, but Great Britain wilfully violated the treaty by not fulfilling her obligations. And in order to forestall the response that the Arab soldiers were not Palestinians, it was immediately mentioned that a large part of Emir Fayṣal’s army was Palestinian.<sup>36</sup>

Occasionally it is said that this Arab stance was senseless. Not only did the McMahon-Husayn correspondence by itself not constitute a treaty, but the correspondence was never completed and left both sides in their original positions. At most we are dealing with a promise or moral obligation on the part of Britain, but between this and a treaty there is a considerable gap.<sup>37</sup> This opinion, correct as it may be, does not itself diminish the value of the Arab argument based on McMahon’s letter. In this realm of claims and proofs it is not so much reality which counts, but more the attitudes and beliefs of the parties concerned. And it is precisely here that we are able to check, if only partially, the degree to which the various Arab factors who saw themselves as parties to the “treaty”, the Palestinians and the members of the *Sharīf*’s family, regarded this “treaty” as valid.

The first occasion on which the Palestinians raised their demands for a national government, independence and the rejection of Zionism on the basis of the “Anglo-Arab Treaty” was in the statement to the High Commissioner from the Third Congress in December 1920.<sup>38</sup> From then onwards this was repeated in all their appeals to the British and the world at large. This is hardly surprising if one accepts the interpretation that in 1915 a treaty was signed by Britain and the Arabs promising the latter independence in an area including Palestine, and consequently this became a

superlative weapon in the Arab struggle for primacy in Palestine. However, another question presents itself: why did the Palestinians wait until the end of 1920 to present this forceful claim? Why was this argument not mentioned in any of the petitions and letters of protest which were presented to the British authorities with mounting frequency from November 1918 onwards? If we recall that these petitions made mention of, and were based on, the other arguments we have dealt with, the silence in this instance is surprising. It is even more so when one notes the fact that the report of the Palin Commission, which investigated the April 1920 disturbances in Jerusalem, cites as one of the major factors behind the nationalist agitation of the Palestine Arabs "that in spite of the fact that nothing had been said about Palestine being included in the Hedjaz Empire and the fact that the Balfour Declaration had been published in 1917, the early impression left upon the Arabs generally was that the British were going to set up an independent Arab state which would include Palestine".<sup>39</sup> From this we learn that there was in Palestine some knowledge of the McMahon letters, and indeed the Arab witnesses before the Palin Commission contended that the Palestinians believed that Palestine had been promised to them in these letters. Nonetheless the Palestinians refrained from any mention of this matter in all their petitions and protests which were submitted to the British authorities.

Bernard Joseph has proposed a solution to the riddle. In his opinion the Palestinians knew very well that Palestine was not included in McMahon's promises and therefore preferred to base themselves in their appeals to the authorities on the various Allied wartime declarations and to keep silent on the McMahon promises. According to Joseph, this was also Fayṣal's position, and in his appearances before the Peace Commission at Versailles, Fayṣal was careful to distinguish between Syria, Iraq and the Hejaz on the one hand and Palestine on the other.<sup>40</sup> Obviously, if this interpretation is correct, it is easy to understand Fayṣal's moderate, even friendly stance on Zionism as it was expressed in the contract with Weizmann, in his famous letter to Frankfurter and in a number of letters to Herbert Samuel and other Zionist leaders.<sup>41</sup>

It appears that the correct interpretation is even more far-reaching. In 1919 when Fayṣal was in London bargaining with British policy-makers and officials over the future of Syria and his relations with the French, he requested his father *Sharīf* Husayn to send him a copy of the McMahon letters so he could use this weapon in his talks with the British. Yet *Sharīf* Husayn chose to send him in place of the letters a copy of the demands he had

made to McMahon.<sup>42</sup> It is unlikely that this strange response was caused by inefficiency in Ḥusayn's chancellery. It is more probably that Ḥusayn was aware that the McMahon letters did not constitute a binding obligation on the part of the British, and therefore chose to send instead a version of his original demands. Just as Ḥusayn and Fayṣal refrained throughout 1919 from using the McMahon correspondence to back up their demands, so the Palestinians were silent on this subject. The close ties which existed, as we shall see in the next chapter, between Damascus and Palestine in that year reinforce the impression that it was this factor which brought about the common silence.

Why Ḥusayn and his sons, and later the Palestinians, decided to make use of the claim of an "Anglo-Arab treaty" after their early silence on the matter is difficult to discover. However, it seems safe to assume that this claim, which on the surface appears to be the sharpest weapon in the Palestinian armoury of arguments, was not considered even by them to be their most weighty argument.

What we have tried to clarify is merely the degree of importance which the Palestinians themselves ascribed to this claim. The conclusion reached does not mean that the Palestinians failed to make copious use of this claim or to advance it in their attempts to persuade the British of the justness of their demands. On the contrary, it seems that as time passed and this argument became one of the cornerstones of the Palestinian case, it also became axiomatic as far as the Arab community was concerned. That this argument was raised only towards the end of 1920, after two years of silence, was forgotten, and it is doubtful if many people attributed any importance to this fact. Even British officialdom in London, which concerned itself with this question a good deal and even composed a large number of lengthy memoranda on the subject, failed to notice the two-year silence of Ḥusayn, Fayṣal and the Palestinians.

Notwithstanding the doubts which the British also felt concerning this argument, the official position from 1922 onwards was that Palestine was not included in the promised area.<sup>43</sup> However, the uncertainty concerning Palestine and the unwillingness to publicize the promises concerning the Caliphate, for fear of a hostile reaction on the part of the Indian Muslims, made the British decide against publishing the exchange of letters. Only in 1939, when the Palestine question was clouded by wholly new circumstances, were the letters officially published.

So far we have dealt with the positive contentions of the Arabs on Palestine. No less important a place in the Arab case was taken up by arguments which attempted to prove how much the other side—the Zionists—were wrong.

The first argument to be discussed is actually a product of the sum of the positive arguments. Since Palestine is ours, went the resolutions of the Third Congress, it would be an offence against our natural rights if our homeland were taken from us by the Zionists. A people's homeland is like an individual's home—no person "other than himself has the right to take a part of it unless he proves his right by being a majority of the population".<sup>44</sup> To act otherwise is to violate the laws of God and man, or in other words, to act contrary to natural justice. The land with all it contains is the property of its inhabitants, and foreigners have no right to share in this property. The right of the inhabitants to oppose foreign immigration is exactly like Britain's enactments of 1912 and 1914 against Jewish immigration, like America's action in preventing Chinese immigration and Australia's in preventing the entry of Asians.<sup>45</sup>

"Palestine is a purely Arab land", stated 'Izzat Darwaza, and "it is surrounded on all sides by purely Arab lands. National (*al-qawmi*) feeling has begun to awaken and gain strength among the Arab population which has lived uninterruptedly in its own territory. In Arab countries there are only pure Arabs and Arabicized individuals who know no nationality other than Arab and who all speak the same language. History has welded them into a single mass, and there is no possibility that another people, with their own language, customs and traditions and a contradictory political goal, could live with them." Darwaza went on to say that the introduction of a nationality of separate blood, tongue, aims, traditions, religion and policy would be dangerous indeed. We were living in the age of nationalism, and historical developments in Turkey, Russia, Austria and England proved that disparate national groups were not able to live together.<sup>46</sup>

It must be stated that if the full implication of these words had been acceptable to the Palestine community in 1921, or even ten years later, there would have been no need for the numerous other arguments which the Palestinians put forward against Zionism. If there had been a strong feeling of belonging to a single Arab nation, of whose territory Palestine was a part, then the entire history of the Palestinians' struggle would have had a different character, and indeed their line of argument concerning Palestine would have been similar to that sketched out by 'Izzat Darwaza. But 'Izzat Darwaza was not typical of the mood of the Arab community of the time. He belonged to that part of the young Arab community in Palestine which had gone to Damascus in 1919 and become the backbone of the radical Pan-Arab camp there. When these young men returned to Palestine, they stood apart from the struggle for quite

some time; only in the thirties did they take over positions of leadership in the Palestinian community. I have quoted him here in order to show that despite the large amount of localized anti-Zionist agitation, in 1921 this opposition was already being formulated by some in Pan-Arab terms.

In early Palestinian anti-Zionist arguments it was often claimed that the realization of Zionism in Palestine was impossible. Arab spokesmen stated that there was no room for the Zionists in the country.<sup>47</sup> This statement was based on the fact that most of the land in Palestine was owned by Arabs. Reality proved that the assumption underlying these words, *i.e.* that the Arabs would refrain from selling land to Jews, was over-optimistic.

The mainstay of the argument that it was impossible to realize Zionism was not the lack of land. Far more significant, and prominent, was the contention—already made by ‘Izzat Darwaza—that there was no room for both Jews and Arabs in the country. In a reply to Herbert Samuel’s important speech on 3rd June 1921, the Arab Executive Committee stated that “peace and tranquillity would be the rule in Palestine only so long as it was inhabited by one people, possessing one language, one nationality and one interest”. The Palestinians could hardly be indifferent to the creation of a new nationality in their land.<sup>48</sup> In a more unequivocal tone: “We cannot patiently watch our homeland pass into others’ hands. Either us or the Zionists! There is no room for both elements struggling together in the same area. The laws of nature require that one side be defeated. We want life and they are striving for it, but life is indivisible. There is no escaping the fact that one of us must win.”<sup>49</sup> Another claim made on this level was that Zionism and Jewish immigration would necessarily cause Arab emigration from Palestine.<sup>50</sup> It would seem that the gist of these arguments is embedded in a recognition of the fact that Zionism necessarily undermined the Arab character of the country, and therefore the Zionist answer that the Zionists wanted only peace and brotherhood was insufficient.

Another assertion that was brought up against Zionism on the nationalist plane was that it was the Balfour Declaration and its implementation which caused Palestine to be separated from Syria. Had it not been for the greed of the Zionist colonists Palestine would have been a part of Syria under the rule of Fayṣal.<sup>51</sup> This assertion was of course heard only until July 1920, and even within this time limit it was extremely exaggerated, since even then it was clear that the division of mandate territories between Britain and France was carried out according to the conflicting interests of these two powers.

After July 1920 Zionism was accused, with much more justice, of being responsible for the fact that the governmental arrangements adopted in the country were less autonomous than those in Iraq and the Hejaz. Were it not for Zionism, the ruler or Emir of Palestine would be an Arab. Even the fact that the British government ignored the Ottoman (standard) governmental procedures for the municipalities and the general councils of the *vilāyets* was ascribed to Zionism.<sup>52</sup> Without a doubt this particular issue contributed much to increasing the hatred against Zionism. The Palestinians were not unaware of the differences between the Palestinian version of the Mandate and the Syrian version in so far as preparation for independence and the establishment of autonomous institutions were concerned. The Writ of Mandate for Syria and Lebanon required the Mandatory to prepare an organic law within three years from the time when the Mandate entered into force. The drafting of the organic law was to be done by agreement with the local authorities. The Mandatory was also to take steps "to facilitate the progressive development of Syria and Lebanon as independent states".<sup>53</sup>

The Writ of Mandate for Palestine, on the other hand, did not require the Mandatory to enact an organic law for the country. On the contrary, the Mandatory received complete legislative and administrative authority. Likewise it was not required to prepare the country for independence, but merely to ensure the development of "self-governing institutions". The Writ of Mandate did, however, make the Mandatory responsible for "placing the country under such political, administrative and economic conditions as will secure the establishment of the Jewish national home".<sup>54</sup> The Palestinians were not unaware of the fact that at the head of Transjordan and Iraq were put Hashemite princes, who, though their authority was very limited, undoubtedly provided at least symbolic compensation for Arab nationalist feelings. Even Syria, which underwent serious conflicts and struggles with the Mandate authorities, was represented by the Palestinians as being much better off in the area of government, since Syrian governing bodies were set up, with the French in the role of mere advisers and supervisors. However, it appears that the real state of affairs in Syria, over which the French had complete control, was well known to the Palestinians, and it is highly doubtful if the developments there up to 1928, when the first elected representative assembly was set up, aroused their envy.

A charge frequently heard until 1923 was that the entire Zionist policy—immigration, the government's new legislation, the introduction of the Hebrew language—was contrary to the principles of

international law. This charge was based on the provisions of Article 3 of the Hague Treaty (1909) regarding the administration of occupied enemy territory, according to which the occupier must try to keep the administrative and legal *status quo* unchanged until final confirmation of the status of the occupied area. Such final confirmation was delayed until September 1923 when the Palestinian (and Syrian) Mandate came into force, or perhaps until 1924 when the peace treaty with Turkey was finally ratified. This charge had received a sympathetic hearing during the period of the Military Administration, which acted according to military law and the Hague Treaty and as a result aroused the anger of the Zionist Commission;<sup>55</sup> however the civilian government which was set up in July 1920 with Herbert Samuel at its head did not consider itself bound by these provisions, since it saw the assigning of mandates at the San Remo conference in April 1920 as equivalent to a final determination of the country's fate.<sup>56</sup>

The force of this argument against Zionism was of limited duration and therefore of secondary importance. More important was the chain of arguments and contentions which were meant to refute the very essence of the Balfour Declaration and the Zionist policy, to prove their illegality and to effect their annulment. For this purpose the Arabs made use of the various assertions discussed above, which in their opinion demonstrated that Palestine belonged to them and ought not to be given to the Jews. The second group of arguments tried to refute the Balfour Declaration from a legal standpoint and reveal its erroneous foundations.

At the beginning of the Palestinian fight against the Balfour Declaration, the Palestinian spokesmen claimed that it was issued by virtue of a mistake. The Zionists had claimed that they were a majority in the country, or that they were oppressed there, and it was this claim which had apparently led to the issuing of the Declaration. From this it followed that when the truth was discovered, the Declaration would be annulled.<sup>57</sup> Later, however, when it became clear that there had been no mistake and that this was official British policy confirmed by all the British governments of the 'twenties and 'thirties, the Palestinians resorted to other arguments.

Since they claimed that the McMahon promises included Palestine and had the force of a treaty, they inevitably utilized the argument that the Balfour Declaration was contrary to this treaty. And inasmuch as the "treaty" preceded the "Declaration" and since the "treaty" was made with a recognized monarch while the Declaration was given to an amorphous body lacking political form and juridical definition, the "treaty" was obviously to be preferred and the Declaration was void *ab initio*.<sup>58</sup>

A second argument resulted from the Palestinians' assertion that Article 22 of the Covenant of the League of Nations applied to Palestine. The Balfour Declaration, they claimed, was contrary to the spirit of this article. Because this contradiction existed, they continued, the Balfour Declaration was automatically invalid, since Article 20 of the League Covenant stated that if a member of the League before joining the organization, took on obligations which were contrary to the Covenant, he was responsible for trying to free himself from these obligations.<sup>59</sup> The reply of the Zionists and the British to this was that in Palestine there existed a special situation which had been recognized by all the Allied Powers.

A third argument used was that the Balfour Declaration contained an inner contradiction which could not be overcome, was therefore incapable of being executed and so void *ab initio*. "It is impossible," claimed the Arabs, "to set up a Jewish homeland without prejudicing the civil and religious rights of the existing non-Jewish communities in Palestine". By denying the right of the majority of inhabitants to deal with immigration as they saw fit, one of the civil rights of the inhabitants was being infringed.<sup>60</sup>

Another argument that was heard was that the Balfour Declaration was just a smokescreen to obscure the true intentions of the Zionists—the establishment of a Jewish state in Palestine. To prove this the Arabs quoted passages from the speeches of Zionist leaders and from newspaper articles, all of which appeared during the period of euphoria following the publication of the Balfour Declaration. It should be noted that this argument did not disappear even after June 1922, when the official, restricted interpretation of the Balfour Declaration was published, negating the possibility of establishing a Jewish state—which won the public approval of the Zionist Organization.<sup>61</sup> Aside from the above-mentioned speeches there was another factor which for years was seen by the Arabs as proof of their interpretation: the question of the "Jewish army". In their opinion the demand made by Jabotinsky in the early 'twenties for the establishment of an official Jewish Legion which would serve as a garrison force in Palestine, the organization of Jewish defence forces, and the hoarding of weapons—all these pointed to far-reaching Jewish aims in the country. It must be noted that in general the Arabs made no distinction when presenting their case between official Zionist positions and the private utterances of the spokesmen for the more extreme Zionist factions.<sup>62</sup>

On many occasions the Arabs stated emphatically that they had nothing against the Jewish religion or Jewish visits to the country as foreigners. Their wrath was directed against the promises to set up a national home for the Jews in Palestine. They repeatedly

emphasized that throughout Muslim history, up to the First World War, the Jews had lived among them in peace, tranquillity and equality. The Jews were said to have experienced under Islamic rule a long period of security and a flourishing culture. Only the Balfour Declaration had destroyed this.<sup>63</sup> At times the Arabs went still further and claimed that until the First World War the Jews of Palestine enjoyed not only peaceful conditions but even complete equality of rights as Ottoman subjects.<sup>64</sup> In a private conversation even Mūsā Kāzīm al-Ḥusayni claimed that the Arabs had not opposed Zionist immigration and settlement until the First World War. He had, so he claimed, as the *Qā'imaqām* of Safed and Jaffa helped in setting up the first Jewish settlements and had established close ties with Baron Rothschild's officials. Only the Balfour Declaration, which gave this process a political character, brought about a change in the situation. Even Muḥammad Amīn al-Ḥusayni, the Mufti of Jerusalem, argued thus in an open letter;<sup>65</sup> the implication being that had the Zionists foregone the British guarantee, the Palestinians themselves would have enabled them to settle in the country, on the sole condition that they recognized the Arab character of Palestine.<sup>66</sup>

There is no reason to doubt Mūsā Kāzīm al-Ḥusayni's precision in his statements, but it must be remembered that until 1918 this man was a high Ottoman official, loyal to his government and far removed from any Arab nationalist position. Moreover, most of the members of his family, who held high posts in the administration of the Jerusalem district (*sanjaq*) were not connected with the Arab awakening prior to the First World War. However, large sections of the Arab community and the emergent Arab press had been antagonistic towards Zionism well before the First World War, and there is thus no reason to see the hostility after the Balfour Declaration as a new development. What happened was simply that as Zionism gathered momentum so did the opposition to it.<sup>67</sup>

A different type of argument tried to show that the Jews possessed no right to Palestine. First of all, claimed the Palestinians, the Jews are members of a universal religion and not a people which needs a country of its own. They have nothing in common except their religion. Hebrew is a dead language, and the Jews throughout the world are citizens of the countries they live in. Herbert Samuel and Lord Reading cannot belong simultaneously to both the British nation and the Jewish nation.<sup>68</sup>

Secondly, they argued, Jewish rule in Palestine had been of a short duration; on one occasion they specified 250 years, on another 400 years. What is more, this short period was one of disturbances, rebellions and wars against neighbouring peoples. Only during

King Solomon's reign was there peace. Arab rule, on the other hand, was continuous and peaceful for over 1,300 years, interrupted only by the Crusades.<sup>69</sup>

Nor was this all: even if the Jews had lived for a long period in Palestine and left impressive monuments there, they had no right to return to the country. There were laws of human history—nations rise and fall, one grows strong while the other weakens, and “one state rises on the ruins of another”. If the Jews could claim Palestine, by the same token the Arabs had the right to claim Spain and Cyprus, the Turks the Balkans, the Romans Britain, and pagans, Christians, and Jews together the Arabian Peninsula. It was impossible to redraw the map of the world on the basis of ancient claims.<sup>70</sup>

Another group of arguments was tied to the economic status of Palestine. From the start of British rule until the middle 'thirties, the Palestinians claimed that Jewish immigration and the policy of furthering it were causing the economic state of the country to deteriorate. There were several reasons for this decline. First of all, a large majority of the Jewish immigrants were unemployed and were a burden on the inhabitants of the country. This burden was particularly heavy, since the First World War had seriously affected the country. Instead of adopting a policy of economic recovery, the government had based its policy on relieving Jewish unemployment. The government had built unnecessary roads, railroad tracks and public parks in order to provide work for the Jewish immigrants. In 1919–20 the government had prohibited the export of cereal grains produced by Arabs so that their prices would be reduced in Palestine for the benefit of Jewish purchasers, and in order to cause the impoverishment of the Arabs, who would then be compelled to sell their land to Jews. The pro-Zionist policy was responsible for an inflated administrative corps and a large army. In the time of the Turks the administrative corps was much smaller, as were the army and the police force. Nevertheless, public order and security were incomparably greater.<sup>71</sup> This situation was an inevitable result of Zionist immigration, since “Palestine is entirely an agricultural country and the Jews all over the world are commonly merchants and usurers”.<sup>72</sup> In order to cover its expenditure the government had accumulated a large public debt, but it was unable to issue a loan to cover the debt since by 1923 it had forfeited all financial confidence.<sup>73</sup>

Another aspect of this argument was the claim that Jewish immigration had brought about a steep rise in prices compared with the pre-war period. This rise applied to foodstuffs, industrial commodities and housing. The government's customs policy also con-

tributed to the price increase. Nevertheless, when in 1925 the government attempted by administrative action to limit the increase in real estate prices, and when on various occasions housing rentals were controlled, the reaction of the leaders of the Arab community was emphatically negative. They saw in these actions a favouring of the Jews who owned no property, as opposed to the Arabs who did. The high rentals which Arab tenants paid was not a factor which was likely to influence the Arab leaders, all of whom came from the landed class. The economic interest of Arab property-owners was the decisive factor.<sup>74</sup>

The economic recession which Palestine underwent in 1926–8 supplied the Arabs with excellent arguments against Jewish immigration. The large wave of immigration of 1925 and the artificial building boom that accompanied it ended in disappointment for the Jewish immigrants and the *Yishūv*, while the Arabs saw in this a sign of failure of the Zionist project and a proof of the troubles which the latter had brought on the country.<sup>75</sup> In order to prove that Zionist settlement had failed and that the existing settlements were in a dilapidated condition, the Arabs claimed that these lacked any economic basis and had to exist on charity. With respect to the work done there, they claimed that it was carried out by Arabs and not by Jews.<sup>76</sup> On the other hand, the Arab spokesmen had often accused the Jews of doing everything possible in order not to employ Arabs on their land—alleged proof that they were hostile to the Arabs.<sup>77</sup>

The Arabs put special emphasis on the harm the Jews were said to cause Arab commerce. Since the Jews had at their disposal, so they claimed, such large resources and so many rich banks, they would be able to take over commerce and deprive Arab merchants of their livelihood. The Jews “are inflicting unbearably heavy blows on the local commerce with the aim of paralysing the activity of the inhabitants (the Arabs) and putting obstacles in their path”. They were doing all this while they represented less than a tenth of the population. “What will happen to this people (the Palestine Arabs) if the dreams of the Jews come true, God forbid, and they became as numerous as the Arabs, or more so?”<sup>78</sup> This apprehension over Jewish trade was accompanied by anti-Semitic arguments that the Jews were unscrupulous in business and made use of any sharp practices they could in order to enrich themselves.<sup>79</sup>

One of the main motifs running through the arguments against Zionism and Jewish immigration to Palestine throughout the 'twenties and 'thirties was that the Jews were agents of foreign organizations and disseminators of dangerous ideas. At the start of the British conquest the claim was made that the Jews were German-

speaking and looked to Germany although "Germany sowed in Palestine but did not reap".<sup>80</sup> However, immediately afterwards the accusation that the Jews were bringing Bolshevism to Palestine and to the entire Middle East became one of the most important Arab arguments against Zionism. Proof was found in profusion: the existence of a Communist party from the early 'twenties onwards; the distribution of Communist leaflets; May-Day demonstrations; the existence of *kibbutzim*, having a collective way of life; the organization of strikes for pay-increases and against unemployment, etc., etc.<sup>81</sup> Naturally, the May 1921 disturbances in Jaffa and its environs—which broke out following a clash between Communist May-Day demonstrators all of whom were Jewish and demonstrators from the Jewish Labour Federation (*Histadrūt Ha-'Ovdīm*) in the Manshiyya quarter of Jaffa—supplied the most striking proof of the deterioration which had set in as a result of the arrival in Palestine of Jewish Bolsheviks. "The bloodshed which occurred in Jaffa and the Bolshevik principles which the Jewish immigrants are spreading in Palestine are but the natural result of the Balfour Declaration, of the Government's action in turning Palestine into a national home for the Jews, and of its haste in executing the plans of the Zionist Organization for removing the inhabitants and depriving them of the legacy of their fathers. Such is the perverted policy which has made the diffusion of Bolshevik principles easier and which is the cause of the bloodshed, the ruin of the country and the ceaseless protests of the Palestinian people. In this critical hour, as the fires of Bolshevism rage in one of our large cities (Jaffa), while the Bolshevik flag flies insolently there and Bolshevik manifestoes are being distributed openly and in complete freedom throughout the country, in this critical hour we once again appeal to the Government to retract that Declaration and that policy, before the situation worsens and the Government finds itself unable to quench the fires of disorder, regardless of whatever help we can offer."<sup>82</sup> It was necessary, therefore, "to expel this deviant revolutionary group from Palestine so that this holy land, the cradle of religion and peace, need not become a fount of immorality and a source of that flame which could ignite the entire East and cause the end of all civilization, whether Eastern or Western."<sup>83</sup>

Another practical conclusion to be reached by observing the Bolshevik nature of Jewish immigration was that if that immigration was not to be stopped, it should at least be controlled by the local inhabitants<sup>84</sup>—which practically of course equalled the first demand.

This argument concerning the Bolshevik character of Jewish immigration did not cease to be heard during the whole period

under discussion. As late as 1935, when the Arab leaders presented their memorandum-cum-ultimatum to the High Commissioner, they repeated this argument.<sup>85</sup> On the surface this is surprising, since it is well known how great was the dissention between Zionism and Communism; but things were not so simple. First it must be remembered that the Palestinian Communist Party developed from the left wing of the *Poalei Zion* party, i.e. the Jewish Communists entered Palestine as Zionist immigrants. Secondly, in the early 'twenties many foreign observers failed to distinguish between the Zionist left and Communism. According to British Intelligence files in the Israel State-Archives, the late Itzhak Ben-Zvi, then one of the heads of *Ahdui Ha-'Avodah* and during 1952-63 the President of Israel, was the "principal Bolshevik agent in the Middle East". If Intelligence officers, whose job it was, failed to make a distinction, it should hardly surprise us that the less enlightened Arab population made the same mistake. Thirdly, it is probable that the Palestinian leaders got wind of the fact that envoys of the Palestinian Communist Party played a decisive part in establishing the Communist party of Syria and Lebanon and thus supported the notion of the "Communist danger" which Zionist immigration was bringing to the Middle East.

However, all this applies to the early 'twenties. By the middle 'thirties it was clear to everyone that Communism was not a companion of Zionism, since the conflict between the two had reached its climax and the language of the Communist leaflets with respect to Zionism was even more violent than that of Arab publications. It would seem, then, that the close connection between Zionism and Communism as the Palestinian Arabs saw it, was not a result of an illusion but of more deep-seated reasons which will be discussed below.

The Arabs repeatedly claimed that Communism, revolution and anarchy were rooted in the Jews' very being. Jews were in many countries "sowers of controversy and ruin"; they had caused the disintegration of Russia as well as the defeat of Germany and Austria. As long as the Central Powers were in the ascendant, the Jews had smiled graciously towards them, but as soon as their luck ran out the Jews turned to the Allies and put their treasures at their disposal. A brief glance at Socialism showed how large a part the Jews had played in it. Karl Marx, Bakunin (?) and Trotsky were Jews. The Jews never hesitated to exploit the country they dwelt in and later, if they found it necessary, to destroy it or to involve it in war. To know them it was sufficient to refer to the book *The Jewish Peril* (the English translation of the "Protocols of the Elders of Zion"),<sup>86</sup> which included the protocols of the sessions in which

Jewish notables discussed ways of destroying the world and of taking it over, and which was filled with hatred for Christianity. The Jews were like bacteria which multiplied and then destroyed the surroundings in which they lived. If spacious Russia and Poland had been unable to contain them, how could Palestine be expected to do so?<sup>87</sup> Such attacks occurred frequently in Arab publications.<sup>88</sup>

This anti-Semitic attitude was not an invention of the Arabs but rather a translation of Western-Christian anti-Semitism into Arab terms. Its absorption by Arab culture was a part of the wider process of westernization. There is no doubt that simultaneous phenomena of westernization and the anti-Zionist awakening facilitated this absorption. It appears that the major factor nourishing this anti-Semitic feeling was not hatred for the Jews as such but opposition to Jewish settlement in Palestine; this fact stands out clearly from the Arab case.

The pioneers of the Third *'Aliyah* at the beginning of the 1920s were in their way of life, their philosophy and their social patterns in complete contrast to the norms of traditional Palestinian society. It is no wonder therefore that immediately after their arrival the Palestinians began complaining that these immigrants were the "politicians and wretched characters" from among the Jews. The wealthy, the merchants and propertied individuals did not come to Palestine, stated the President of the Jaffa MCA, 'Umar al-Bayṭār.<sup>89</sup> To Palestine came, according to the Palestinians, a disparate multitude from all over the world, speaking various languages and having totally different social customs from those of the country's inhabitants. The coming of such an element to Palestine aroused tension and hardship and certainly did not induce peace and tranquility.<sup>90</sup> A good example of this were the Jewish women, who dressed indecently and went around half-naked in full view of the Palestinians, who were unused to such immoral conduct.<sup>91</sup> "This immigration (of Jews) has enabled vagabonds and outcasts to enter Palestine, the Holy Land, the land of peace and the birthplace of religions and to spread in this country their strange doctrines and destructive practices in a manner which reflects on the sanctity of this country." The *kibbutzim* were the breeding grounds of such immorality: "The manner in which the settlers live in some of the Jewish settlements such as 'Ain Ḥarōd and other settlements is a clear indication that the Jews, headed by the Socialist Party which has overpowered all the other Jewish Parties, eventually intend to flood this country with subversive doctrines which are inconsistent with religious principles and doctrines of morality."<sup>92</sup> And in clearer tones: "The civilization which the Jews are bringing to and

spreading in Palestine is nothing but anarchy, Communism, and the destruction of family life."<sup>93</sup>

The social variance, the strangeness in culture, customs and life-style, contributed a great deal to the Palestinian opposition to Zionism. It is safe to assume that the groups which during the second and third decades of the twentieth century succeeded in crystallizing an Arab national and political consciousness did not have to resort to these differences in order to express their opposition to Zionism, which they saw as a factor endangering the Arab character of Palestine. But there is no doubt that for the Arab masses, lacking in education and political and national consciousness, this variance, this strangeness and these apprehensions were a most important factor—perhaps the primary factor—in the growth of their hatred for Zionism. One need only recall that on May Day, 1921, when Jaffa crowds went wild and began attacking Jews, their main target was the Jaffa Immigrants' Hostel. The pioneer couples who came and went from this house and who walked arm-in-arm through the streets of Jaffa were for the Jaffa Arabs the most tangible demonstration of the moral and social ruin which Palestine faced from Jewish immigration.

It must be borne in mind that Islam itself, despite its relative tolerance, was not free of anti-Jewish sentiment, and had its own explanations of why the Jews were exiled from Palestine.<sup>94</sup> These features were occasionally emphasized openly. 'Izzat Darwaza proposed to stress the Koranic statement about the Jews: "And We let loose on them a scourge from heaven as a punishment for their misdeeds".<sup>95</sup> It was forbidden to believe the Jews, who claimed that their intentions were good, since "they are scoundrels and the Koran itself is full of stories of the Jews' fraudulent acts". Nevertheless, the Jews would not succeed with their trickery, since the Muslims and the Christians knew the Jews well from "the verses of the Koran and the stories of the *hadith* which relate their deceit, their cunning, their selfishness and corruption".<sup>96</sup>

The contribution which Islamic institutions and beliefs made to the Palestinians' anti-Zionist struggle will be dealt with later; the above quotations were included in order to complete the range of sources from which the Palestinian awakening drew its anti-Jewish arguments.

Initially the Arab national movement in Palestine and Syria attempted to make a distinction between the indigenous Jewish residents of Palestine "who live in peace among the Arabs" and the Zionist immigrants. The first anti-Zionist petition from the Jerusalem Arab community, dated 3rd-November 1918, stated that "it is our wish to live in a satisfactory manner with our brothers the

Israelites, the indigenous inhabitants of the country, with complete equality between their rights and obligations and ours".<sup>97</sup>

The general Syrian Congress of July 1919 went still further, claiming to represent all the Arabs of Syria—Muslims, Christians and Jews alike.<sup>98</sup> Apparently, there was even one Jewish delegate at this Congress.<sup>99</sup>

The anti-Zionist manifesto of the First Palestinian Congress in early February 1919 also distinguished between Zionist immigration—which it rejected—and "those among them [the Jews] who have been Arabized, who have been living in our province since before the war; they are as we are, and their loyalties are as our own."<sup>100</sup> Even in March 1920 in the midst of the many demonstrations against the announcement of a pro-Zionist policy (see following chapter), the note of protest from Nazareth and the surrounding villages claimed that its words were directed against Zionist immigration and not against the Jewish people. "The Jews of our country, who have been living in our midst since before the conquest, are our brothers and countrymen, and all the Jews of the world are our brothers in humanity."<sup>101</sup>

Still; one must bear in mind that this distinction was conditional upon the indigenous Jewish residents' identifying with Arab nationalism and being culturally Arab, or—at the very least upon a continuation of the tradition of Jewish self-effacement as a tolerated religious community (*millet*) taking no part in administrative and public life.

Had this position been consistently upheld, it might well have been quite successful and beneficial to the Palestine Arabs' national struggle. Two elements in the Jewish camp were likely to be attracted in this manner to the anti-Zionist Palestinian camp: the extreme orthodox, and some of the native Sephardic Jews. The former were completely opposed to Zionism and attempted several times to form a common front with anti-Zionist Palestinian groups.<sup>102</sup> Some of the Sephardic notables were bitter over losing their leadership of the Jerusalem Jewish community to the new immigrants, the predominantly secular Ashkenazim, who mocked the traditional way of life of the Sephardim. In April 1920 a group of Sephardim agreed to sign an anti-Zionist petition organized by the Arabs, and three years later a group of Sephardic Jews was induced by the MCA to hold a meeting in a synagogue, in the course of which they spoke up against Zionist and Ashkenazi rule and some even cheered the MCA and Mūsā Kāzīm al-Ḥusayni. This event worried the Jewish National Council (*Va'ad Le'umi*) which succeeded in preventing its being reported in the press.<sup>103</sup>

Whatever chances of success this Arab policy had were spoiled by

the failure of the Arabs to uphold its basic principle, namely the distinction between the Zionists and the indigenous Jewish residents of Palestine. In the large-scale Arab demonstrations of February–March 1920, many anti-Jewish slogans were heard. Mottoes such as “Palestine is our land and the Jews our dogs” abounded.<sup>104</sup> It should be noted that if in the above-mentioned petition from Nazareth the authors distinguished between Jews and Zionists, in the meeting which preceded the presentation of the petition, the Anglican priest of Nazareth, As‘ad Mansūr, gave a speech in which he quoted from the Talmūd to prove that the Jews were commanded to prevent strangers from entering their midst while they had the power to do so. He also explained that Palestine was taken from them because they rejected the Messiah.<sup>105</sup> In the April 1920 disturbances in Jerusalem the Arab mob attacked Zionists and Jews indiscriminately, and since it headed for the Jewish Quarter of the Old City, it was actually the Jews of the “old *yishūv*” who were hardest hit. Violence again erupted with greater severity in the 1929 pogroms in Hebron and Safed.

It seems that in the final analysis, the inability of the Arabs to make this distinction was inevitable. That is not to say that anti-Zionism inevitably develops into anti-Semitism; however, in Palestine, as immigration increased, so did the Jewish community’s identification with the Zionist movement, from the point of view of its composition, way of life and aspirations. The non-Zionist and anti-Zionist factors became an insignificant minority, and a large measure of sophistication was required to make the older distinction. It was unreasonable to hope that the wider Arab population, and the riotous mob which was part of it, would maintain this distinction. The Palestinian-Arab movement accordingly lost an excellent opportunity to sow internal dissension in the ranks of the Jewish community and so increase its support.

One of the most significant features of Palestinian-Arab ideology from the end of the second decade of the twentieth century until the 1930s was its concentration on Palestine alone. Even if during this period there were occasional demands for partial or complete Arab unity, this was never expressed on an ideological plane. There was as yet no crystallized theory attempting to prove by any objective standards that the Arabs throughout the Middle East and North Africa constituted a single nation. Still, the Arab awakening in the Fertile Crescent prior to the First World War was characterized by Pan-Arabism on both an ideological and a political level, although even then there were signs of the weakness of such a movement. What, then, caused the development of a separate Palestinian ideological position after the war?

It must be remembered that the emergence of the Arab nationalist movement was in the main a cultural phenomenon. It was a result of direct contact with the West on the one hand, and the need to defend Islam and to revitalize it in the face of Western attack on the other. The basis of this cultural renaissance was education. Arab society in general, however, did not undergo a parallel process of change. The social processes of integration, which could bring about the breakdown of traditional barriers of local, family and religious community, and could create a feeling of common Arab identity throughout the Middle East—these processes had not yet taken place. Thus when in the wake of the First World War a new political reality—that of division into separate mandates—was created in the Middle East, the various sections of the Arab nationalist movement adapted themselves to this new reality at varying rates.

Those elements who before the war had shown a trend towards particularism now stressed it all the more. The Damascenes, who saw themselves as the "pioneers of Arabism", tried harder than the rest to adhere to a Pan-Arab conception, whereas the Palestinians were more concerned over the Zionist threat and thus less occupied with Arab unity or even independence than with convincing themselves and the rest of the world of the evil of Zionism. Resistance to Zionism was, as we shall see later, the prime motive force behind Palestinian nationalist activity; their relation to the question of Arab unity in its various manifestations was a function of the efficacy of the anti-Zionist struggle. When they were of the opinion that unity would help them in this struggle, they leaned towards it (1919-20), but when they grew suspicious of the intentions of certain Arab nationalists from Syria with respect to Zionism, they dissociated themselves from them and tried to go it alone.

In Chapter Two it will be seen that the Palestinians' anti-Zionist ideology had important implications with respect to the Palestinians' relations with the British Mandate. Their opposition to the Mandate itself was minimal, indeed until the early 'thirties almost non-existent, and what opposition there was to the Mandate was a product of its Zionist implications.

What was the meaning of this anti-Zionist ideology in connection with the political stand on Zionism of the Palestinian nationalists, the members of the Arab Executive Committee and the organizations associated with it? To this question I shall now turn.

## THE REALITY OF ANTI-ZIONIST IDEOLOGY

A survey of the practical manifestations of the Palestinian Arabs' anti-Zionist stand reveals a complex heterogeneous picture. Except for occasional short outbreaks there was no attempt until 1936 to prevent by force the realization of Zionism in Palestine. In everyday life many ties were formed between Jews and Arabs from all strata of society, notwithstanding the tension which existed most of the time.

It appears that the political expression of the rejection of the Balfour Declaration was in the main a refusal to see the Zionists as legitimate partners in Palestine or a body with which agreement on the political future of the country would be possible. The only such factor was, in the Palestinian opinion, the British Government.

This position was demonstrated when the Colonial Secretary, Winston Churchill, and his subordinates tried to arrange negotiations for a possible agreement between the first Palestinian Delegation and the Zionist Organization. During the preparations for the Delegation's arrival, officials of the Middle East Department of the British Colonial Office decided that if the Delegation made any reasonable concrete suggestions it would be appropriate to turn them over to the Zionist Organization for the purposes of discussion. Dr. Weizmann was informed of the Delegation's arrival, and he announced his readiness to negotiate with them in order to reach agreement and to co-operate with them.<sup>1</sup>

In the course of the first session with the Delegation on 12th August 1921, Churchill suggested that the Delegation meet with the leaders of the Zionist Organization and in particular with Dr. Weizmann, either officially or privately. The response of the Delegation's leader, Mūsā Kāzīm al-Ḥusayni, was that they did not recognize Dr. Weizmann. They would only have talks with the British Government, with whom they wished to come to terms. It was for this purpose that the inhabitants of Palestine had sent the Delegation, and they would not countenance discussions with the Zionists.<sup>2</sup> Dr. Weizmann also appealed to the Delegation, expressing the desire that either he or Nahum Sokolow could meet with them at a time and place to be determined,<sup>3</sup> but the Delegation repeated its refusal and claimed that Weizmann had made the meeting conditional upon the talks being based on an acceptance of the Balfour Declaration. Churchill found this explanation, incorrect as it was, unacceptable.<sup>4</sup>

Meanwhile, the *Jewish Chronicle* published reports on the possibility of such a meeting being held. The reaction of the Delegation

tion was an unequivocal denial of the report.<sup>5</sup> Moreover, with the departure of the Delegation for London the Hebrew papers *Ha-'Aretz* and *Do'ar Ha-Yōm* wrote of this possibility. Reaction in the Arab community was extremely negative. *Al-Karmil* wrote that the origin of this idea was the Zionists' wish to inspire lack of confidence in the Delegation, and it had no basis in fact.<sup>6</sup> Another Palestinian, Qayṣar Khalil, took pains to remind the Delegation of its duty to cleave to its "holy mission" and not to fall into the Zionist trap.<sup>7</sup> The remarks of one of the active members of the national movement, Jubrān Iskandar Kazmā of Nazareth and Beisan, were typical: there was no room for a meeting with the Zionist leaders "because the corner-stone of an Israelite kingdom in Palestine will be laid the moment our Delegation meets with these leaders. Such a meeting would be tantamount to an admission on our part that Zionism possesses some rights in Palestine, whereas the basis for our activity and of its future success is the utter denial of such rights". He then demanded that the Arab Executive Committee instruct the Delegation to refrain from such negotiations.<sup>8</sup>

However, when it became clear to the Delegation after the first few sessions with Churchill that the chances of gaining a complete abrogation of the Balfour Declaration were nil, its members began changing their minds with respect to the idea of a meeting with Weizmann. Colonial Office personnel explained to the Delegation that the British Government was ready to issue an authoritative declaration regarding its future policy in Palestine and to submit this declaration for preliminary consideration by both sides.<sup>9</sup> During a ceremonial dinner on 25th November 1921, Churchill discussed the possibility of a meeting of both sides and eventually the Delegation agreed to meet and to discuss with the Zionist representatives ways of reaching a working agreement.<sup>10</sup> As so often occurs in political relations, the Delegation apparently read more into the talks than the other side had intended. The Delegation believed that Churchill was interested in reaching an agreement with them and therefore had urged them to meet with the Zionist leaders, and because of this they had agreed.<sup>11</sup> Ri'ād al-Ṣulḥ, who was in London at the time having private talks with the heads of the Zionist Organization, also did his share in persuading the Palestinian Delegation to agree to the meeting (see Chapter Two). As a result of this pressure a meeting took place on 29th November 1921 with Sir John Shuckburgh of the British Colonial Office presiding. It was decided that the meeting would be unofficial and that nothing would be published on it. Shuckburgh proposed during the meeting that discussion would centre on two practical issues: the real fears of the Arabs concerning Jewish immigration and Jewish political

ascendancy in Palestine. In his opinion the first question had been solved by making the country's economic absorption capacity the principle which would regulate immigration, while the second issue would be solved by the proposed constitution for Palestine. Dr. Weizmann was prepared to enter negotiations with the Palestinian Delegation on these two issues.

The Palestinian Delegation, on the other hand, held initially to the principle of annulling the Balfour Declaration. Later on, however, their tone changed and Mūsā Kāzīm al-Ḥusayni asked why the British Government could not publish a clear-cut explanation of the Balfour Declaration, so that the Arabs would know where they stood. The Delegation stated during the course of the talks that if a satisfactory, authoritative interpretation of the Declaration were issued and if the proposed form of the Mandate were altered, then there would perhaps be a basis for discussion.

This statement was a departure from normal tactics. However, the Official Recorder of the conversation (Eric Mills, an official from the Colonial Office, later one of the senior officials of the Palestine Government) was unimpressed and noted that there was no chance of agreement as long as the British Government adhered to the Balfour Declaration.<sup>12</sup>

This statement is confirmed by the report which the Arab Delegation sent the Arab Executive Committee about this meeting. The Delegation reported that they had insisted on the demands of the people. They wrote that they had declared that "Palestine is an Arab land and we do not admit that anyone other than the Arabs has any rights there; we stated that there is no possibility of recognizing the Zionist Organization as a body with which we could negotiate, and that the Delegation is unable to enter negotiations based on the Balfour Declaration". The Delegation emphasized the fact that it was prepared to discuss the new interpretation of the Balfour Declaration with the Government but not with the Zionists.<sup>13</sup> In light of these remarks it is no wonder that the meeting had no follow-up!

The Zionist Organization did everything it could to prevent the new interpretation of the Balfour Declaration from turning it into a document without any practical significance. Weizmann was of the opinion—or so he wrote—that rejection of the Arab demand concerning the interpretation of the Balfour Declaration would cause the Arab Delegation to enter the realm of practical diplomacy and reach agreement with the Zionists.<sup>14</sup> As we shall see in Chapter Two, the new interpretation of the Balfour Declaration did not satisfy the Palestinians and was in fact totally rejected by them.<sup>15</sup> A last-minute attempt in May 1922 to prompt the two sides to come

to an agreement on the basis of the new interpretation failed because the Arabs refused to abandon their demand for a complete change of the Balfour Declaration as a preliminary step to any bilateral discussion of the matter. The Zionists were also non-committal over the talks and explained this attitude by claiming that it was impossible to hold negotiations with the Palestinian Delegation without risking misunderstandings and misrepresentations of the case.<sup>16</sup> In all probability the inexact way in which the conversation of 29th November 1921 was described made a strong impression on them. The upshot of it was that the British Government authorized and published the new interpretation of the Balfour Declaration with the Zionists accepting it and the Arabs rejecting it.<sup>17</sup>

This barren meeting revealed the chasm between the two positions: the Zionists held to the Balfour Declaration and were unwilling to give up this British stamp of approval of the rights of the Jewish people in Palestine which had gained international endorsement whereas the Arabs refused to discuss matters with the Zionists as long as the Balfour Declaration had any practical significance. It is no wonder, then, that this meeting of the most important leaders on both sides remained a unique occurrence.

In the years 1927-8, when the crisis within Zionism was at its height and it appeared that its realization was completely impractical, different noises were heard coming from the Palestinian camp. During this period the Mufti of Jerusalem attempted to reach an agreement with the heads of the *Yishūv* that would ensure the Jerusalem mayoralty for his supporters.<sup>18</sup> The resolutions of the Seventh Palestinian Congress, which met in June 1928, were only indirectly anti-Zionist. However, when the crisis passed the anti-Zionist position returned to normal.

We have noted that this anti-Zionism was not so strongly felt on a personal level as on a political level. H. M. Kalvarisky, who headed the Arab Department of the Zionist Executive in Jerusalem in the early 'twenties, maintained close ties with the leaders of the Arab community for many years, including Mūsā Kāzīm al-Ḥusayni, the President of the Palestinian Arab Executive Committee. Moreover, in late 1922 when the Second Palestinian Delegation was staying at Lausanne, he began strengthening these ties between them with the aim of bringing Mūsā Kāzīm al-Ḥusayni around to a moderate position on Zionism and cutting him off from its fierier opponents. These contacts were continued throughout the first half of 1923, finally reaching the point where Mūsā Kāzīm al-Ḥusayni began to call for co-operation among Jews, Christians and Muslims and even feigned illness in order to bring about the postponement of the Sixth Palestinian Congress. The

Jews were anxious to gain such a postponement at least until after the holiday period in April in order to lessen the danger of disturbances, which were likely to break out during this tense month. It should also be recalled that feelings were high at this time in the Arab camp following the AE's successful boycott of the elections for the Legislative Council (see Chapter Three), and there were fears that holding the Congress at this moment would cause dangerous unrest. After the congress met and adopted extremist resolutions, Mūsā Kāzīm al-Ḥusaynī informed the Zionists that as long as he was on their side they could rest assured that the resolution would not be implemented.<sup>19</sup>

This new stand was not the result of a turning-point in Mūsā Kāzīm al-Ḥusaynī's attitude to Zionism but of his having been bribed by Kalvarisky. Relations such as this, dependent on financial incentives are conditional upon the continuity of the payments; when these ceased, the moderate stance disappeared entirely. What is more, since Kalvarisky had not great funds upon which to draw he was forced to bargain with Mūsā Kāzīm al-Ḥusaynī over the price to be paid, leaving the latter with bitter feelings about the matter.<sup>20</sup>

These "ties" with Kalvarisky on the part of the President of the AE did not prevent this body from accusing its rivals in the Arab community of having sold out to Kalyarisky. In fact, Kalvarisky's name was for years an insult epithet, and the AE called the rival associations which were set up during the 'twenties "Kalvarisky associations".<sup>21</sup> AE's attitude towards Kalvarisky was well expressed in 'Awni 'Abd al-Hādī's words: "Vous parlez toujours d'une entente judéo-arabe ou de bonnes relations entre juifs et arabes. Je connais vos idées. Je vous dirai même que plusieurs de mes collègues et amis ont réellement de la sympathie pour vous et pour vos idées. Quant à moi je vous dis franchement que je préfère avoir affaire à Jabotinsky ou à Ussishkin, plutôt qu'à vous. Je sais que ceux-ci sont des ennemis déclarés qui veulent nous écraser, nous prendre nos terres et nous obliger à quitter le pays et que nous devons lutter contre eux, tandis que vous, Kalvarisky, semblez être notre ami, mais au fond je ne vois pas de différence entre votre but et celui de Jabotinsky. Vous aussi tenez fermement à la Déclaration Balfour, au Foyer National, à une immigration sans restriction, à l'acquisition ininterrompue des terres occupées par les arabes *ce qui pour moi est une question primordiale* (de mort ou de vie)."<sup>22</sup>

The violent denunciation of Kalvarisky and his work on the one hand, and a readiness to benefit from the favours he could offer on the other—this duality is typical of the relationship which the leaders of the Arab community had with Zionism. Just as Mūsā

Kāzīm al-Husayni did not shrink from serving a Zionist interest for a bribe, so others were willing to sell their lands to Jewish organizations, despite the fact that they themselves were strongly opposed to the Jews acquiring land and even demanded the Government to forbid such sales completely.

## Chapter Two

### FROM "SOUTHERN SYRIA" TO PALESTINE

#### THE IDEA OF THE UNITY OF PALESTINE AND SYRIA

At the time of the British conquest of Palestine from late 1917 onwards, the Arabs of the country were still in a primordial state as far as national consciousness was concerned. We have seen that before the war only a few Palestinians were caught up in the young Arab nationalist movement. Loyalty to the Muslim Ottoman Empire was then stronger than any other form of loyalty, and apparently only the sufferings of the war and the repressive policy of Jemal Pasha undermined this allegiance.

However, the British conquest created a completely new situation, Palestine was put under a separate Military Administration [OETA (S)], and it is highly doubtful if anyone believed that the Ottoman Empire would some day return to rule it. The very fact that a separate administration was set up was a great innovation. We have seen that from the last quarter of the nineteenth century the *sanjaq* of Jerusalem had developed into an administrative unit directly subordinate to Istanbul, with the heads of Jerusalem's noted families enjoying a large degree of influence within it. Now Jerusalem had become the centre of the entire country in an administrative and legal sense. There is no doubt that the meaning of the term "Palestine" was largely reinforced by this, for although it is true that the term was in general use among the population before the war, the division of the country into three separate districts certainly did not strengthen this concept.

On the other hand, there was another factor at work which influenced things in a Pan-Arab, direction namely the revolt led by the *Sharif* Ḥusayn and his sons. Together with the advancing British Army the *Sharif's* officers also reached Palestine and began a propaganda and recruitment campaign for Fayṣal's army. Until they appeared, the Muslim population had shown little or no interest in the Arab nationalist movement. Even the class of urban notables, and especially the enlightened Muslim "Levantine" population of Jaffa, regarded the Arab movement with something akin to hatred, a sentiment which was echoed in Cairo and Alexandria.<sup>1</sup> Now Fayṣal's propagandists explained in the course of their recruit-

ment campaign that they were fighting for the liberation of the country, and those who enlisted were told that Palestine would be included in the independent Arab state which would be established after the war.<sup>2</sup> However, neither the Muslim nor the Christian population of Palestine was quick to show enthusiasm for the ensuing Arab revolt under the *Sharif Husayn's* leadership, and the support given it in the summer of 1918 was lukewarm. Among the Muslims there were those who resented that Ottoman rule had come to an end, whereas some Christians hoped that British rule would enhance the status of Christianity and "with the arrival of British troops they behaved arrogantly and assumed a contemptuous mien".<sup>3</sup>

However, this indifferent attitude towards the Arab nationalist movement had changed within the course of the next six months, and the demand for unity with Syria gained increasing support in the Palestinian political community.<sup>4</sup> Two events which occurred in close proximity, and which therefore had a strong cumulative effect, contributed decisively to this development. Firstly, Fayṣal's army reached Damascus in early October 1918, and a military administration was set up there which was subordinate to the Supreme Commander of the Egyptian Expeditionary Force (General Allenby), but with Fayṣal installed at its head. He could thus announce the establishment of a "completely independent constitutional" government.<sup>5</sup> It appeared that the foundation had been laid for the fulfilment of the dream of Arab independence. Secondly, we have already seen how the Palestinians reacted to the celebrations of the first anniversary of the Balfour Declaration. The combination of these two factors resulted in the Palestinian population showing a tendency to turn towards the King of Hejaz and the Arab government in Damascus.<sup>6</sup>

The British Military Administration, appalled by the anti-Zionist reaction in early November 1918, decided that it was necessary to take measures to conciliate the Palestinians. Thus Ronald Storrs, the Military Governor of Jerusalem, saw to it that copies of the Anglo-French Declaration of 7th November 1918 were displayed in Jerusalem.<sup>7</sup> This Declaration stated that the war aims of France and Great Britain in the East were to liberate the oppressed peoples and to enable them to establish the government of their choice, without coercion. "In order to attain these ends and purposes, both France and Great Britain have agreed to support and help the establishment of National Governments and Administrations in Syria and Iraq, which countries have now already been liberated by the allies, and also in other countries which the allies are still aiming to liberate."<sup>8</sup> Palestine was not mentioned in this Declara-

tion, and this was no accident.<sup>9</sup> The heads of the Arab community in Jerusalem, having so recently protested against the Balfour Declaration, noticed this exclusion and on the day after its publication they requested the Governor to clarify: 1) Whether Palestine was part of Syria; 2) If so, were the Palestinians included in the group entitled to choose its government; 3) If not, why was the Declaration even sent to them? The Governor answered in general terms. The following day the heads of the Muslim and Christian communities assembled and decided to demand a government headed by the *Sharif* of Mecca; the Muslims requested the Mufti to make mention of the *Sharif's* name, as Caliph, in the Friday prayers.<sup>10</sup>

In the opinion of the heads of the Military Administration, this decision possessed only an anti-Zionist significance. Inasmuch as they were appalled at the thought that Palestine would be given over to Jewish rule, and since the inhabitants of Syria had been promised that they would be able to choose their own government, the Palestinian Arabs preferred unity with Syria. Clayton was not concerned that Arab nationalist ambitions carried some weight in Palestine. In his view, non-Jewish sectors of Palestine were concerned not with nationalist aims but with maintaining their status in the country, believing as they did that it was in danger from the Zionists.<sup>11</sup> It would appear that this explanation, however correct and fundamental it may have been, was not the only one. The heads of the Military Administration, unhappy over the pro-Zionist policy, were anxious to attribute the problems which arose to the influence of this unwelcome policy. It was easy for them to ignore the fact that the establishment of a semi-independent Arab regime in Damascus—a regime which owed its existence to British support—caused complex problems in the area of their rule. From the time the inhabitants of Syria were promised the right to choose their government, while the inhabitants of Palestine were excluded from this promise, it was reasonable to expect that the Palestinians would attribute their exclusion to the Balfour Declaration—and this fact then reinforced their desire to be considered a part of the population of Syria.<sup>12</sup>

An additional factor which until July 1920 paradoxically strengthened their wish to unite with Syria was the Anglo-French rivalry in Syria and Palestine. The basis for this rivalry lay in the opposing interests which these two powers had in Syria and Palestine and in the zeal with which the representatives of these powers in the Middle East worked to realize these interests.

There is no need to mention in detail the ties which France had with the Levant and its Christian communities. What is important

to recall is that until the First World War there was no clear distinction in French diplomatic usage between the terms "Syria" and "Palestine". This confusion created the impression that when the French spoke of their interests in Syria this included Palestine. Speaking of French interests in Syria, a French diplomat stated on the eve of the First World War: "By Syria must be understood, not a Syria mutilated and discrowned, but Syria in its entirety, which extends from El-Arish to the Taurus."<sup>13</sup> It should be noted that in the Treaty of London of 1840 northern Palestine (the district of Acre) also appears as "Southern Syria".<sup>14</sup> The same is true of a reference book of the British Foreign Office published on the eve of the First World War.<sup>15</sup> It seems, then, that in speaking of their interests in Syria or the Levant the French included Palestine. The existence of the Holy Places reinforced this tendency.

On the eve of the First World War, the British interest in Palestine and to a lesser degree in Syria was due to their proximity to the Suez Canal. The over-all nature of this interest was the prevention of any other power from gaining a dominant position in the vicinity of the Canal. It is no wonder, then, that it was the British Residency in Egypt—and particularly Lord Kitchener—that was responsible for fostering ties with various organizations in Syria, for map-making in Palestine and researching the country.<sup>16</sup>

The First World War contributed a new dimension to this interest. As M. Vereté has shown, the British aimed at creating a land bridge under British control from the Persian Gulf to the Mediterranean, including Palestine and the eastern part of Syria. This interest inevitably required changing the international status which the Sykes-Picot Agreement had established for Palestine. This international status had been accepted as a compromise between the conflicting interests of the powers, while the Balfour Declaration was apparently one of the measures taken in order to ensure the British position in Palestine. What is more, Allenby and the officers of the British Military Administration strove to deprive the French of any influential position in Syria. This was a result of their desire to keep the promises that had been given to the *Sharif Husayn*, and to attain maximum security for the British position on this land bridge. This clash between British and French interests and the terms of the Sykes-Picot Agreement formed the basis for the rivalry of these two powers over the future rule of Syria and also of Palestine.<sup>17</sup>

Practical expressions of this rivalry were, on the one hand, the support and encouragement which the British Military Administration gave Fayçal's Damascus regime and its supporters, who spread anti-French propaganda, and on the other hand, the activities of

French agents in Palestine who disseminated anti-Zionist propaganda, pointing out that it was the British who had brought the Zionists to Palestine. The remedy they proposed was to unite Palestine with Syria.<sup>18</sup> Thus it happened that two mutually antagonistic sides found themselves united on this point, although for different reasons: the French strove towards a "Greater Syria" under their rule, while the Arab nationalists strove for an independent "Greater Syria", with the Palestinians joining them primarily because of their fear of Zionism. The term "Southern Syria", which was common in French, passed into Palestinian usage and was adopted by the Arab nationalist movement.

#### THE ORGANIZATIONAL INSTRUMENTS

Just as the anti-Zionist awakening had brought about the creation of the MCA, so the emergence of the idea of Palestine's unity with Syria led to the establishment of two organizations: *al-Muntadā al-Adabi* (the Literary Club) and *al-Nādi al-'Arabi* (the Arab Club). These organizations were completely different in their composition from the MCA: their members were drawn from the young enlightened generation, and they were without Christian influence. One can see in them organizations based on an ideology, rather than simply a modern framework for traditional representation, like the MCA.

*Al-Muntadā* was the most active association throughout 1919 and early 1920. It began as an organization set up in January 1918 by Ḥasan Ṣidqi al-Dajāni and Yūsuf al-Khaṭīb under the name of *Muqtaṭaf al-Durūs* ("Selection of Lessons"), for the purpose of spreading French propaganda. In November 1918 the organization's name was changed to *al-Muntadā al-Adabi*, although it signed the anti-Zionist protest note of the leaders of the community in Jerusalem under its old name. The organization was financed by the French and concealed its true intentions under the guise of cultural activity. The British authorities perceived its real purpose, and due to their pressure it replaced its leadership with a new one mainly composed of members of the al-Nashāshibi family; the educator and writer Is'āf, Fu'ād, and Fakhri (or Fakhḥ al-Dīn).<sup>1</sup> The latter was the moving spirit behind the organization until the spring of 1920.

With its appearance in a new form the organization began calling for the unification of Palestine with Syria and demanding that the *Sharīf* of Mecca be mentioned in the Friday sermons as the *Khalīfah*. What is interesting is that these resolutions were addressed to the

French Commissariat (Consulate) in Jerusalem.<sup>2</sup> The organization's activity was carried on in this uniate spirit. It adopted a particularly violent anti-British and anti-Zionist line and was considered by both the Zionists and the British as their most extreme opponent.

In anticipation of the arrival of the King-Crane Commission, the propagandists of *al-Muntadā al-Adabi* began discussing the possibility of effecting a revolution if complete independence was denied the inhabitants. They even began to recruit volunteers for the purpose—at least, such was the opinion of a British Intelligence Officer.<sup>3</sup> Their motto was: "In the name of the Arabs we will live and in the name of the Arabs we shall die."<sup>4</sup>

British and Jewish sources were of the opinion that *al-Muntadā*, or at least some of its members, continued to maintain connections with French agents in Palestine even after the changes in its leadership.<sup>5</sup> Its close ties with the Catholic Association, which was totally under the influence of the French, helped to substantiate this claim.<sup>6</sup>

The centre of the organization was Jerusalem, but according to a Zionist Intelligence source it succeeded during 1919 in establishing branches in various parts of the country, the largest ones being in Jaffa, Ṭul-Karm and Gaza. At the height of its activity, in early 1920, its members were estimated by Zionist Intelligence to be over 500.<sup>7</sup> This appears to be an exaggerated estimate. There is no mention in any British source material of these branches, with the exception of the Jaffa branch; and indeed the Jaffa branch was important for its contribution to the struggle within the MCA between moderates and extremists.<sup>8</sup>

A prominent feature of this organization was that, aside from being an organization of young people, teachers and ex-army and police officers were prominent in its leadership and membership in both Jerusalem and Jaffa. The Arab schools in Jerusalem were centres of the association's activity and organization.<sup>9</sup>

Its origins as an educational organization and its intellectual composition lent a cultural tinge to the association's activity. It concerned itself with athletic activities, the formation of an orchestra, the organization of concerts, and the dissemination of Arab literature. The association was extremely strict about membership standards, at least according to its statutes, and maintained a profusion of emblems and ceremonies.<sup>10</sup>

*Al-Nādi al-'Arabi*, like *al-Muntadā al-Adabi*, was a young people's organization rather than a body representing the heads of families and the notables of the communities.<sup>11</sup> It was also set up in 1918, although news of it first appeared quite late in early November.<sup>12</sup> However, in contrast to *al-Muntadā*, its leadership and active members were drawn mainly from the younger ranks

of the al-Ḥusayni family and those connected to it by marriage or consanguinity—such as al-Ḥājj Muḥammad Amin al-Ḥusayni (the President of *al-Nādi*), his brother Fakhr al-Dīn (Fakhri for short) al-Ḥusayni, Jamil al-Ḥusayni (who was also a member of *al-Muntadā*), Ibrāhīm Sa‘id al-Ḥusayni, Ḥilmi al-Ḥusayni\* and Tawfiq al-Ḥusayni,\* Ishāq Darwish and Muḥammad al-‘Afifi (who were related to the Ḥusaynis by marriage), Kāmil al-Budayri, Ḥasan al-Budayri and Sheikh Mūsā al-Budayri, Sheikh Ḥasan Abū al-Sa‘ūd (the Shāfi‘i Mufti of Jerusalem), ‘Abd al-Ṣamad al-‘Alami and others.<sup>13</sup> In March 1920, when Arab nationalist activity under the Military Administration was at its height, the membership of *Al-Nādi* was estimated by Zionist Intelligence as over 500,<sup>14</sup> and even at the end of 1920 when its activity had noticeably declined, the CID put its membership at 400.<sup>15</sup>

*Al-Nādi* also engaged in cultural and social activities. Its motto was: “Our Land is Ours”.<sup>13</sup> Islamic religious leaders and officers of the *Sharīf* were conspicuous among its active members. The first Arab nationalist newspaper in Palestine, *Sūriya al-Janūbiyyah*, which first appeared in September 1919, was edited by Kāmil al-Budayri, a member of the organization, and ‘Ārif al-‘Ārif, who was sympathetic to its aims. The organization’s meetings were frequently held in the offices of this paper, and the connections between the organization and the paper were very close. The centre and leadership of the organization was in Jerusalem, although it succeeded in setting up smaller and less active branches in Gaza, Hebron, Nāblus, Ṭul-Karm and Galilee.

The political goals of *al-Nādi al-‘Arabi* were identical with those of *al-Muntadā*: the unification of Palestine with Syria, and resistance to Zionism; however, its propaganda was more restrained than that of *al-Muntadā* and demonstrated pro-British tendencies.<sup>17</sup> The President of the organization, al-Ḥājj Amin al-Ḥusayni, was considered by one British officer “most pro-English”. It should be recalled that in 1918 al-Ḥusayni helped recruit volunteers for the army of the *Sharīf* Ḥusayn together with British officers<sup>18</sup> and afterwards served as an official in the headquarters of the British Military Governor of Jerusalem.<sup>19</sup> Another, more important reason for this position was the status of the al-Ḥusayni family in Jerusalem. Members of this family held high positions in the local administration; the Mufti of Jerusalem was at that time Kāmil al-Ḥusayni, the elder brother (from a different mother) of al-Ḥājj Amin al-Ḥusayni, and Mūsā Kāzim al-Ḥusayni served as Mayor. Both these men were forced by virtue of their duties to maintain

\* These two were brothers of Jamāl al-Ḥusayni; Tawfiq was Director of the Muslim Orphanage in Jerusalem.

close relations with the authorities and were very dependent upon them. Kāmil al-Ḥusayni, moreover, was conspicuously friendly and helpful to the British regime, and the British rewarded him for this by strengthening his position (I shall return to this subject below). It is virtually certain that these ties influenced the stance of the organization, headed as it was by the Ḥusaynis.

The identity of interests between *al-Nādi* and *al-Muntadā* brought about co-operation between them in all the major political events of 1919 and early 1920: together they pressed for the adoption of a unity programme at the Congress that convened in January 1919 in Jerusalem; together they arranged for the appearance of advocates of unity before the King-Crane Commission; and together they organized petitions in favour of unity, and protests and demonstrations against Zionism, which were presented to the Military Administration.<sup>20</sup> *Al-Nādi*, which was basically pro-British, refrained of course from having contacts with French agents (unlike *al-Muntadā*); it did, however, have close ties with members of Fayṣal's regime in Damascus and received financial support from that source.<sup>21</sup> Inevitably, the question arises: was *al-Nādi al-'Arabi* in Palestine simply part of a larger organization based in Damascus and bearing the same name?

The Damascus *al-Nādi al-'Arabi* was set up not long after the capture of Damascus by the armies of Allenby and Fayṣal. It was first mentioned in connection with the distribution of anti-Zionist manifestos in Damascus in January 1919. It was for this purpose that it was set up by Palestinians who had moved to Damascus after its capture.<sup>22</sup> This body continued to be composed mainly of Palestinians, and its leadership was entirely Palestinian: Sheikh 'Abd al-Qādir al-Muẓaffar of Jerusalem (his earlier name was al-Muẓghar), the President of the organization; Salīm 'Abd al-Raḥmān al-Ḥājj Ibrāhīm (from Ṭul-Karm); Muḥammad 'Alī Bey al-Tamīmī (of Nāblus), the Damascus Police Chief under Fayṣal; Şubḥī Bey al-Khadrā' (of Safed), the Commander of the Gendarmerie; and 'Izzat Darwaza, Secretary of *al-Nādi al-'Arabi* and the Secretary of the General Syrian Congress.<sup>23</sup>

This body quickly became the main nationalist organization in Syria. Its club was the site of the most important political meetings and the First General Syrian Congress, convened in July 1919. In the opinion of Darwaza it was an offshoot from the *al-Fatāh* association, but actually it was much more than that. It was, in the words of Amīn Sa'īd, the "main prop" of the (extreme) nationalist activity in Syria under Fayṣal. In the view of both these authors, all the clubs of this name throughout Syria (including Palestine) were tied to the central organization in Damascus and acted on

its orders.<sup>24</sup> An intelligence source from early 1920 describes *al-Nādi al-'Arabi* as playing a decisive role in Fayṣal's administration, and a factor working towards Fayṣal's being declared King, and rejecting the compromise settlement which Fayṣal had reached with the French. The source does not mention either *al-Fatāh* or the *al-Istiqlāl* party, which was set up by *al-Fatāh* for purpose of public activity.<sup>25</sup> It is interesting to note that the rivals of *al-Nādi al-'Arabi* in Syria were the members of *al-Ḥizb al-Waṭani*, conspicuous among whom were landowners and businessmen, who preferred stability to disorder and war. *Al-Ḥizb al-Waṭani* was not committed to independence, and was willing to recognize the Jewish National Home in Palestine.<sup>26</sup>

The source material available largely confirms the view that there was a connection between the *al-Nādi al-'Arabi* in Damascus and the one in Jerusalem, although the strength of the connection is not entirely clear. The heads of *al-Nādi* in Damascus went to Jerusalem from time to time in order to instruct the active members there, or would communicate with them by letters and messengers. Messengers would also travel from the heads of the organization in Jerusalem to Damascus. The newspaper connected with the Jerusalem *al-Nādi* was promised financial support from *al-Nādi* in Damascus, and leaflets distributed in Jerusalem were printed in Damascus.<sup>27</sup> We have already seen that the Jerusalem *al-Nādi* received financial support from Damascus. It is also true that *al-Muntadā al-Adabi* as well as the smaller associations maintained similar ties with the Palestinian leaders in Damascus, and it is likely that they too were connected to *al-Nādi* in Damascus; but the evidence of the various sources suggests that *al-Muntadā's* ties were weaker. It is almost certain that after their flight from Jerusalem in April 1920, the activities of the President of the Jerusalem *al-Nādi*, al-Ḥājj Amīn al-Ḥusayni, and 'Arif al-'Arif, the Editor of *Sūriya al-Janūbiyyah*, in Damascus strengthened these ties.<sup>28</sup> The fact that 'Abd al-Qādir al-Muẓaffar, the President of the Damascus *al-Nādi al-'Arabi*, was active in the Jerusalem *al-Nādi al-'Arabi* from the time of his return to the city and was even elected its President in 1923 gives added weight to the assertion that *al-Nādi* in Jerusalem was connected to the one in Damascus.<sup>29</sup> It appears that these connections were quite strong, and even succeeded in causing the sheikhs of the Bedouin tribes of the *Jazīrah* in North-East Syria to present a protest note against Zionism to the Chief Administrator of OETA(S).<sup>30</sup> The importance of these ties is not limited to the fact that a Pan-Syrian organization was created and worked for Pan-Syrian unity, but extends to the fact that this was the main channel of communication between the Damascus leader-

ship and the nationalist circles in Jerusalem, Nāblus and elsewhere, all working for such unity.

Aside from these two organizations there existed several smaller, more secretive, and less important associations.<sup>31</sup> One of these, *Jam'iyyat al-Ikhā' wa-al-'Afāf* (Association of Brotherhood and Purity), acted as an executive body for *al-Muntadā al-Adabi*; later, when *al-Nādi* gained support at the expense of *al-Muntadā*, it became a tool of *al-Nādi*. Its function was to distribute pamphlets, maintain security meetings, and organize demonstrations. It also possessed weapons and espoused terrorism.<sup>32</sup> Its leader was Sheikh Sa'id al-Khaṭīb, and religious leaders were prominent among its propagandists. Its membership reached two hundred in early 1919. In contrast with the other associations, it had among its members a proportion of commoners, including a number of policemen! According to Zionist Intelligence, this was because, with the passing of Ottoman rule, bribery disappeared which deprived policemen of much of their income. They therefore joined the association, which paid them a small salary for illegal actions.<sup>33</sup>

Such were the organizations which developed along with the growth of the idea of the unity of Palestine and Syria. These were the bodies which pressed for acceptance of the idea of unity and consequently won a position of considerable influence, despite their youth and the relatively modern character of their organization, just as in Fayṣal's regime in Damascus young extremists who had dislodged the veteran élite from its traditional strongholds achieved prominence.<sup>34</sup>

#### THE TRIUMPH OF THE "SOUTHERN SYRIA" TREND

The atmosphere in November 1918, when it became clear to the Palestinians that Syria would have the right to choose its own government, while they faced the prospect of Zionist rule, brought into prominence the organizations of young men working towards the idea of unity with Syria. The need to choose some representative agency which would express the will of Palestinians at the impending Peace Conference in Paris and to the Arab regime in Damascus also became apparent. These factors were responsible for convening the First Congress of the Muslim-Christian Associations in Jerusalem in January 1919.

It is possible to regard this Congress in many respects as representative of the entire political community and not only the MCA. It is true that other associations did not participate as official bodies, but some of the delegates were also members of *al-Nādi al-'Arabi* or

*al-Muntadā al-Adabi*, and these organizations played an active part in the behind-the-scenes discussions which led to the adoption of Pan-Syrian resolutions.<sup>1</sup> Nonetheless, it is important to emphasize that it was the MCA which was chosen to represent the Palestinians. Without a doubt, it was the traditional nature of this body, and its composition of notables from important families and representatives of the religious communities, which decided the matter.

The Congress was to have opened 25th January, but because not all the delegates had arrived on this date it was delayed until 1st February.<sup>2</sup> There were about 30 participants from the various cities of Palestine. Although delegates had been invited from Acre, Hebron and Beersheba none came.<sup>3</sup> The delay was utilized for an unofficial exchange of views. More importantly, the various factions which were to compete for influence in the Congress were working to consolidate their positions, namely the young Pan-Arab associations, and officers of the British Administration and French agents. These factions continued to be active during the Congress, and their conflicting aims left their marks on its discussions and resolutions.

The order of business put together during the preparatory discussions was as follows:

- 1) The political future of Palestine.
- 2) The stand on Zionism.
- 3) The election of a delegation which would present the demands of the Congress to the Peace Conference.
- 4) Various internal matters of the Arab community.<sup>4</sup>

The *al-Nādi* and *al-Muntadā* associations and some of the delegates to the Congress who supported them, pressed for Palestine's definition as "Southern Syria" and for the presentation of a demand for the unity of all the parts of Syria, including Palestine, and for its independence. They demanded a delegation be sent to Paris, despite the financial difficulties involved.<sup>5</sup>

The other factor operating behind the scenes was the British Military Administration. Its officers worked for the adoption by the Congress of resolutions calling for home rule for Palestine under British aegis. For this purpose they met with various delegates to the Congress<sup>6</sup> and even called General Gabriel Bey Ḥaddād (a Syrian who was Director of Public Security in Damascus under Fayṣal's regime) to Jerusalem in order to convince the delegates to the Congress of the justice of "Palestine for the Palestinians".<sup>7</sup>

The French were the third factor involved. They concerned themselves with spreading anti-Zionist and anti-British propaganda which favoured a united Syria. Britain's obligation towards Zionism

aided them in this. The Dragomans of the French and Italian consulates in Jerusalem (also a Catholic factor) were present at the Congress with pre-arranged resolutions.<sup>8</sup>

The British Administration was apparently certain that the Congress would adopt resolutions in the spirit it wanted, and therefore had permitted it to be convened in the first place. The British Intelligence Officer J. N. Camp believed that of the delegates to the Congress, at least twelve were pro-British, twelve Pan-Arabists, and two pro-French. Storrs went still further, claiming that the original intention of the majority of delegates, at the first session of the Congress, was to request the establishment of an autonomous government in Palestine under British protection, on condition that guarantees against Zionist immigration or government were given.<sup>9</sup>

However, from the point of view of the British Administration's expectations, the Congress ended in frustration. A strange coalition was formed of Pan-Arabists (for the most part Muslims) and pro-French Latins and Greek Catholics (including their Muslim agent 'Abd al-Ḥamīd Abū Ghaush) which was united on some questions and divided on others. The pro-British supporters of "Palestine for the Palestinians" were left in the minority.

The first act of the Congress was the framing of a long memorandum justifying the rejection of Zionism and intended for the Peace Conference in Paris. It was signed by twenty-five of the participating delegates.<sup>10</sup> The four who did not sign were: Ya'qūb Farrāj, the representative of the Jerusalem Orthodox community, 'Abd al-Ḥamīd Abū Ghaush, the representative of the villagers in the Jerusalem district, and two delegates from Hebron who had left the Congress. Ya'qūb Farrāj and 'Abd al-Ḥamīd Abū Ghaush belonged to opposing camps in the Congress; the former was pro-British, while the latter was a French agent. There seems to be no explanation for the former not signing the memorandum, as on other occasions he expressed the usual anti-Zionist stand. With respect to the latter, it is likely that in early 1919 he was already working in the service of both the French and the Information Office of the Zionist Commission. In any case in the spring of 1920 he was active in collecting pro-Zionist petitions from the villagers of Judea and the south.<sup>11</sup> However, it is clear that the vast majority of the delegates united in rejecting Zionism.

The second document to emerge from the Congress was adopted after two additional days of discussion. It included five resolutions:

1) "We consider Palestine as part of Arab Syria as it has never been separated from it at any time. We are connected with it by

national, religious, linguistic, natural, economic and geographical bonds.

2) The declaration made by M. Pichon, Minister for Foreign Affairs for France, that France has rights in our country based on the desires and aspirations of the inhabitants has no foundation and we reject all the declarations made in the speech of 29th December,<sup>12</sup> as our wishes and aspirations are only in our Arabic unity and complete independence.

3) In view of the above we desire that our district Southern Syria or Palestine should not be separated from the Independent Arab Syrian Government and be free from all foreign influence and protection.

4) In accordance with the rule laid down by President Wilson and approved by most of the Great Powers we consider that every promise or treaty concluded in respect of our country and its future as null and void and reject the same.

5) The Government of the country will apply for help to its friend Great Britain in case of need for improvement and development of the country provided that this will not affect its independence and Arab Unity in any way and will keep good relations with the Allied Powers."<sup>13</sup>

The resolution was a demand for Syrian unity along with the desire to foster friendly relations with Britain and the rejection of French demands. The Congress also decided to send two delegations with the resolutions adopted by the Congress, one to Paris consisting of Sheikh Tawfiq Ḥamād (Nāblus), Sheikh Rāghib Abū Sa'ūd al-Dajāni (Jaffa) and Jubrān Iskandar Kazmā (an agronomist from Nazareth who set up an agricultural farm in Beisan in the twenties); and the other to Damascus including Ibrāhīm al-Qāsīm 'Abd al-Hādi, Ḥaydar 'Abd al-Hādi, 'Izzat Darwaza (Nāblus) and the latter two members of the delegation to Paris. It is interesting to note that despite the unity resolution, the Palestinians were in no hurry to turn their representation in Paris over to Fayṣal's delegation despite the fact that it was already there!

The decision in favour of unity with Syria was made by the coalition of Pan-Arab delegates and the pro-French Catholics. The French agents who worked behind the scenes for its adoption had, of course, different intentions from those of the Pan-Arab delegation. However, when it became clear to the Pan-Arab delegates that French influence was becoming too strong, they apparently made an about-face and together with the pro-British delegates adopted the resolution in favour of British aid.<sup>14</sup> This consolidation of interests was facilitated by fear of Zionism, since this was the

common denominator. This factor was also the primary motive behind the activity of the young Pan-Arab element.<sup>15</sup>

It is clear, then, that these resolutions were not based upon unanimity and that they were bound to undergo upheavals. The document was not signed by two important delegates of the four delegates from Jerusalem: 'Ārif Pāshā al-Dajāni al-Da'ūdi, the President of the Jerusalem MCA and the President of the Congress, and Ya'qūb Farrāj. These two headed the pro-British camp at the Congress and were aided by the head of the most important Muslim family of Jerusalem, Ismā'il al-Ḥusayni.

In fact, some immediately began to dissociate themselves from the above resolutions. The two pro-French delegates from Jerusalem, the Latin Shukri al-Kārmi and 'Abd al-Ḥamid Abū Ghaush, announced that their signatures on the draft of the resolutions applied only to the matter of the unity of Palestine and Syria and not to the other resolutions, particularly not to Article 2 (which was anti-French).<sup>16</sup>

The two pro-British delegates from Jerusalem managed to persuade the two delegates from Gaza, Aḥmad al-Ṣūrāni and al-Ḥājj Sa'id Shawā, and the two Haifa delegates Rashīd al-Ḥājj Ibrāhīm and Iskandar Menasā (a Greek-Orthodox), to renounce their support of the idea of unity with Syria. These six men demanded a renewed discussion of the matter on 9th February, and when their request was turned down they announced to the Government that they supported only the second (anti-French) article. In their opinion, "Palestine should have a constitutional autonomous government, independent for its home internal affairs, based on the wishes of its inhabitants, able to promulgate special laws—laws, suitable to the aspirations of its inhabitants, having, however, connection with general Arab unity. And we desire to appeal to Great Britain, the friend of Palestine, as stated in Article 5 (of the Resolutions), provided that the British Government would defend Palestine from the Zionist immigration and would not interfere with its independence in any way."<sup>17</sup> These two Jerusalemites also wrote a strongly worded letter to the Military Governor of Jerusalem in which they totally renounced the Congress and its resolutions. In their opinion many of the delegates had been chosen in a way contrary to the requirements of the MCA statutes, and protests against many of them had arrived from their cities. They requested that the resolutions of the Congress be not accepted and that their draft be returned to the President of the Association, 'Ārif Pāshā al-Dajāni.<sup>18</sup>

As a result of these dissenters, the four delegates of the Jerusalem MCA, besides the delegates from Haifa and Gaza, were in the

camp which opposed the resolutions of the Congress. It seemed that the unity line was about to collapse because of the opposition to it from Jerusalem, the heart of the movement. But the majority of the Congress immediately counter-attacked. In a public meeting in Jerusalem on 8th February 1919 to collect money for the Paris delegation, Maḥmūd 'Azīz al-Khālīdī<sup>19</sup> spoke up against the faint-hearted old men who refused to back the resolutions. Organizational steps were also taken: Sheikh Rāghib Sa'ūd al-Dajāni of Jaffa was chosen as substitute President, and the Military Governor of Jerusalem was informed that from then on it was prohibited for any city, association or individual to address the "General Palestinian Association" (according to the statutes, this was the country-wide framework on the MCA). It was also decided to entrust the Congress's documents to the delegates from Nāblus and to authorize them to convene within three months the next congress in their city.<sup>20</sup>

In this manner the Congress ended in a division between the supporters and the opponents of unity; however, the threat that Jerusalem might lose its primacy had an immediate effect, and the unity line soon achieved dominance. This threat was effective because it was directed towards shaping opposition to the uniate approach. It is hardly coincidental that it was the heads of two important families of Jerusalem, 'Arif Pāshā al-Dajāni and Ismā'il al-Ḥusayni, who led the movement for "Palestine for the Palestinians," just as it was no coincidence that they were supported by the class of notables and community elders, in contrast to the opposition of the youth. The establishment of a separate government for Palestine would turn the notables of Jerusalem and the heads of the influential families into office-holders, ministers, and future heads of state. On the other hand, the youthful partisans of unity could only gain from unity with Damascus. Around Fayṣal converged their contemporaries and ideological comrades from Syria and Iraq, who had become the decisive element in his regime, pre-empting the veteran Damascene élite. It is obvious why it was this group that supported this stand.

Thus when the supporters of unity succeeded in tipping the scales in their favour and presented the Jerusalem élite with the possibility that the leadership might be taken from their hands and their city, a reappraisal was not long in coming. A mere two days after the announcement of the transfer of the centre of the movement to Nāblus, the Jerusalem MCA convened a general meeting which was actually an assembly of the notables of the city and surrounding villages, and resolved: "Owing to the fact that the Big Powers by the Anglo-French Declaration bestowed upon the liberated peoples

the right of establishing governments, which shall derive their authority from the free choice of the indigenous population, we, therefore, on behalf of the public in general, beg that a constitutional and internally independent government be, by the free choice of the indigenous population, established in Palestine. This government will enact its all necessary laws, according to the wishes of its inhabitants, *and be politically associated with the completely independent Arab Syria . . .*<sup>21</sup> This meant almost total acceptance of the unification position. It was the partial internal unity which was thus attained which gave this Congress significance, in that it was the first sign of the way the political pendulum was to swing back and forth for many years between Palestinian separatism and full or partial Arab unity.

The British Administration, whose hopes of the Congress had been disappointed, forbade the departure of the delegation which had been chosen to go to Paris and prevented the publication of leaflets announcing the resolutions to the populace.<sup>22</sup>

The victory of the idea of unity was rapid. Until November 1918 the Palestinian political community had been content with a certain measure of self-rule in Palestine under British patronage, but the powerful effect of the Anglo-French Declaration of 7th November 1918 brought about swift changes. There was no reason to expect that so swift a triumph of the idea of unity would be accompanied by the growth of Pan-Arab or Pan-Syrian national ideology of unity. If, nonetheless, arguments in favour of unity that were not a product of some practical political need were heard during 1919 and 1920, these merely stressed the natural, economic, linguistic and religious ties which united "Greater Syria" into a single unit.<sup>23</sup> Another argument was drawn from the political realities of Europe in the wake of the First World War. How was it possible, demanded the Palestinians, to separate us from Syria, when the Allies were busy uniting divided peoples in Europe: the Austrian Slavs with the Serbian, the Austrian Rumanians with Rumania, the Tyrol with Italy. If a process of unification was being executed there, all the more reason for it to be carried out in our country.<sup>24</sup>

#### THE IDEA OF ALL-SYRIA UNITY IN POLITICS

The first public expression of the movement for unity came, apparently, in the wake of the refusal of the British Military Administration to let the Palestinian delegation leave for the Peace Conference in Paris. The Jerusalem Muslim-Christian Association decided on 11th March 1919 to send Fayṣal a copy of its decision

of 10th February 1919 "to authorize Your Excellency to represent Palestine and defend it at the Peace Conference, within the limits of the previous resolutions and the one mentioned above".<sup>1</sup> Aside from the contents of this document, which are instructive in themselves, it must be noted that the authorization of Fayṣal to represent the Palestinians was sent by the Jerusalem MCA, on the basis of a resolution favouring political unity, but insisting that Palestine must enjoy complete internal autonomy within the framework of that unity. In all probability this shows that the Jerusalem MCA had regained country-wide leadership of the national movement and its viewpoint had again become dominant. Apparently, the more extremist groups understood that without the Jerusalem leadership their appearance as the representatives of Palestine would carry no weight.

This authorization, important though it was, was not the primary element in the forging of the political link between Palestine and Syria. For one thing, Fayṣal never actually used it. At Versailles he refrained from claiming that Palestine was included in Syria and even appeared to be in favour of the Jewish National Home, although in this he was not consistent.

More important were two other phenomena: one that has already been described i.e. the close tie between the Pan-Syrian supporters in Palestine and their comrades in Damascus, primarily through *al-Nādi al-'Arabi* and its active members; the other was the activity of a newly formed Palestine group, with extremist views, active in Damascus during Fayṣal's regime.

This group was concentrated there early in 1919. Some of its members were in Damascus even before its capture (Rafiq al-Tamīmi of Nāblus and 'Awni 'Abd al-Hādi from the Jenin area); others left Palestine voluntarily for Syria in early 1919, e.g. Mu'in al-Mādi (from Ijzim near Haifa), Salīm 'Abd al-Raḥmān al-Hājj Ibrāhīm (of Ṭul-Karm), and 'Izzat Darwaza (of Nāblus). Sheikh 'Abd al-Qādir al-Muẓaffar (al-Muzghar) was exiled there for extremist agitation, and there were some who went there for personal advancement.<sup>2</sup> Just as Nāblus had been considered as an alternative to Jerusalem for the centre of the movement when the Jerusalem MCA had opposed the unity resolutions, so Nāblus was prominent here in that a large number of its sons were active in the Palestinian group working in Damascus and in the ranks of the volunteers to Fayṣal's army during the conquest of Palestine in 1918.<sup>3</sup>

The importance of Nāblus as the centre of the Pan-Arab movement in Palestine has a wider significance for the study of the development of Arab nationalism in general. Nāblus lagged behind

the coastal cities and Jerusalem (the capital) in modernization. The patterns of traditional Muslim society were preserved there much more strongly than in other places. Its Christian community was already languishing in the nineteenth century, and at the end of the second decade of the twentieth century there were no more than several hundred Greek-Orthodox there. Despite, and perhaps because of this, it was in Nāblus that the spirit of national Arab unity was stronger than in other parts of Palestine. This constitutes strong confirmation of the importance of Islam in the awakening of the Pan-Arab national spirit and contradicts accepted theories concerning the importance of the Christians in the Arab awakening in general and in Palestine in particular.<sup>4</sup>

The first organization of the Palestinians in Damascus was *al-Nahḍah al-Filasṭīniyyah*, whose President was Salīm Bey al-Ṭayyibi, a lieutenant-colonel in Fayṣal's army.<sup>5</sup> However, in the course of 1919, when the Palestinians became concentrated in Damascus and were there playing a central role, *al-Nādi al-'Arabi* became their primary organization. The importance of Palestinian activity in Damascus lay in the fact that there *al-Nādi al-'Arabi* became (see section B of this chapter, pp. 74-9) the most important political body with respect to its organization and political activity.<sup>6</sup> *Al-Nādi's* policy, as reflected in the sources, was to gain the complete unity of Syria and Palestine and independence of the united country, without any foreign protection.<sup>7</sup> This body played a decisive role in bringing about the failure of the agreement Fayṣal made with the French in late 1919 and was the moving spirit behind the extremist policy which made the military contest with the French inevitable.

The influence which this group had in Damascus was a product not only of its political organization in *al-Nādi al-'Arabi* but also of the fact that several dozen Palestinians served in Fayṣal's army and administration, and several of these reached high positions. Sa'īd al-Ḥusayni served a short time (March-April 1920) as Foreign Minister in the government of 'Alī Riḍā al-Rikābi, which was set up at the time of the announcement of the independent monarchy; 'Awni 'Abd al-Hādi was a member of the Hejaz Delegation (which actually represented Fayṣal's Syria at the Peace Conference) and afterwards served as Fayṣal's private secretary; Amīn al-Tamīmī served as advisor to Emir Zayd, Fayṣal's brother, and Head of the "Directors' Council" that was set up in January 1920; Aḥmad Ḥilmi Pasha 'Abd al-Bāqi was Director of the Treasury in this "Directors' Council"; Mu'īn al-Māḍī was Head of Intelligence and later Governor of the Karak district in Transjordan; 'Abd al-Qādir al-Muẓaffar was sent on an official diplomatic mission to Turkey;

Muḥammad 'Alī al-Tamīmī was the Chief of the Damascus Police; 'Abd al-Laṭīf Ṣalāḥ also served (with 'Izzat Darwaza) as Secretary of the Syrian Congress; Rafīq al-Tamīmī and 'Izzat Darwaza alternated as General Secretary of the *al-Fatāh* association; 'Izzat Darwaza, Zaki al-Tamīmī and Salīm 'Abd al-Raḥmān were members of the leadership of the *al-Istiqlāl* party, etc.<sup>8</sup>

On the basis of the unity concept, the Palestinians sent delegates to the First General Syrian Congress, convened in July 1919 in the *al-Nādi al-'Arabi* Club in Damascus.<sup>9</sup> It appears that in the main, notables who came from Palestine were chosen by the various MCA associations.<sup>10</sup> Several of the young Palestinians who were living in Damascus also participated in the Congress, but they disagreed with the resolutions of the Congress, which they considered too moderate; in particular they objected to the willingness of the Congress to accept American protection and demanded unreserved independence.<sup>11</sup> The resolution in favour of American protection was adopted due to British initiative; the British officers knew for certain that the Americans would refuse to accept a mandate in Syria or in other parts of the Middle East (e.g. Armenia or the area of the Bosphorus and the Dardanelles). Therefore they preferred that for the purpose of their diplomatic struggle with the French, the Syrian delegates should demand American protection and would designate British protection merely as a second possibility.<sup>12</sup> It is virtually certain that the young Palestinians understood this as well and therefore opposed the resolution which would mean being under the aegis of a power obligated towards Zionism.

This Palestinian group continued to be active in Damascus until the collapse of Fayṣal's regime. It took part in the Second General Syrian Congress in March 1920 and was an important factor in the creation of a martial spirit before the struggle against the French. After April 1920 there arrived in Damascus two important Palestinian figures from the young Pan-Arab circle: al-Ḥājj Amin al-Ḥusayni and 'Ārif al-'Ārif. Both had escaped from Jerusalem after being accused of being responsible for the April 1920 disturbances. With the participation of these two men there was set up at the end of May 1920 a general organization for the Palestinians in Damascus under the name *al-Jam'iyyah al-'Arabiyyah al-Filasṭīniyyah* which was active in disseminating anti-Zionist propaganda and defending the Arab interest in Palestine.<sup>13</sup>

With the collapse of Fayṣal's regime, the Palestinian group fled Damascus and one by one returned to Palestine, after death sentences had been passed on some of them by the French authorities.<sup>14</sup>

We have already mentioned Fayṣal's tolerant attitude towards

Zionism, which was in complete contrast to the position of the Arab community and its spokesmen. The question which arises is how did this community—which saw Fayṣal's regime as its own aspiration and Fayṣal as its representative—react to his unusual stand on this crucial question?

It seems that the community was not exactly aware of what was going on. It is true that from time to time there appeared news in the world press about the agreement between Fayṣal and Weizmann and about the former's letter to Frankfurter, but whenever the Palestinians addressed questions to Fayṣal on this matter he would vigorously deny that he had ever given his consent to Zionist immigration to Palestine.<sup>15</sup> So long as his regime existed, the promise it held for Palestinians struggling against Zionism was greater than any possible bitterness over this matter; they therefore kept silent. Nevertheless, a British officer was able to state in August 1919: "In my opinion, Dr. Weizmann's agreement with Emir Feisal is not worth the paper it is written on or the energy wasted in the conversation to make it. On the other hand, if it becomes sufficiently known among the Arabs [speaking of the Palestinians], it will be somewhat in the nature of a noose about Feisal's neck, for he will be regarded by the Arab population as a traitor." Also Herbert Samuel thought that "Faisal . . . has never set foot in Palestine".<sup>16</sup>

It seems that in spring of 1920 this matter became better known in the community. At that time a Palestinian delegation asked for an explanation from Fayṣal of this agreement (see note 15 above), and at that time also 'Izzat Darwaza appeared at the Syrian Congress and spoke in fairly strongly-worded terms: "Up until now we have been silent, but in the future we will be unable to be silent and will not agree to Palestine's being sacrificed on the altar of independence . . . The Government must deny the reports which have spread of this matter and deliver specific instructions to its emissaries to reject all the rumours connected with the Zionist question . . . The Palestinians have been silent until now because of the honour of the Syrian state; but wretched Palestine has been devastated."<sup>17</sup>

And in fact, when Fayṣal's regime collapsed the Palestinians no longer hesitated to express their bitterness over this matter.<sup>18</sup> Nevertheless, Fayṣal's image in general Arab and Palestinian historiography has remained free from any Zionist stain and he is seen as completely blameless in his actions for the Arab nationalist cause.<sup>19</sup>

In Palestine itself, news of the expected arrival of an international (ultimately American) Commission of Inquiry was an important factor in advancing and organizing the national movement. The first

reports arrived in early April 1919 and caused a wave of meetings and consultations with the purpose of presenting a united front before the Commission.<sup>20</sup>

The MCA distributed leaflets in the country, sent emissaries and tried to get the population to sign petitions which would be presented to the Commission. These petitions demanded: 1) Absolute independence for Syria within the boundaries of the Euphrates and the Taurus in the north and east and the Mediterranean and the Red Sea in the west and south; 2) Palestine was to be included in this arrangement, but would preserve its independence in internal affairs; its rulers would be chosen from the local inhabitants and it would have an independent legislature; 3) Absolute opposition to the National Home and to Zionist immigration, though with recognition of the local Jews as inhabitants of the country possessing equality in everything.<sup>21</sup> This programme was based on the MCA's position, which crystallized following the adoption of the resolution favouring complete unity at the First Palestinian Congress. It preserved the principle of Palestinian autonomy and probably did not satisfy the Pan-Arab associations.

Members of *al-Muntadā al-Adabi* carried on a propaganda campaign in favour of unity and absolute independence without foreign protection, and were assisted in this by Sheikh 'Abd al-Qādir al-Muẓaffar, the President of the Damascus *al-Nādi al-'Arabi*, who arrived from Damascus for this purpose.<sup>22</sup> They also worked together with members of *al-Nādi al-'Arabi* to elect an extremist leadership, composed of their members, for the MCA branch in Jaffa, and to forestall the possibility of a pro-British appearance on the part of the traditional élite of Jaffa.<sup>23</sup> This élite, composed of the rich men of the city who dealt in growing and marketing citrus, had adopted a pro-British stance, and one may assume that this position was based on their interest in safeguarding the citrus fruit trade with Britain.

However, various factors worked against the creation of a front united behind these demands. First of all Fayṣal himself was convinced that there was no sense in continuing with this extremist programme and that it was preferable to demand British protection.<sup>24</sup> The extremists in Damascus, concentrated in *al-Nādi al-'Arabi*, opposed such a compromise, and a struggle therefore broke out between Fayṣal and his followers on the one hand and the members of *al-Nādi* on the other—a struggle which was also expressed by the bitterness of the extremists over the resolutions of the First General Syrian Congress.<sup>25</sup> In addition, there was in the midst of the traditional Muslim élite of Damascus a strong pro-French party which preferred French protection to any other and

even to independence.<sup>26</sup> It is very likely that through their ties with Damascus those active in Palestine knew of these differences of opinion, and that their positions were influenced by them.

The British Administration worked towards the creation of a public opinion which would demand British protection over Palestine, and thus also contributed to hindering the appearance of a united front. It regarded with concern the growing demand for unity with Syria and prohibited the distribution of the MCA leaflets containing the draft of the demand. The authorities also tried to influence the heads of the community to demand foreign protection—inasmuch as the demand for independence without such protection was opposed to what had been determined at the Peace Conference and thus had no chance of being accepted. They were also determined that anyone resorting to extremist agitation would be arrested and prevented from influencing the population.<sup>27</sup> The working of the American Commission of Inquiry (the King-Crane Commission), as described in Howard's book, proves that the British authorities did their job well. In many instances they were present during the hearing of evidence; they were the organizers of meetings with representatives of the population; and they took care to create an anti-French and pro-British mood.<sup>28</sup> The Jaffa Governor even intervened in an internal struggle within the Jaffa MCA between the pro-British majority and the President of the Association, Sheikh Rāghib Abū Sa'ūd al-Dajāni, who was a Pan-Arabist and a member of *al-Muntadā al-Adabi*. As a result of his intervention the President was retired and the pro-British elements took over the Association's council.<sup>29</sup>

The French spread propaganda for unity with Syria under their aegis, with Britain's obligation towards Zionism serving as one of their main weapons against the idea of British protection. The effect of their propaganda was apparently considerable, since with respect to the idea of unity their aim coincided with that of the Pan-Syrians. The Chief Administrator General Money could say: "I assert without hesitation that in the present political mood, if the Zionist programme is a necessary adjunct to a British Mandate, the people of Palestine will have none of it; but will, if their wishes are consulted, select in preference the United States or France as the Mandatory Power, or as the Protecting Power of an Arab Administration."<sup>30</sup> It is likely that General Money exaggerated the effect of French propaganda in order to motivate his government to renounce the Zionist programme, as he suggested in his letter, but there is no doubt that the combination of circumstances we have pointed out greatly enhanced the attraction of the French propaganda.

This struggle of interests was expressed in the positions which

were finally adopted and in the appearance of the Palestinians before the King-Crane Commission. From the few sources we have on this matter it appears that there was general agreement on one point—the absolute rejection of Zionism. Many insisted that Palestine be united with Syria, though the representatives of the Greek-Orthodox community opposed this.<sup>31</sup> On the other hand, only a small minority maintained that united Syria be given full independence without any foreign protection. Only the Jaffa branch of *al-Muntadā al-Adabi* insisted on this.<sup>32</sup> However, those who supported independence under any conditions were split in their opinions as to which foreign protection was desirable. The Commission reached the conclusion that most of the Muslims tended to prefer an American mandate and certainly rejected a French one; the Catholics wanted a French mandate while the Greek-Orthodox wanted a British mandate.<sup>33</sup> The Jaffa MCA, Muslims and Christians, requested British protection, but among the Muslims of Jaffa there were some who preferred a French mandate over all of united Syria to its division between England and France.<sup>34</sup>

It appears that in the final analysis two factors succeeded in giving shape to the demands of the popular representatives: the Pan-Syrians, in that the idea of unity with Syria became a popular notion; and the British Administration, which reduced to a minimum the demands for a French mandate. Aside from the Catholics, few demanded such a mandate; the majority of the Greek-Orthodox community and the Jaffa MCA<sup>35</sup> demanded a British mandate, and also the demand of most Muslims for an American mandate in the end constituted a British victory, for the reason mentioned above.

It seems that had the British Administration not been active, the voices favouring French protection would have been much more numerous by virtue of the fact that the French agents had been carrying on a vigorous propaganda campaign for Syrian unity and against Zionism. In any case the fact remains that notwithstanding the obstruction which the Pan-Arabists suffered, most of the *political* population united behind the idea of unity with Syria.

This is not to say that the entire population supported this demand. It has been shown that the strength of the Pan-Syrians within this triangular struggle of forces (Pan-Arabists, British and French) was significant, which undoubtedly reflected the attraction of the idea of unity with a semi-independent Arab power in Damascus, able to free the country from the danger of Zionism.

## THE SUPPORTERS OF UNITY AT THE PEAK OF THEIR POWER

The intensive activity of the nationalist associations abated considerably at the end of the visit of the King-Crane Commission. Probably attention was diverted to the continuation of the Commission's activity in Syria, after which everyone expected its conclusions to be published immediately—which of course was not the case. However, this period of calm was short-lived. In September 1919 the activities of the Pan-Arab associations in Palestine resumed, along with the growing strength of these elements, who were members of the *al-Nādi al-'Arabi*, in Damascus.

It seems that the testimony given before the King-Crane Commission left a bitter impression on the Pan-Arabists and may well have had a great influence upon the further development of the nationalist movement during the period of the Military Administration.

We have seen that the members of the Jaffa MCA pleaded before the Commission for British protection. It is also known that the Christians in the Jerusalem MCA were agreeable to foreign protection, and the weight which the Christians carried in the Jerusalem MCA was considerable. It is almost certain that this was also the position of the Muslim heads of the MCA, who did not completely accept the demand for unity and continued to be supporters of Palestinian autonomy. It is reasonable to assume that the radical Pan-Arabist circles were not happy with the situation in which the Muslim spokesmen agreed in their testimony to foreign protection, for the most part American.

It is no accident, then, that the resurgence of nationalist activity beginning in September 1919 was directed by *al-Nādi al-'Arabi*, *al-Muntadā al-Adabi* and the Nāblus MCA (which was more or less similar in its composition to *al-Nādi al-'Arabi* there), without the two central Muslim-Christian Associations of Jerusalem and Jaffa taking part in it. This split was reflected first of all in the presentation of separate petitions of protest against Zionism, despite the fact that *both* the MCA and the Pan-Arabists continued to oppose it in its various manifestations. This was conspicuous in Jerusalem, when protests were presented by *al-Muntadā al-Adabi* on the one hand and by the MCA on the other.<sup>1</sup> What is more, while the protests of *al-Nādi al-'Arabi* and *al-Muntadā*, the Nāblus MCA and the Muslim Association of Haifa continued to demand the unification of "Southern Syria" with the other parts of Syria,<sup>2</sup> the petitioners from the Jaffa MCA protested against Zionism but also admitted that their interests were identical with those of Britain

and that they aspired to a British protectorate. They explained this by stating that their exports (citrus) were designated for Britain and for Egypt, which was under British rule.<sup>3</sup> The Jerusalem MCA did not immediately go so far. For a short time after the visit of the King-Crane Commission it continued to profess unity of Palestine and Syria, but explicitly expressed its agreement to a mandate over all of united Syria so long as the mandate would adopt an anti-Zionist policy. On a second occasion they were content merely to express their opposition to Zionism.<sup>4</sup>

A public expression of this split occurred on 27th November 1919, when a country-wide meeting of the nationalist associations was convened in Haifa. This was the first attempt to unite *all* the associations in a nation-wide network; but the participants, it turned out, were *al-Muntadā al-Adabi* from Jerusalem and Jaffa, *al-Nādi al-'Arabi* from Jerusalem, Nāblus and Ṭul-Karm, the Tiberias MCA, the Muslim Association of Haifa and representatives of a local association from Nazareth.<sup>5</sup> The two main associations of the MCA, Jerusalem and Jaffa, took no part in the meeting. The meeting ended in the establishment of the "Supreme Committee of the Palestinian Associations" (*Al-Lajnah al-'Ulyā lil-Jam'iyyāt al-Filasṭiniyyah*) and in the presentation of a protest note from this body to the authorities. The document was distinguished by its Pan-Syrian and anti-Zionist spirit of unity and in its demand for the complete independence of united Syria without foreign protection.<sup>6</sup>

This body quickly became the co-ordinating framework of the Pan-Syrian unity associations. Its strength was concentrated in three cities: Jerusalem, Nāblus and Haifa. The *Lajnah* maintained regular contact with the Palestinian party in Damascus, collected money in Palestine for financing nationalist activity and in late 1919 even tried to enlist young Palestinians in Fayṣal's army,<sup>7</sup> although this campaign failed owing to the opposition of the British authorities.<sup>8</sup>

This organization marked the first stage in the attempt on the part of the unity movement to attain its goals by forceful and even violent methods. It is not by chance that one of the protests presented in December 1919 ended with the warning that the petitioners were not responsible for what would happen if they were called upon to defend Syria's unity and resist the division necessary for the establishment of the Jewish National Home.<sup>9</sup> It should be noted that in this period, according even to Zionist sources, Arab enmity towards Zionism was exacerbated and at the same time there was a wave of political activity. It is interesting to note that, contrary to the belief common in the Zionist camp, the Zionist Commission

was of the opinion that the source of this intensified anti-Zionist activity was "that the Arabs begin to understand that the British Government are resolute in their determination to implement the policy of the [Balfour] Declaration".<sup>10</sup>

Developments in Damascus also contributed in an important way to the wave of extreme nationalism in Palestine. During December 1919 Fayṣal carried on negotiations with Clemenceau towards agreement over French recognition of Fayṣal's rule in Syria, under French protection, and it seems that the distance between their positions was not great.<sup>11</sup> The extremists in Damascus, in the centre of which stood members of *al-Fatāh* and *al-Nādi al-'Arabi*, opposed any compromise settlement with the French, and due to their pressure the agreement was not ratified by the Syrians.<sup>12</sup>

In order to present the Allies with a *fait accompli*, the Syrian Congress convened in March 1920 and decided upon the crowning of Fayṣal as King of United Syria. This coronation naturally aroused a wave of national fervour throughout Palestine. The British military authorities were alarmed at the agreement between Fayṣal and Clemenceau. They feared there was a plot on the part of Fayṣal and the French and saw in the coronation a product of this plot.<sup>13</sup> They searched for a way to forestall such a possibility, "and the Chief Administrator and his assistants began to consider whether it was desirable to enlarge the area of British recognition of Fayṣal as the ruler of an Arab state, so that it would include the English provinces of Mesopotamia and Palestine". Major-General Bols, the Chief Administrator of OETA(S), Lord Allenby, the Commander-in-Chief of the Egyptian Expeditionary Force, and Lord Milner, who arrived in Egypt at this time at the head of a British Commission of Inquiry to explore the causes of the 1919 uprising, were in favour of this idea and recommended to Curzon that he issue a declaration sympathetic to Arab aspirations in Palestine and Iraq; Curzon was opposed to this.<sup>14</sup>

Notwithstanding Curzon's opposition, throughout March 1920 Major-General Bols and Lord Allenby pressed for the issuing of such a declaration, but to no effect. The moving spirit behind this political manoeuvre was Colonel Waters-Taylor, Major-General Bols' Chief of Staff. The British source does not clarify whether or not practical conclusions were drawn from this aim and whether the Palestinians knew about it. In any case, the fact that it was seen fit to be mentioned in the context of determining the causes of the 1920 disturbances in Jerusalem demands explanation. The authors of the Palin Report were also prepared to assume that the storm of excitement which took hold of the Palestinians in February-April 1920, both before and after Fayṣal's coronation, was probably

on such a scale because some of them knew that the British military authorities in Palestine were ready to recognize Fayṣal's rule over Palestine.<sup>15</sup> According to a Zionist Intelligence source, the Palestinians did indeed know of this, since in late March 1920 al-Ḥājj Amin al-Ḥusayni returned from Damascus and reported to a meeting of the heads of the associations in Jerusalem that "Britain is not opposed to turning the country over to the *Sharif*".<sup>16</sup>

Fayṣal's coronation in Damascus and the suspicion of the heads of the British Army in Palestine that the French were behind this step were thus the background to the wave of protests and demonstrations which hit the cities of Palestine in the months from February to April 1920, and to the constantly recurring reports of preparations for a general rebellion in the country, a rebellion which was intended to achieve unity with Syria.

The first occasion on which discontent was expressed publicly came on 27th February 1920 after Major-General Bols was compelled to issue an official proclamation to the effect that the British Government intended to execute the Balfour Declaration.<sup>17</sup> The reaction took the form of protest demonstrations (in Jerusalem about 1,500 participated; in Jaffa, around 2,000; and in Haifa, 250); the closing-down of shops, and presentations of protests to the authorities, which encompassed to a greater or lesser degree Jerusalem, Jaffa, Haifa, Ramleh, and the villages near these urban centres. The demonstrations had a conspicuously anti-Zionist and anti-Jewish character. *Al-Nādi al-'Arabi* and *al-Muntadā al-Adabi* were instrumental in organizing them, although the heads of the MCA appeared before the British authorities as the representatives of the community and deliverers of its petitions. It seems that this wave of fervour also affected the MCA, and this organization joined the action in a spirit of unity which it had been lacking for half a year. A notable phenomenon was the friendly attitude of the staff of the French Commissariat (Consulate) in Jerusalem towards the demonstrators. The French Consul welcomed them with a warm and friendly speech, and according to a Jewish source, the Secretary of the French Consulate even helped organize the demonstrations; it is certainly clear that French propaganda in favour of Syrian unity was a contributory factor. It should be noted that the demonstrations were quiet and orderly and without incident.<sup>18</sup>

The organization of these demonstrations revealed the degree to which the nationalist associations in Palestine had advanced. For the first time they showed an ability to organize a co-ordinated action on a nation-wide scale in which all the associations took part. The almost identical language of the protest notes strengthens this impression. This occurrence of nation-wide demonstrations was re-

peated on 8th March, this time with a more violent character; they were accompanied by instances of attacks upon Jewish passers-by and store-owners. The demonstrations and protest movement embraced most of the urban centres in the central, northern and southern areas of the country, with the exception of Acre. Again the young associations were prominent among the organizers of the demonstrations, the speakers and petitioners; they were aided by the two heads of *al-Nādi al-'Arabi* in Damascus, Salīm 'Abd al-Raḥmān al-Ḥājj Ibrāhīm and 'Abd al-Qādir al-Muẓaffar. On this occasion they were joined by some of the MCA leaders and the notables, including 'Arif Pāshā al-Dajāni, President of the Jerusalem MCA, members of the municipality and its head Mūsā Kāẓim al-Ḥusayni, Ismā'il al-Ḥusayni, and Ya'qūb Farrāj, the leader of the Greek-Orthodox community in Jerusalem. Fayḍi al-'Alami, the head of the al-'Alami family, and Rāghib al-Nashāshībi—who were past delegates to the Ottoman Parliament, and the latter had been a delegate to the General Syrian Congress in July 1919—took no part in them.

The purpose of the demonstrations was to express popular support for Fayṣal's coronation as King of United Syria, and indeed the demonstrations were characterized by slogans and speeches in favour of Fayṣal's reign, the demand for independence and the rejection of Zionism.<sup>19</sup> The violent anti-Jewish tone (there were calls to kill the Jews along with the popular slogan "Palestine is our land and the Jews are our dogs") greatly worried the Zionist Commission and the Committee of Jerusalem Jews, which demanded that the authorities prevent their recurrence. In particular they came out against a speech by the Mayor of Jerusalem, where Jews were in the majority, given in the presence of the demonstrators who passed by the municipality building, and "the Committee of Jerusalem Jews states that the Jews of Jerusalem no longer consider Mr. Mūsā Kāẓim as their representative".<sup>20</sup> Apparently the authorities were also slightly alarmed at the proportions the demonstrations took on and at their violent character and on 11th March 1920 prohibited their recurrence.<sup>21</sup>

These demonstrations created tension in the country. They occurred immediately prior to the month of April, always a potentially explosive time owing to the proximity of Muslim, Christian and Jewish holidays. It was clear to the British authorities that "there is evident determination on their part [the Arabs] to support their words with actions".<sup>22</sup> Threats to use force to prevent the realization of Zionism were made openly, though this had happened before.<sup>23</sup> Nonetheless, it seems that the authors of the Palin Report were correct in stating that these threats did not

necessarily constitute proof that there existed a plot to initiate violent actions.<sup>24</sup> Still, the fact that acts of violence were committed in Jerusalem during the al-Nebi Mūsā celebrations on 4th April 1920 requires that special attention be given the appraisals and warnings delivered beforehand of the possible outbreak of violence.

Is it then possible to state that these disturbances<sup>25</sup> constituted a direct continuation of the series of demonstrations of February-March and were indeed planned in advance, or was it that the tension created in the months preceding the al-Nebi Mūsā festivities provided a suitable background for the outbreak in a month which was dangerous in itself?<sup>26</sup> The conclusion of the Palin Commission was that "there is, however, no evidence of any definite plan on the part of an organized body of rioters and the whole affair has the appearance of spontaneity". Nonetheless, the authors of the report were of the opinion that "subsequent events, however, do point to the conclusion that the determination had been come to by the firebrands of the political agitators to take advantage of any occasion which might offer to raise a disturbance and that agents provocateurs were present at the pilgrimage with that intention".<sup>27</sup>

The Zionist view was that these disturbances were premeditated. This was how Dr. Eder, Director of the Political Department of the Zionist Commission, presented the matter in his testimony before the Palin Commission, relying mainly on Intelligence reports which were collected by the "Information Office" of the Zionist Commission.<sup>28</sup> The picture gathered from these reports is of a plot launched by members of *al-Nādi al-'Arabi*, *al-Muntadā al-Adabi* and *Jam'iyyat al-Ikhā' wa-al-'Afāf*, with the assistance of French agents.<sup>29</sup>

On the other hand there are other Intelligence reports, also Zionist, which stated explicitly that two of the heads of these associations, Jamil Bey al-Ḥusayni and the Editor of *Sūriya al-Janūbiyyah*, 'Ārif al-'Ārif, were opposed to disturbances. Jamil Bey al-Ḥusayni asked the members of the associations "to preserve order among the pilgrims and to take care that there would be no disturbances and attacks upon Jews,"<sup>30</sup> while 'Ārif al-'Ārif stressed in a meeting with members of *al-Nādi* and *al-Muntadā* before the al-Nebi Mūsā celebrations that "if anything happens, clashes or incitements to violence against the Jews, we will be lost and will have ruined our future by our own actions". In a community meeting at his house he reiterated this position and demanded that action should be taken to prevent conflicts from breaking out and to prevent any mention of Zionism during the procession.<sup>31</sup> These reports agree on one point: the Pan-Arab associations had decided

to do everything possible to turn the al-Nebi· Mūsā celebrations into a demonstration in favour of the government of Emir Fayṣal, who had just been proclaimed King of All Syria.

Another important factor is the amount of assistance rendered by Colonel Waters-Taylor, Chief of Staff of OETA(S), in organizing the disturbances. Colonel Meinertzhagen, Chief Political Officer of the Egyptian Expeditionary Force, accused him unequivocally of advising the Arabs to riot in Jerusalem and deciding to remove the army from Jerusalem during the celebrations in order to facilitate the rioters' work.<sup>32</sup> The Palin Commission concluded that the removal of the army from Jerusalem was a serious mistake<sup>33</sup> but did not state that this mistake was intentional. It should be recalled that Waters-Taylor was the moving spirit behind the idea of Chief Administrator Bols to recognize Fayṣal as at least nominal ruler of Palestine. It is likely that his possible aid in organizing the riots was because he felt that the Palestinians' opposition to Zionism must be given maximum expression; Foreign Secretary Curzon had thus to be brought to agree to Major-General Bols' suggestions, which had been passed on to Curzon by Allenby but rejected by him.

Whatever the precise truth, there is no doubt that the outbreak of 4th-5th April in Jerusalem was a direct result of the fervour which took hold of the Palestinians in the wake of Fayṣal's coronation, and of the possibility that Palestine might also be included in his kingdom. The fact that the heads of the British Military Administration in Palestine supported this contributed, at least indirectly, if not indeed directly, to the outbreak. Of great significance, therefore, is the fact that on the eve of the disturbances, on 1st April 1920, al-Ḥājj Amīn al-Ḥusayni announced to members of the Pan-Arab associations in Jerusalem, after his return from Damascus, that the British Government supported Fayṣal's rule over Palestine.<sup>34</sup> It is likely that it was this news which drove him to incite the crowd of al-Nebi Mūsā celebrants to riot against the Jews,<sup>35</sup> in contrast to the balanced view of his colleagues Jamīl al-Ḥusayni and 'Arif al-'Arif, who repeated their call for preserving quiet before members of the nationalist associations on the very eve of the disturbances.<sup>36</sup>

In contrast to the disturbances of 4th-5th April, which were limited to Jerusalem, sources tell of preparations beginning at the end of 1919 for a general rebellion in Palestine which would have made unification with Syria a *fait accompli*. The preparations were characterized by the stock-piling of weapons, organizing groups of *Fidā'iyyūn* and recruiting the tribes of the Negev and Transjordan for this mission.<sup>37</sup>

It appears that talk of the preparations was more serious than

the preparations themselves and was reflected in exaggerated Intelligence reports. Nevertheless, a military attempt was indeed made—a British military unit was attacked in Zemach on 24th April 1920 by over 2,000 armed Bedouins from the Hauran and the Beisan valley. According to all sources, Arab, Zionist and British alike, the attack was organized by the nationalists in Damascus, while 'Izzat Darwaza even states that "it was organized by several of the Palestinians who were then living in Damascus".<sup>38</sup> It seems that the attack was to have been the signal for a general revolt in Palestine;<sup>39</sup> with its failure the idea of revolt also died.

#### THE DECLINE OF THE IDEA OF "SOUTHERN SYRIA"

The month of April 1920 was the turning-point. Organized, mounting activity guided by a far-reaching vision of Palestine's unity with Syria was replaced by political resignation, acceptance of the reality of the country's separation from Syria, and disintegration of the existing frameworks.

A series of events brought this about: the arrest of some of the active members of the nationalist associations and the flight of two of their main leaders—al-Ḥājj Amīn al-Ḥusayni and 'Ārif al-'Ārif—to Transjordan and from there to Syria; the failure of the attack on Zemach and the end of the dream of a general rebellion which would lead to the unification of Palestine with Syria; confirmation of the British Mandate over Palestine at the Sarr Remo Conference on 24th April 1920 and Major-General Bols' official announcement of this in Palestine four days later; the organization of a civilian regime in Palestine beginning on 1st July 1920 as an expression of the country's new status; and the climax—the collapse of Fayṣal's rule in Damascus on 20th July 1920.

These developments led to a sense of crisis among the nationalist groups which was expressed in several ways: the outbreak of internal conflicts, both political and familial; a break in national tension; and disillusionment with Fayṣal's government and afterwards even with the idea of unity.

If in the fervour of February–April 1920 a feeling of unity among the majority of political groups had been created, with the appearance of signs of failure, internal struggles broke out, signs of which already appeared in March 1920.

The first conspicuous phenomenon was the outbreak of a violent internal conflict within *al-Muntadā al-Adabi* between the organization's leadership of the al-Nashāshībi family and a group of members who were close to the *al-Nādi al-'Arabi* group (some were even

members of the latter along with their membership of *al-Muntadā*).<sup>1</sup> *Al-Nādi al-'Arabi* aimed at taking over *al-Muntadā* and instructed its members to join *al-Muntadā* in order to effect the take-over from within. The result was that this organization was paralysed; a breach formed between its leadership and many of its members who supported *al-Nādi* and its Ḥusayni leadership. This conflict was closely tied to the beginning of the great conflict between the Ḥusayni and Nashāshībi families which marked Palestinian-Arab politics throughout the British Mandate in Palestine.

Because of the welcoming speech which Mūsā Kāẓim al-Ḥusayni had delivered before the crowd of al-Nebi Mūsā celebrants a short while before the rioting began, Ronald Storrs, the Governor of the Jerusalem district, decided to remove him from the mayoralty and to appoint in his place Rāghīb Bey al-Nashāshībi.<sup>2</sup> Mūsā Kāẓim al-Ḥusayni was certain that no-one among the Arabs would dare to succeed him in this post, but Storrs took care to get Rāghīb al-Nashāshībi's written consent in advance, and thus could present Mūsā Kāẓim al-Ḥusayni's smugness as arrogant conceit.<sup>3</sup> Undoubtedly, his dismissal and the way it was carried out left a bitter impression upon him, his family and his supporters, although Mūsā Kāẓim al-Ḥusayni knew that his tenure as Mayor was conditional upon his not being active in politics.<sup>4</sup>

The weakening of *al-Muntadā al-Adabi* from within was apparently accelerated by the clear split between the French factor and the Arab nationalists. If until then it had been possible to smooth over the conflict of interests between these two factors by joint propaganda for a united Syria, by the spring of 1920 it was no longer possible to prevent its becoming overt. The fact that the al-Nashāshībi heads of *al-Muntadā* had connections, at least during a part of this period, with French agents enhanced the repugnance felt by the nationalist community.

This family conflict also became a political conflict. Until this time the members of *al-Nādi al-'Arabi* had been careful in their relations with the British regime and at a certain stage (March 1920) had won support from its leaders; now they became the extremist factor working against it. It is reasonable to assume that the dismissal of Mūsā Kāẓim al-Ḥusayni removed a powerful brake, since until then he had moderated their stance towards the authorities.

Members of the al-Nashāshībi family, on the other hand, adopted the opposite line; instead of being opponents of British Rule they became its allies. Rāghīb al-Nashāshībi was appointed Mayor since he had taken no part in the demonstrations,<sup>5</sup> while Kakhri al-Nashāshībi, the Secretary of *al-Muntadā al-Adabi*, who until then

had been conspicuous by his extreme anti-British position, was appointed aide to Ronald Storrs.<sup>6</sup> It is likely that the open split between Arab nationalism and France influenced this group to seek support from Britain.<sup>7</sup>

This split occurred simultaneously with the outbreak of a serious controversy following the great disappointment of the month of April. The discussion revolved, practically speaking, around the question of whether to continue with the preparations for a pro-Fayṣal revolt or at least carry on forceful political resistance, or to be resigned; however tacitly, to British rule. The *al-Nādi al-'Arabi* party adopted the extremist position and were assisted by emissaries from Fayṣal's regime; opposing them was the traditional leadership of the MCA, which was now supported by the al-Nashāshibi family, the community notables, the merchants and most of the Greek-Orthodox community.<sup>8</sup> Thus an alliance was formed between Rāghib al-Nashāshibi and 'Arif Pasha al-Dajāni, the President of the Jerusalem MCA—an alliance which was destined to manifest itself again in the future.

The news of the decision of the main Allied Powers at the San Remo Conference to turn Palestine over to British mandatory rule and to include the Balfour Declaration in the peace treaty with Turkey, and the official publication of the decision in Palestine,<sup>9</sup> struck a heavy blow to the young national movement. A call began for the organization of a Palestinian congress of all the MCA branches for the purpose of discussing the new situation.<sup>10</sup> Although on the surface it was the Jerusalem MCA which appeared to be the organizer of the congress and which requested permission from the Government to hold it,<sup>11</sup> it was actually the representatives of the radical associations and the Muslim Association of Haifa who decided the convention would be held and who started organizing it. It is not surprising, then that they intended to hold the congress in Nāblus, "where there are no Europeans".<sup>12</sup>

It is fairly certain that the British Administration was apprehensive about the holding of such a congress so soon after the disturbances of April; it had been very disappointed with the resolutions of the First Congress, and therefore withheld its consent.<sup>13</sup> In any case it appears that the very idea of holding a separate Palestinian congress while the General Syrian Congress was still in existence and was still active in Damascus, bears witness to the beginning of disillusionment with Damascus and a desire to work independently.

The disillusionment grew in the following months. It seems that the Palestinians were gripped by the fear that their affairs were not being suitably represented at the Versailles Peace Conference

and felt a need to send a separate Palestinian delegation there. The initiator of this idea was Najib Naṣṣār, Editor of *al-Karmil*, along with several of his friends.<sup>14</sup> Here was another case of renouncing the idea of unity or at least support for Fayṣal's regime. It is likely that it was at this moment that reports of Fayṣal's tolerant attitude towards Zionism began to be circulated, since we have seen that during this month a Palestinian delegation addressed an appeal to him for clarification of his stand on Zionism, and at the same time 'Izzat Darwaza delivered his critical speech on the subject at the Syrian Congress. In fact, some opposed this delegation because they saw in it an expression of the rejection of Pan-Syrian unity.<sup>15</sup> In the end the delegation did not go, owing to the failure of its organizers to collect the money necessary to finance the trip, as well as mutual distrust among the various nationalist groups, and also apparently governmental opposition.<sup>16</sup>

The mounting tension in Syria between Fayṣal's regime and the French also heightened the controversy in Palestine among faithful supporters of unity and the MCA, and among Christians and Muslims. The effendis, members of the MCA, were accused of having sold out to the British, the French and the Jews, while supporters of Damascus announced that they would no longer maintain contact with the MCA but only with Damascus. Nevertheless, they did not succeed in recruiting many volunteers for Fayṣal's army, although they did succeed in collecting donations for this purpose; even the few volunteers there were, were forbidden by the authorities to cross over into Syria.<sup>17</sup>

#### PALESTINE AS THE OBJECT OF STRUGGLE

The collapse of Fayṣal's regime in Damascus brought to a close the first stage of national organization among the Arabs of Palestine—the stage of "Southern Syria". The orientation towards Damascus was based less on the growth of nationalism around this area than upon a given political situation. When this situation changed, the foundations of the Pan-Syrian movement collapsed.

The first reaction of the nationalists was one of bewilderment and astonishment, followed by a halt in their activity. The great vision had come to nothing and the disappointment was as great as the hope had been.<sup>1</sup> The nucleus of the Pan-Syrian Arab state had collapsed, the guiding force which had supplied money and arms and had been capable of rendering diplomatic backing had disappeared. The various personalities who had surrounded Fayṣal dispersed in all directions. Only a few, mainly the moderates,

remained in Damascus, while the majority, members of *al-Nādi al-'Arabi*, *al-Fatāh* and the *al-Istiqlāl* party, returned to their places of origin; the Iraqis to Iraq, the Palestinians to Palestine, but the Syrians to exile in Egypt. The Syrian exiles in Egypt tried to continue the struggle and established various organizations that were active in Cairo throughout the 'twenties. However, these were far from having a uniform viewpoint, and more than once their organization was split into rival factions. In any case in the second half of 1920 they were sunk in despair, mutual lack of confidence and recrimination.<sup>2</sup> This situation, which was known in Palestine, certainly lessened the attraction, both political and ideological, of Faysal and his exiled supporters.

This political standstill was accompanied by the growth of economic activity. The establishment of the civilian government in early July 1920 reinforced in some measure the feeling that British rule was lasting and stable. It seems that despite his being a Jew and the personal propaganda against him, Herbert Samuel succeeded in impressing the Arab population and its leaders of his good intentions and his determination to set up an efficient rule in Palestine.<sup>3</sup> Indeed, landowners and businessmen quickly returned to their occupations and directed most of their attention to resuming cultivation, reviving the orchards and opening up trade opportunities with various countries. These groups resigned themselves in the long run to the new reality and soon began addressing to the British authorities various demands drawn from daily realities: e.g. for diminishing land taxes, abolishing the special war taxes, for continuing the war-time moratorium on debts, and for doing away with the tobacco monopoly. In one of these demands it was noted that its signatories were "certain of the good intentions of the British Government of Justice towards the Palestinian people in general and towards the agriculturists in particular".<sup>4</sup>

However, this trend did not bring about a complete decline in political awareness. The feeling of opposition to Zionism, the main source of national awakening in Palestine before and after the First World War, survived. Until July 1920 this feeling focused upon the existence of the nucleus of an Arab state in Damascus; now there was a need to incorporate it into another political framework. On the surface there appeared to be two possibilities open: to turn to Islam as the instrument for consolidating the Palestinian population (which was overwhelmingly Muslim), and to the feeling of Pan-Islamic solidarity, for the sake of the struggle against Zionism in Palestine: or to rely upon the entire Palestinian-Arab population, including its Christian members, as the source of strength, authority and justification in this struggle.

In reality, this distinction was unclear. Even during the period of Fayṣal's regime in Damascus the trend towards unity with Damascus was boosted by feelings of Muslim brotherhood; now it was still possible to take the Muslim point of view into account even when opposition to Zionism was justified on the grounds that the Palestinian population should be master of its fate.

Various factions, which even before July 1920 had opposed the goal of unification with Damascus, now began to give public expression to their position. The Hashemite regime in Damascus was accused of having brought about the division of Arab lands, of the fact that "Zionism came [to Palestine] through it and by agreement with it", of having a corrupt administration, of inefficiency and of deserting the interests of Palestine. Thus one author, Muḥammad Ḥusni 'Abd al-Hādī, hoped that "Palestine will see no Hejazite unless as a visitor or suitor [for aid at necessary moments], but certainly not as a ruler!"<sup>6</sup> Later the paper *Bayt al-Maqdis* unequivocally stated that "the time has come for us to understand that the Palestinian problem is one matter and the Arab problem in its present stage another, unless Allah brings a man to the Arab countries who will be equally concerned with both, without favouring one side or the other."<sup>6</sup> This trend was also expressed in the fact that in different places the name of the Ottoman Sultan began to be mentioned again in the Friday sermon in the mosques, and the same Ḥusni 'Abd al-Hādī, who attacked Fayṣal and his regime, supported this and wrote in favour of it in his articles.<sup>7</sup>

After the first shock of Fayṣal's fall from power had passed, the Palestinian activists and those who were beginning to return to Palestine from Damascus started to take stock of the new reality, and to assess their position. The new trend was already evident in a joint meeting of the three main Jerusalem organizations—the MCA, *al-Nādi al-'Arabi* and *al-Muntadā al-Adabi*—which took place in Jerusalem at the end of July. It was decided that from then on the movement in Palestine was to be separate from that in Syria owing to the special situation which had been created there. At additional sessions in Jerusalem during August and September this view was overwhelmingly dominant. It was stressed that the Arabs of Palestine must concentrate all their efforts on Palestine, since the ambitions of the Jews were also concentrated in that country alone.<sup>8</sup>

This development was instrumental in giving a much needed stimulus to organizational activity, and the MCA emerged as the dominant group in the movement and the main source of leadership at the expense of *al-Nādi al-'Arabi* and *al-Muntadā al-Adabi*. In my opinion there were two important reasons for the ascendancy

of the MCA. Firstly, *al-Nādi al-'Arabi* was more closely connected than any other group with the unity movement; it was apparently part of an all-Syria organization under this name, it received active aid from Damascus, and its members together with those of *al-Muntadā al-Adabi* had been responsible for determining that the First Palestinian Congress in January-February 1919 had voted in favour of unity. When this movement had failed, it is reasonable to suppose that the prestige and influence of the organization which had extolled it also declined. *Al-Muntadā al-Adabi*, which in the past had been under French influence, obviously now lost its status. Secondly, two of the leaders of *al-Nādi al-'Arabi*, al-Ḥājj Amin al-Ḥusayni and 'Ārif al-'Ārif, were not included in the general amnesty which Herbert Samuel announced when he assumed office, and were therefore absent from Palestine during this period of change and consolidation.

Thus we see that in the course of the meetings which were held in Jerusalem during these months, the active members of the organizations turned to Mūsā Kāẓim al-Ḥusayni with the request that he assume the position of leadership. He was joined by 'Ārif Pāshā al-Dajāni.<sup>9</sup> President of the Jerusalem MCA, as co-leader. Mūsā Kāẓim al-Ḥusayni had taken no part in the First Congress, since he was then Mayor and therefore prohibited from taking an active part in the propaganda for unity with Syria, while 'Ārif Pāshā al-Dajāni was its chief opponent at the Congress. What is more, these two men were at the head of two of the most important families of Jerusalem, they were advanced in years (Mūsā Kāẓim al-Ḥusayni was in his seventies), they had filled senior posts in the Ottoman administration and were the only people in Palestine who had won the title Pāshā. It was no wonder, then, that they became accepted leaders.

The emergence of the MCA as the dominant organization was not automatic. First of all it was necessary to revitalize the organization, which had become weakened by the period of inactivity.<sup>10</sup> On the other hand, *al-Nādi al-'Arabi* also attempted to unify its ranks and to turn its organization into the dominant nationalist group. The return of the Palestinians who had served Fayṣal in Damascus was likely to strengthen this organization.<sup>11</sup> The third prominent organization, *al-Muntadā al-Adabi*, was largely out of the running, owing to the internal squabble between Fahmi and Fakhri al-Nashāshūbi and their opponents<sup>12</sup> and to their former ties with French agents. It appears that the line taken by Mūsā Kāẓim al-Ḥusayni, which was later ratified by the Third Congress, and the failure of *al-Nādi al-'Arabi*'s goal, were what decided the matter against this militant organization. The MCA became the dominant

factor in the Palestinian movement, with its membership reaching 650 according to an estimate by the CID.<sup>13</sup> *Al-Muntadā al-Adabi* increasingly disintegrated, and by early 1921 no longer existed as an effective organization, although it survived as a nominal body of the al-Nashāshībi family until 1923. *Al-Nādi al-'Arabi* survived until 1923.<sup>14</sup>

When overtures were first made to Mūsā Kāzīm al-Ḥusayni, he remarked to those who had turned to him: "Now, after the recent events in Damascus, we have to effect a complete change in our plans here. Southern Syria no longer exists. We must defend Palestine."<sup>15</sup> In the plan of action prepared by him and Jamil al-Ḥusayni it was stated that all the national effort must be directed solely against the Zionists; the affairs of Syria and the struggle against the French thus no longer represented an area for national activity.<sup>16</sup>

It should be mentioned that this struggle against Zionism and concentration on the affairs of Palestine was encouraged by the support of various personalities in Britain such as members of Parliament, and former members of the Military Administration in Palestine; the *Morning Post* also came out against Zionism and in favour of abrogating the Balfour Declaration.<sup>17</sup> The activists were also assisted by the activities of French agents, who, as in the past, attempted to gain at Britain's expense by promising that the policy of the French government was totally opposed to the establishment of the Jewish National Home in Palestine.<sup>18</sup>

Another matter which engaged the attention of the nationalist movement was the arrangements made for Muslim affairs in the country. This topic will be dealt with in more detail when the setting up of the Supreme Muslim Council is described. What is important for the subject in hand is that during the consolidation process of the nationalist organizations and their adaptation to the new realities, they dealt at length with the provisions for Muslim affairs in Palestine, the religious endowments and the Shar'ī courts. The demand for independent management of these affairs was conspicuous among their activities. It was this phenomenon which gave the British rulers grounds to fear a Pan-Muslim uprising, nurtured by a world-wide movement from India and Anatolia.<sup>19</sup> The fact that many of the Palestine Muslims continued to look forward to the return of the Ottoman Caliphate, as will be seen in the following chapters, reinforced this British fear.<sup>20</sup>

Most of the political activity was carried on in Jerusalem, and in order to give the leadership a representative, nation-wide character, representatives were invited from the other urban centres to meet in Jerusalem in September 1920; at this time Mūsā Kāzīm

al-Ḥusayni was chosen as President of the organization, and alongside him an overall committee was elected.<sup>21</sup> It should be noted that the north of the country was represented only by Haifa, and a considerable length of time was to pass before Galilee also joined the movement; even when it did so, it invariably gave its support to the leadership's rivals.

However, this level of country-wide organization and representation did not satisfy the activists. In one of the Jerusalem sessions one of the active members of the MCA, Ibrāhīm Shammās, demanded that the Muslim and Christian notables of the country be assembled to discuss the situation. The MCA adopted his demand and decided to issue a call in this spirit to Muslims and Christians.<sup>22</sup> This call was reiterated in a public statement published by al-Sheikh Sulaymān al-Tāji al-Fārūqi, a well-known *'ālim* from Ramleh, in the paper *al-Karmil*. His call won positive responses from associations in various parts of Palestine, and in this manner the foundation was laid for the convening of the Third Palestinian Congress in Haifa.<sup>23</sup>

#### NEGLECT OF "THE SOUTHERN SYRIA" IDEA

The Third Palestinian Congress was convened in Haifa on 13th December. There were thirty-seven delegates present (seventeen of them from Haifa alone!), and its debates lasted six days.<sup>1</sup> It was preceded by meetings of the various associations in different parts of the country for the purpose of discussing the situation before the Congress, and it is likely that the delegates to the Congress were decided upon during these meetings.<sup>2</sup> At the Congress there were several notable developments: first of all, efforts were made to turn it into a demonstration of Muslim-Christian unity. Al-Sheikh Sulaymān al-Tāji al-Fārūqi, the Muslim *'ālim*, delivered sermons on Friday in the city's mosque and on Sunday in a church before a large congregation of members of both religions; he spoke of the value of the religions and of the fact that they required unity. Subsequently, Būlūs Shihādah, a Greek-Orthodox from Ramallah, gave sermons in both places, emphasizing that "there is no life but in unity". The sermons ended with preaching by the Priest Basilis, head of the Greek-Catholic community, in the same vein.<sup>3</sup>

The attitude towards Britain, the form of regime which it was about to set up and the Balfour Declaration, occupied a central place in the debates of the Congress (about which we have few details) and in its resolutions. In the course of the debates al-Fārūqi stressed that the Arabs were not adversaries of the Government.

Their intention in convening the Congress was solely to crystallize a position which could be honoured.<sup>4</sup> The resolution adopted demanded that the British Government "establish a native (*waṭaniyyah*) government responsible to a representative assembly (*majlis niyābi*), whose members would be chosen from the populace which was Arabic-speaking and which had resided in Palestine before the War, as had been done in Iraq and Transjordan".<sup>5</sup>

On the surface this could have been understood as a rejection of British rule and a demand for an independent parliamentary government. However, the last clause relating to what had been done in Iraq and Transjordan revealed the true intention of the statement. Britain was being requested to set up self-governing institutions under British hegemony. On the other hand, the Congress totally rejected the present form of British rule; an omnipotent High Commissioner, assisted by an appointed advisory council, and passing legislation even before the ratification of the Mandate by the League of Nations and before the final determination of the country's fate.<sup>6</sup> The stress laid on the temporary nature of the governing arrangements at that time was of central importance, for in the course of the next two or three years the nationalist organizations worked under the impression that the form of government in Palestine and British policy had not yet been finally determined and that it was possible by bargaining to attain far-reaching changes in them.

The meaning of the resolution was confirmed also by other resolutions dealing with every-day administrative arrangements: demands for the reopening of the Agricultural Bank, permission to export cereal grains (this had been prohibited owing to the scarcity of cereals in Palestine and in the neighbouring countries, which also prohibited their export), the organization of the prisons and improvement in the prisoners' conditions.<sup>7</sup> "The Congress thanks Great Britain in advance by virtue of its faith that it (Britain) is the place to which one ought to turn, the place towards which eyes are lifted up and which responds to appeal"—thus the Congress summed up its expectations from the British Government.<sup>8</sup>

The rejection of the Balfour-Declaration policy was, on the other hand, expressed in an extreme and unequivocal tone. The Congress protested violently against this Declaration and claimed that it was in violation of all "laws of God and man". The Congress demanded that the Government abrogate all steps taken until then in accordance with this policy: the recognition of the Zionist Organization as an official body; the acceptance of immigrants; the use of Hebrew as an official language; the acquiescence in the existence of

the Zionist flag, and Zionist leaders' serving in high positions in the government, despite the fact that Palestine was the Holy Land for the Christian and Muslim worlds and it was forbidden to entrust its affairs to non-Muslims and non-Christians.<sup>9</sup>

This combination of a demand for self-rule while being resigned to British hegemony, and an absolute rejection of the Balfour-Declaration policy became the official Arab stance towards the British authorities, and guided the Arab representatives in their various negotiations with them.

In order to execute these resolutions a nine-member body was elected called at first the Central Committee but which soon became known as "the Executive Committee of the Palestinian Arab Congress".<sup>10</sup> It was headed by the President of the Congress, Mūsā Kāzīm al-Ḥusayni, and 'Arif Pāshā al-Dajāni, his Vice-President.

The lack of any demand for unity with Syria and the abandonment of the term "Southern Syria",<sup>11</sup> were evident. However, the absence of references to this matter is not in itself positive confirmation that it was neglected. One could claim that for tactical reasons the delegates preferred not to mention the matter in their resolutions and put it off until a more favourable time. In order to prove that the absence of a resolution regarding Syrian unity meant abandonment of the idea, it is important to see in what measure this idea came up again after the Congress, and even more, in what measure the Palestinian leaders aided the Syrian exiles in Cairo who continued to proclaim the idea of Pan-Syrian unity and to work towards its realization.

The Fourth Congress, which convened its first session on 29th May 1921 in Jerusalem, was concerned with various organizational matters, but above all with selecting a delegation to carry on negotiations with the British Government and all that this entailed. The delegation was authorized to speak in the name of "the Arab people of Palestine", and "Southern Syria" was not mentioned.<sup>12</sup> No wonder, then, that a British Intelligence officer judged that the Arab movement in Palestine was now completely ignoring Sharīfian policy, and the movement for the unification of Syria, Palestine and Iraq was growing weaker. The Palestinians no longer wanted a [Hāshemite] Emir but rather a representative government.<sup>13</sup>

The Fifth Congress, which gathered at Nāblus on 22nd August 1922, was of a more extreme character than its predecessor and focused attention once again on Pan-Arab topics. It took place after the failure of the contacts between the First Delegation and Winston Churchill, the British Colonial Secretary, regarding a constitution for Palestine. The extremism was expressed in the agenda, in the debates and the resolutions. The agenda proposed by the

AE contained the following section (16): "Discussion of the idea to send a delegation to the Arabian Peninsula to work towards reaching a mutual understanding between the Arab Emirs [referring clearly to the conflict between 'Abd al-'Aziz Ibn Sa'ūd, the ruler of Najd, and Ḥusayn Ibn 'Ali, King of the Hejaz], and in addressing an appeal to all the Arab lands to call a conference which would discuss Arab partnership (*al-Jāmi'ah al-'Arabiyyah*)."<sup>14</sup> This approach was expressed in the First Delegation's report to the Congress. It proposed to devote attention to strengthening ties (*'urā al-ittihād*) among the Arabs and to refuting claims of their disunion.<sup>15</sup>

One delegate to the Congress, Ibrāhīm 'Abd al-Hādi, wanted to go still further. He proposed a discussion of the question of the mandates over Palestine and Syria, since "the inhabitants of *Southern Syria* see themselves and their land as an inseparable part of the rest of Syria"; a clarification of "whether Southern Syria [Palestine] could withstand the injustice perpetrated against her without the assistance of the Arab nation"; and congratulating the population of Iraq on escaping the mandate.<sup>16</sup> However, his approach was not accepted. True, the delegates to the Congress swore "to continue the efforts for country's independence and the realization of Arab unity (*Waḥdah*) by legal means, and never to agree to the Jewish National Home and Jewish immigration", but the oath had merely ritual significance. The eighteen resolutions adopted dealt with Palestinian affairs only, and even in the oath the participants in the Congress were defined as "delegates of the Palestinian Arab people".<sup>17</sup>

The Sixth Congress, convened on 16th June 1923 in Jaffa, was dominated by the British-Hejazi treaty, an affair which won much publicity. For our purposes here it is important to note that the term "Southern Syria" was completely absent. No-one mentioned the term; no-one proposed a discussion in this spirit; in the debates the matter was never brought up, as was the case in the resolutions; everyone's attention was directed to Palestine alone. Moreover, the Congress put pressure on King Ḥusayn, as we shall see, not to sign the treaty with Britain, in which he recognized Britain's status in Palestine in return for Britain looking favourably upon the establishment of a confederation of the Arabs of the Hejaz, Iraq and Transjordan.<sup>18</sup> Reacting to this pressure, King Ḥusayn requested the Congress to show confidence in him, but not all the delegates were prepared to do this. 'Īsā al-'Īsā, the Editor of *Filasfīn*, stated that his experience from the period in which he had served under Fayṣal in Damascus had taught him that the policy of the Hāshemite family was never in the best interests of Palestine. In his

opinion, the Palestinians must deal with the question of Palestine themselves and not rely on outside help. Jamāl al-Husayni, Secretary of the AE, continued in this vein, claiming that until then the Palestinians had only suffered disappointments when they had relied upon others and their good intentions.<sup>19</sup>

These two spokesmen reflected in their comments the causes of disappointment with the Pan-Arab policy and its backers. Even while Fayṣal's government had still existed in Damascus the population of Palestine had not accepted his policy of coming to terms with Zionism. Then, however, the reaction was muted, since the advantage of having the support of a semi-independent Arab government was considerable, and being linked to it seemed to provide a guarantee of defeating Zionism. When this advantage disappeared, the Palestinians did not hesitate to reveal their bitterness over Fayṣal's moderate approach to Zionism.

However, Fayṣal was not the only one who tried to come to terms with the Zionists. In November 1921 Ri'ād al-Ṣulḥ had talks with several Zionist leaders in Britain, including Chaim Weizmann, in the London house of James de Rothschild. The conversation revolved around two drafts for ordering the relations between Jews and Arabs in Palestine, one of them prepared by Itamar Ben-Avi, Editor of *Do'ar Ha-Yōm*, in consultation with Ri'ād al-Ṣulḥ (the contact between them had been made by Asher Sapir, a school-fellow of Ri'ād al-Ṣulḥ's, and Itamar Ben-Avi's editorial colleague in *Do'ar Ha-Yōm*); the second was drawn up by L. Stein, Secretary of the Zionist Executive in London. The parties did not reach explicit agreement, and each side objected to several points mentioned in the drafts, but it was agreed to see them as the basis for a continuation of the discussions in the coming February or March. What is important to note is that Ri'ād al-Ṣulḥ was prepared to recognize the Jewish National Home in Palestine, claiming only that Palestine deserved independence by virtue of Article 22 of the Covenant of the League of Nations. On the other hand, it was stated in the draft that the Jewish leaders and the Jews of Palestine would assist materially and morally the various existing Arab states and the ones which would be set up in the future, and would co-operate fully with the Arab people in its efforts to realize its national aspirations.<sup>20</sup> As we saw in the previous chapter, Ri'ād al-Ṣulḥ attempted to get the First Palestinian Delegation, which was then in London, to take part in these contacts, but he admitted that he was not very successful in this.<sup>21</sup>

On the basis of these preliminary contacts, Asher Sapir, Dr. D. Eder, the chairman of the Zionist Commission in Jerusalem, and Mr. Felix Menashe, one of the Egyptian Jewish leaders, had talks

in Cairo in March-April 1922 with three of the heads of the "Party of Syrian Unity" (*Ḥizb al-'Ittiḥād al-Sūri*) Sheikh Rashīd Riḍā, Ri'ād al-Ṣūlḥ and Sheikh Kāmil al-Qaṣṣāb. These talks ended with a draft agreement based on two points: the Jews would aid the Arab lands in attaining Independence and unification within the framework of a confederation, while the second party would recognize the rights of the Jews, though not on the basis of the Balfour Declaration or the Palestinian Mandate. In the opinion of Dr Eder, the main object of the Syrian leaders was to forestall the ratification of the French mandate over Syria which was about to be discussed in the Council of the League of Nations in July 1922.<sup>22</sup>

These talks were continued in August 1922 between Asher Sapir and Emir Ḥabīb Luṭfāllāh, Emir Shakīb Arslān and Iḥsān Bey al-Jābiri, members of the Syrian-Palestinian Delegation in Geneva (for the nature of this body, see below); they were concluded with a tentative draft agreement, similar in spirit to the previous draft. The talks were carried on with the knowledge and authorization of Chaim Weizmann, and at the end of the year he himself took over their direction and went to Cairo. F. H. Kisch, Director of the Political Department of the Zionist Executive in Jerusalem, got the impression from them that the hope of reaching complete understanding with the Arabs on the basis of the proposals already outlined had been proved to be justified.

Both parties had certain apprehensions over the ability of the other side to act. The Syrian party wanted to know if the Zionist Organization would be able to co-operate with them regarding Arab demands outside Palestine. The Zionist Organization made it clear that its hands were tied and its ability to assist the Arabs was only in the sphere of handling their political negotiations. The Zionist Organization knew very well that the British authorities were opposed to any Zionist-Arab arrangement directed against the Mandate authorities in Palestine and Syria, and worked on the basis of the British position. F. H. Kisch states that the Arabs understood this and agreed to it, but it seems that this appraisal was over-optimistic.<sup>23</sup>

On the other hand, the Jewish representatives were aware that the value of such an agreement depended above all upon the measure of its acceptance by the Palestinians, and therefore requested the Syrian party to be active amongst them. The first thing the Syrians did was to send Kāmil al-Qaṣṣāb to Palestine to work towards preventing disturbances during the holiday season of April 1922.<sup>24</sup> And indeed, Asher Sapir ascribed the peace in this period to this emissary's activity, although of course we have no proof that this really was the case.

It is impossible to tell how much the Palestinians knew of this activity and what lay behind it. One paper, which apparently did know, reacted to it violently. It wrote: "There is a group of Syrian Arabs who believe that moderation (*Tasāhul*) on the problem of Palestine will evoke the affection of Britain and the Zionists with respect to the Arab problem and especially the Syrian problem. The beginnings of this idea are to be found in the days of King Fayṣal's government in Syria . . . It appears that this idea exists in the hearts of some of our Syrian brothers." The paper then explains how dangerous Zionism is for all the Arab lands, and states: "Anyone who thinks that the sacrifice [of Palestine] is likely to help save another spot is suffering from a repugnant brain disease and should stay out of the world of Arab politics until he gets well."<sup>25</sup>

The second thing the Syrian side did was to try to convince the Palestinians themselves to accept the agreement which the Syrians had reached with the Jews. In May 1923 Ri'ād al-Ṣulḥ arrived in Palestine and tried to persuade Jamāl al-Ḥusayni, the Secretary of the AE, to co-operate with the Zionists—since Zionism was anyway an accomplished fact. He stressed that such co-operation would be for the good of the Arabs and that this was also 'Abdāllah's position. The Palestinians rejected his appeal completely and informed him that as a Syrian he should refrain from intervening in the affairs of Palestine! Moreover, Mu'īn al-Māḍi, a member of the First Delegation to London, who was closely tied to Ri'ād al-Ṣulḥ (the two of them had worked in Fayṣal's administration, and Mu'īn al-Māḍi had been Governor of Karak district under Fayṣal's rule), was suspected, because of these contacts, of being unreliable.<sup>26</sup>

It seems then that the comments of Jamāl al-Ḥusayni and 'Isā al-'Isā at the Sixth Congress reflected the bitterness of the Palestinian leaders towards the stance of their Syrian colleagues regarding Zionism. Not only had Fayṣal reached agreement with the Zionists in his time, but now the Syrian exiles in Cairo were prepared to sign a treaty for co-operation and mutual recognition with the Zionist Organization. There is no doubt that this disappointment over the moderation of the Syrians towards Zionism cooled the Palestinians' enthusiasm for the idea of Pan-Syrian unity as well as for its adherents.

The Seventh Congress was held five years later, in June 1928. It took place under special circumstances and had its own particular character. On the one hand it adopted moderate resolutions calling for the establishment of a representative assembly (*Majlis Niyābi*) in Palestine, amidst tacit resignation to the Mandate, and of course the entire "Southern Syria" affair was not mentioned. On the other hand, a new Pan-Arab trend began to emerge at this Congress, as

expounded by a group of young men, with no connection with the Hāshemite family, and having a different character and ideology from the earlier "Southern Syria" movement.<sup>27</sup>

The other expressions of public opinion reveal a similar picture. During these years the Arab press was occupied for the most part with Palestinian matters. Its point of origin was Palestinian, and to the extent that Pan-Arab ideas were expressed at all, it was within a general framework only. The more explicit idea of unification with Syria was hardly expressed at all.

The situation was the same in the memoranda which the AE presented to the British Colonial Secretary in March and August 1921. True, they did contain expressions of bitterness over Palestine's separation from Syria, but the concrete demands revealed a contradiction. On the one hand the British Government was requested "to establish a native (*waṭaniyyah*) government responsible to a representative assembly (*Majlis Niyābi*) elected by the inhabitants of Palestine who lived in the country before the War", and on the other hand "not to separate Palestine from its neighbouring Arab lands".<sup>28</sup> It would seem that the vague phrasing of the second demand bears witness to the seriousness of the first request.

The First Arab Delegation presented Churchill on 12th August 1921 with a statement of opinion in which it reiterated to a large extent its reasons and demands as expressed in the previous memorandum.<sup>29</sup> Here too we find the same two demands, but this time the negotiations which had gone on between the Delegation and the Colonial Secretary and his aides reveal the Delegation's real objective. As we shall see below, the Delegation did not once bring up in the course of the negotiations any demand to unite Palestine with any neighbouring Arab country; undoubtedly it did not even imagine at the time that it was possible to unite Palestine with the French Mandate in Syria. The many leaflets which were printed at this time, the telegrams of protest, etc., confirm this conclusion.

This policy was not unknown in the community and had its opponents, although not openly. In the summer of 1922 the President of the AE issued an appeal containing the slogan "Let Palestine be free and independent". This phrasing irritated Adib Abū Ḍabbah, Secretary of the delegation which left for the Hejaz in June 1922, because of "the absence of any mention of Arab unity", and he claimed that it was tainted with the suggestion of the dismemberment of the Arab lands.<sup>30</sup>

The most instructive part of this case is the matter of the relations between the AE and its delegation on the one hand, and the "Party of Syrian Unity" (*Ḥizb al-'Ittihād al-Sūri*) and the "Syrian-Palestinian Delegation" on the other.

The Party of Syrian Unity was established at the end of 1918 in Egypt by Syrian exiles who had belonged to the "Ottoman Decentralization Party". These men professed the idea of Syrian unity but demurred from the Pan-Arabism of the *al-Fatāh* group and their *al-Istiqlāl* party. For this reason their relations with Fayṣal and his administration were not good, since the latter for the most part supported *al-Fatāh*.<sup>31</sup> It is likely that it was because of this that the Party of Syrian Unity turned into the central body of the Syrian exiles following the collapse of Fayṣal's rule, and some of the members of *al-Istiqlāl*, such as Ri'ād al-Ṣulḥ, then joined it.<sup>32</sup>

This party attempted to establish a uniform framework for all the associations and organizations which were active against the division of Syria and against foreign rule over its various parts. In April 1921 it published an appeal signed by its President, Michel Luṭfāllah, and its Vice-President Muḥammad Rashīd Riḍā, to "all the Syrian parties and associations demanding Syria's independence within its natural borders", i.e. including Lebanon and Palestine, to convene a congress of the above-mentioned organizations. The congress was to convene on 10th June in Geneva, the seat of the League of Nations, in order to present the League with its demand for independence, in view of the debate soon to be held there on the conditions of the Mandate. A copy of this manifesto was sent to the Palestine AE with an accompanying letter in which the AE was asked to send representatives to the congress and to inform its organizers of this.<sup>33</sup> The Palestinian AE was in no hurry to answer this appeal. Khalīl al-Sakākīni was therefore sent to the Fourth Palestinian Congress in May 1921. He proposed to the Congress that the Palestinian Delegation, which the Congress had decided to send to London, should join the Syrian Delegation about to leave for Geneva, to work together for Syrian unity. The Congress refused to adopt a positive resolution on this matter and stated that it was impossible to do so until it had further details on the Syrian Delegation.<sup>34</sup>

An additional attempt to convince the Palestinians to co-operate was made as the First Palestinian Delegation was on its way to England. The Delegation left Jerusalem on 19th July 1921 and stayed until the 22nd of the month in Egypt waiting to embark for an Italian port. The Syrian activists used this delay to try to persuade the Palestinian representatives to come with them to Geneva before their departure for London in order to hold the joint congress. Since the two delegations sailed together for Trieste, the attempts at persuasion went on until their arrival there. This attempt also failed, though not entirely, as we shall see. In any case, at this stage the Palestinian Delegation preferred to continue its separate

course of action. The British authorities did not look favourably on the possible co-operation between the Palestinian and the Syrian delegations, and their disapproval probably influenced the Palestinians' decision.<sup>35</sup>

However, after holding its first talks in London the Palestinian Delegation decided to make contact with the Syrians, and in August three of the Delegation's members—Tawfiq Ḥamād, Vice-President of the Delegation, Amīn Bey al-Tamīmi, and Shibli al-Jamal, the Secretary—left for Geneva.<sup>36</sup>

Thus on 25th August 1921 the "Syrian-Palestinian Congress" assembled. Apart from the above-mentioned Palestinians, representatives of the following bodies participated: the Party of Syrian Unity, the *al-Istiqlāl al-'Arabi* party, organizations of emigrants to America, and the "Palestinian Association" in Egypt (an association of Palestinian emigrants in Egypt headed by the lawyer Wahbah al-'Isā and Muḥammad 'Alī al-Ṭāhir, a businessman of Nāblusite origin who afterwards published the paper *al-Shūra*).<sup>37</sup>

As we have seen, the Syrians repeatedly tried to persuade the Palestinians to participate in the Congress and were to continue these attempts. Because of the strong emphasis which they put on the question of Syria's unity, it was crucial for them to prevent the appearance of a separate Palestinian delegation. What were the Palestinians' motives in responding to this? Undoubtedly, a natural feeling of solidarity with their Arab neighbours influenced them. However, it seems that this is not the whole explanation. There were Palestinians who were apprehensive over the tolerance shown by the Syrian Delegation towards Zionism, and one of them wrote to the Secretary of the AE that the Palestinian representatives must influence the entire Syrian Congress to adopt an agreed policy for the good of Palestine, i.e. to adopt an anti-Zionist stand. The Syrians must be reminded, so he wrote, that Palestine did not flinch from being the first to demand the independence and unity of all Syria at the First Congress in Jerusalem in 1919, despite the dangers involved in this stand from the Military Administration.<sup>38</sup> It appears that this aim and the desire to win Syrian agreement for the existence of an independent Palestine were the factors motivating the Palestinian Delegation to send representatives to the All-Syria Congress.

On 21st September, after twenty-six days of discussion, the joint "Syrian-Palestinian Congress" issued a public statement to the League of Nations demanding: 1) Recognition of the independence and national rule (*al-Sulṭān al-Qawmi*) of Syria, Lebanon and Palestine; 2) Recognition of the right of these countries to unite in the framework of a civilian government, responsible to a parliament

elected by the people, and in association with the other Arab lands; 3) Immediate annulment of the Mandate; 4) The departure of the French and British forces from Syria, Lebanon and Palestine; 5) The annulment of the Balfour Declaration.<sup>39</sup>

The public statement was a compromise between the Syrian position on the one hand and the demands of the Palestinians on the other. The Syrians demanded the adoption of a stance in favour of Syrian unity within its national frontiers, but the Palestinians were prepared to agree only to phrasing which called for the "independence of Palestine, Syria and Lebanon *each alone* (author's italics), but having the right to unite and establish a confederation with the rest of the Arab countries".<sup>40</sup> This, then, was the meaning—at least in the eyes of the Palestinians—of the joint public statement, thus representing a complete triumph for the Palestinian position. The only concession which the Palestinian Delegation made was that it committed itself to the demand for independence raised by the Syrians, whereas its position in the talks with British politicians had been much more moderate. It had been content then to demand the establishment of institutions for self-rule under the Mandate. It should be noted that this concession, which was apparently needed in order to gain an outward appearance of unity, aroused criticism within the Arab community in Palestine.<sup>41</sup>

The Syrians strove to establish a joint Supreme Executive and a single delegation to take the place of the separate Syrian and Palestinian delegations, but to this too the Palestinians did not agree. On one occasion the Syrians reacted by writing: "Our Committee (the Executive of the 'Syrian-Palestinian Congress' in Cairo) recognizes the fact that the Palestinian Delegation, during its stay in Europe, gave us full moral support, although the Committee was not represented there, as should have been the case according to the resolutions of the Syrian-Palestinian Congress . . ." <sup>42</sup> As a result of the Congress an "Executive of the Syrian-Palestinian Congress" was formed which was active in Cairo, but this was a Syrian body and, as we shall see, there were no Palestinian representatives on it.

From then on the practical relations between the "Syrian-Palestinian" body in Cairo and the Palestinian AE were marked by attempts on the part of the Syrians to involve the Palestinian body in joint action, which the Palestinians steadfastly resisted.

In November 1921 the Party of Syrian Unity began to set up an Executive Committee to represent all the organizations which had taken part in the "Syrian-Palestinian" Congress in Geneva. In the course of November and December the Syrians turned to the

Palestinian Delegation in London and the Palestinian Executive which had remained in Palestine with the request that they appoint a representative to the proposed joint Executive Committee. The answer the Syrians finally received stated that "our present situation requires that none of the members of the AE or other active members in the national movement depart [from the country for Egypt]. You are no doubt aware of the critical situation we are in, especially of late. The Jews have begun arming themselves in an alarming fashion, and the Government has begun carrying out a policy of terror (*irhābiyyah*). Nevertheless, the AE desires to be kept informed of the activities of your Executive Committee, and so when circumstances permit, it will send a representative or appoint someone in Egypt who will represent it on your honoured Executive."<sup>43</sup> This answer, direct as it is, needs no analysis.

At the end of January 1922 the Executive Committee calling itself "Syrian-Palestinian" resumed its efforts to attain unity. It convened on 28th January 1922 and decided to call for the assembly of a second Syrian-Palestinian Congress. It invited all the "Syrian, Lebanese and Palestinian associations and parties which demand independence" to gather for the Congress at the site of the League of Nations. This time, apparently in order to pacify the Palestinians and Lebanese, they dropped the rest of the call of April 1921 "... demanding Syria's independence within its natural borders".<sup>44</sup> This call too failed to elicit a response from the Palestinians, although in principle the Palestinian Delegation in London had agreed to participate.<sup>45</sup>

We have seen that the Fifth Congress, in August 1922 also ignored this appeal in its debates and concrete resolutions, although it paid lip service to Arab unity. The Syrian Committee was not unaware of this snub. They again addressed the Palestinian AE with the claim that they were continuing to work for the defence of Syria and Palestine "on the strength of the resolutions of the Syrian-Palestinian Congress, although we found nothing in the Fifth Palestinian Congress which confirmed or encouraged this line of action. We ascribe this fact to an abundance of work and the lack of time and have therefore written this letter to you, in the hope that you will give it the attention it deserves." At the end of the letter the Syrians announced the Committee's decision to convene a second Syrian-Palestinian Congress in Cairo in December 1922, and again requested the AE to send representatives to it.<sup>46</sup> This time the Palestinians decided to take part and apparently started making preparations for sending representatives to the Congress. The Secretary of the AE addressed a request to the Nāblus MCA to select a representative for the delegation which

would leave for Cairo and the Congress, but the Nāblus MCA was not agreeable to sending a delegate and proposed instead to authorize Muḥammad 'Alī al-Ṭāhir, one of the "Palestine Committee's" active members in Cairo, to represent them at the Congress. The Nāblus MCA laid down the condition that this authorization be based on the debates and resolutions of the Congress being within the framework of the resolutions of the Fifth Palestinian Congress, which as we have seen ignored the concrete matter of Syrian unity and its realization.<sup>47</sup> In the end the AE refrained from sending emissaries to Egypt to represent them at the Congress<sup>48</sup> and the only thing that was done was to take advantage of the departure abroad of the Second Delegation for holding talks with the Syrian Committee.

Indeed, as soon as the second Palestinian Delegation arrived in Cairo in early November 1922 it had a meeting with the Executive Committee of the Syrian-Palestinian Congress. The Syrians again demanded action under the slogan "Syria for the Syrians, independent within its natural borders", i.e. including Palestine; the Palestinians were adamant in opposing this and were unwilling to work together except on the basis of the resolution demanding "independence for Palestine, Syria and Lebanon, *each alone* (author's italics) but having the right to unite and establish a confederation with the rest of the Arab countries". Mūsā Kāzīm al-Ḥusayni explained that "the political circumstances have made our problem separate [from that of Syria] and separate efforts must be made on its behalf; we are therefore unable to unite our efforts with those of the Syrians except in this form". On this basis, then, the parties agreed to appear at Lausanne as a single body bearing the name "the Syrian-Palestinian Delegation".<sup>49</sup>

The only joint action of this body was the presentation of a memorandum to the Peace Conference in which they demanded independence for Syria, Lebanon and Palestine and expressed their opposition to the Mandates and the pro-Zionist policy.<sup>50</sup> However, the Palestinian Delegation soon went back to working separately. A rumour was currently circulating that Britain was likely to retract the Balfour Declaration. It is almost certain that the fall of Lloyd George's government in October 1922 and the formation of a new government headed by A. Bonar-Law were what created the background for these rumours. The Palestinian Delegation immediately reacted with a separate initiative. It met with the General Secretary of the League of Nations in order to establish the truth of the rumour, and when it received a disappointing reply from him decided to leave for London to clarify the situation; the Syrian Delegation remained in Lausanne.<sup>51</sup> Before its departure for Lon-

don the Palestinian Delegation tendered a new, separate memorandum which was almost entirely devoted to justifying opposition to the policy of the National Home and which made no mention of the question of independence, mandates, and the situation in Syria.<sup>52</sup>

This pattern of relations continued. On the eve of the Sixth Congress the Executive Committee of the "Syrian-Palestinian Congress" again wrote to the Palestinian AE, drawing its attention to "the importance of co-operation among the parties and associations working on the problem . . . we would like at least to get information from you so that we know what you have resolved and so that we will be able to carry on an exchange of views to prevent us from working against each other's interests . . ."<sup>53</sup> All the Palestinian Congress did in reply to this appeal was to send telegrams of greetings to the various bodies throughout the world which supported the Palestinian position, among them one to the Executive of the "Syrian-Palestinian Congress".

This Congress decided to send another delegation to England to influence the course of negotiations between the representatives of King Ḥusayn and the British Government with respect to Palestine.<sup>54</sup> The "Syrian-Palestinian" Delegation again tried to bring the Palestinian Delegation to Geneva before its departure for England and to work jointly with it, but again failed.<sup>55</sup>

In the course of 1924-5 the Syrians reiterated their proposals for co-operation. The only response was in October 1925, when Shakīb Arslān was authorized by the Palestinians to represent them before the Mandates Committee of the League of Nations.<sup>56</sup>

During the years 1925-7 the Palestinian national movement lay dormant, and contact was of course not maintained with the Syrian-Palestinian Executive in Cairo or with its delegation in Geneva. Even with the resurgence of the Palestinian movement in 1928, nothing was done to create close ties with the Syrian body. The Palestinians contented themselves with resolving at their Seventh Congress "to salute the Syrian-Palestinian Delegation in Europe for its activities for the benefit of the homeland, and to entreat it to continue to demand the rights of the Syrian and Palestinian peoples".<sup>57</sup>

The picture formed is thus clear and unequivocal. Despite the existence of a Pan-Syrian body in Cairo working for the attainment of unity and independence for "Greater Syria", the Palestinians preferred to work for what they saw as their important interests and to refrain from supporting the demands of the Syrian body and from co-operating with it. It should be noted that such proposed co-operation would not perhaps have been easy even if the Palestinians had desired it. Already in 1922 the "Palestine Com-

mittee" in Cairo had deserted the "Syrian-Palestine Congress" and did everything it could from then onwards to hinder the Palestinian AE from co-operating with the Syrian body. Moreover, in 1925 the Syrians themselves were split into two camps: one headed by Emir Michel Luṭfāllah and one by Emir Shakīb Arslān, each side claiming to embody the true nationalism and accusing the other of treachery.<sup>58</sup> Even though the withdrawal of the "Palestine Committee" was of secondary importance, it is likely that it influenced the Palestinians' attitude towards the Syrian body to some extent. As to the split which occurred at a time when the Palestinian movement was sunk in heavy lethargy, even had it not occurred it is unlikely that anything would have been changed.

## Chapter Three

### CONFRONTATION WITH THE BRITISH GOVERNMENT

The pattern of relations between the British regime and the Palestinian-Arab national movement was the product of various factors, both internal and external, at work throughout this period.

The conquest of Jerusalem by the British Army in December 1917 and of the rest of Palestine in the first half of 1918 came after four years of bitter fighting. The populace had suffered greatly in these years from conscription, the *corvée*, sickness and hunger. For three years Palestine had served as a base for the Ottoman Army fighting in Sinai, and this army's passage through the country added a lot to the sufferings of the populace. The more the scales of war turned against the Turks, the more the efficiency of the administration and its desire to alleviate the suffering declined. The basic requirement of an adequate food supply was not organized satisfactorily, and along with the objective factors which led to a reduction in the quantities of food in the markets (the army's consumption, the drafting of fellahs, and a plague of locusts) there was a decline in the value of money and loss of confidence in the currency, profiteering by wheat producers and merchants, and a corrupt administration.<sup>1</sup>

The British Army immediately after the taking of Jerusalem began to organize the supply of food to the inhabitants and did the best it could to alleviate the misery. This fact, so much in contrast to the situation before the city's capture, led to the Army's being regarded by the entire populace as a saviour. In addition, the British military authorities began recruiting volunteers from among the Arabs of Palestine for Fayṣal's army, which was active east of the Jordan in the desert between Hejaz and Syria. This recruitment for a force tied to the British and constituting part of the forces under their command enhanced the sympathy which the populace felt for these forces—especially inasmuch as it was accompanied by systematic propaganda describing the prosperity in store for the population under British rule.<sup>2</sup>

This situation created a favourable background for the development of good relations between the British and the Arab population. However, the simple fact of occupation and the administrative

arrangements made by the occupier did not exist in a political vacuum, and they were not the only influences on developments. The question of Palestine's political future was raised with increasing frequency as the military conquest of the country proceeded; eventually the political factor was to be decisive in shaping the relationship between the British regime and the politically conscious nationalist element in the Arab population.

I have already described (in the previous chapter) the basic factors which moulded this relationship during the period of military rule. The military authorities saw the pro-Zionist policy to which the British Government was committed as an intolerable burden. The arrival of the Zionist Commission in Palestine was to them a surprise which soon turned to disgust.<sup>3</sup> On the other hand, their attitude towards Arab nationalist aspirations was positive, so long as these aspirations did not conflict with British imperial needs. In practice they went to extremes in their sympathy and leaned towards support of Fayṣal's rule in Damascus under British protection, even after Britain had explicitly declared that Syria was given over to French protection. This "giving in" enhanced the importance of Palestine in the eyes of the officers of the occupying army, both because of its proximity to the Suez Canal and its function as a land bridge to the Persian Gulf. For this reason they tended to support the aspirations of the vast majority of the population, under the assumption that they could be reconciled with British interests. However, the political limitations imposed by the Anglo-French agreement required that the Military Administration should not go too far in its sympathy for the national movement, and when it saw that an extremist demonstration—that is to say Pan-Syrian and uniate—by the Palestinian nationalists was imminent, it did not hesitate to prevent it. Thus the officers of the Military Administration encouraged the setting up of the MCA, the organization in which adherents of the "Palestine for the Palestinians" idea were prominent; forestalled its take-over by extremist elements; and prohibited the departure of a Palestinian delegation for Paris in March 1919, when it became clear that it would demand the unification of Palestine with Syria. Clearly, then, a large measure of sympathy for the British Military Administration was created among the nationalists. The setting up of a civilian regime with a British Jew at its head did not noticeably change this situation. Herbert Samuel's liberal policies compensated for the fact that a Jew had been appointed as head of the Palestine Government; many years were to pass before opposition to British rule became widespread.

The growing demand for Palestinian autonomy and the effort to

ward off the danger of Zionism were responsible more than other factors for shaping the relationship between the Palestinian national movement and the British regime. Zionism, it appeared, was the prime danger; there was a high degree of resignation to British rule. The demand for the setting up a native (*waṭaniyyah*) government, raised at the Third Palestinian Congress, went no further than the principle of self-rule under the protection of the Mandatory, as the situation had developed in Iraq and Transjordan and later in Syria. The main stipulation was the annulment of the Balfour Declaration.

The Palestinian leadership was of the opinion that the pro-Zionist policy of the British Government and the proposed draft of the Mandate could still be changed by appeal to the British Government and public opinion and by bringing to their attention the true facts about Palestine. This view remained unchanged even after the disappointing experiences of the three Delegations from 1921-3, and in fact even at the end of the 'twenties.<sup>4</sup> The fact that a certain group of British politicians was also opposed to the pro-Zionist policy reinforced this view. In April 1921 Mūsā Kāzīm al-Ḥusayni, President of the Palestinian AE, appealed to the community to preserve quiet "and to put its hope in the Government of Great Britain, which is famous for its justice, its concern for the well-being of the inhabitants, its safe-guarding of their rights and consent to their lawful demands. It will not disappoint the people's hopes, as *vox populi vox dei*."<sup>5</sup> The successes of the Kemalist movement in Turkey contributed to this view. The opinion was current at the time that ratification of the Peace Treaty with Turkey (the Treaty of Sèvres) was a preliminary condition to ratification of the Mandate, and as it was clear that the victory of the Turkish nationalists would prevent ratification of the Treaty, holders of this view believed that the whole question of the Mandate would be discussed anew.<sup>6</sup>

The instruments set up for attaining this goal were the AE, which was to be active in Palestine and to present the demands of the Palestinian community to the High Commissioner, and delegations which were sent to Britain to convince the British Government and public opinion of the need for a reversal in British policy in Palestine.

#### ACTIVITIES IN THE COUNTRY

The AE, elected at the Third Palestinian Congress in Haifa, attempted immediately after its election to win from the Palestine Government recognition of its status as the body representing the

Palestinian-Arab population. However, the Government position was "that the members of the Congress were appointed by small groups and are by no means representative of the population".<sup>7</sup> It is highly doubtful whether the Government really believed this to be the case but by questioning the representative character of the AE it was possible to circumvent the demands of this body for the establishment of a national government responsible to an elected representative assembly. In his letter to Curzon, Herbert Samuel wrote that the Muslim-Christian Associations were few and not to be taken seriously, "although undoubtedly they stand for a considerable body of opinion latent in the country, which might at any time be stirred into activity by an aggressive or unsympathetic policy on the part of the Government".<sup>8</sup> This sentence reflects Herbert Samuel's approach and policy. He believed that the pro-Zionist policy by itself was not an "unsympathetic policy on the part of the Government" towards the Palestinian population and that it could be implemented without arousing the active opposition of the latter, so long as it was not taken too far and so long as it was possible to allay the fears of the populace as to the Government's intentions. The steps he took from the start of his rule were intended to reveal his good will towards the populace: amnesty for those sentenced in connection with the April 1920 disturbances; the appointment of al-Ḥājj Amīn al-Ḥusayni as Mufti of Jerusalem in May 1921; the allocation of land in the Beisan valley, which had been previously owned by the Sultan 'Abd ül-Ḥamīd II and had been nationalized by the Young Turk Government, to Bedouins of the area on generous terms; the setting up of the Supreme Muslim Council, with the Muslim representatives determining its statutes and choosing its members without government interference; an effort to establish an efficient administration concerned with the well-being of the inhabitants, and repeated attempts to divert the attention of the community from politics to economic development; and a laying of emphasis upon the limited character of the Balfour Declaration, i.e. on the equality of its two provisions: the one promising the Jews help in setting up the National Home, and the other promising that nothing would be done to prejudice the civil and religious rights of the existing non-Jewish communities.

The AE also received in practice different treatment from that implied by the Government's refusal to recognize it as an authorized representative of the Palestinian population. Thus, despite the Government's approach, members of the AE were received by the High Commissioner for talks on two occasions, in January and February 1921. At the first meeting the High Commissioner changed

his stand regarding the representative character of the AE, explaining that the Government did not recognize it "owing to the nature of the resolutions which were adopted, which are in contradiction to the Mandate and the declared policy of His Majesty's Government", although he added that he was still doubtful about its manner of election. He was thus prepared to recognize a representative Arab body on the basis of the conditions according to which the institutions of the Jewish community had been recognized: non-adoption of resolutions in opposition to the Mandate, and limitation of discussion to internal affairs of the community. The first reaction of members of the AE was positive and they were inclined to accept this proposal, but at the second meeting of 4th February 1921 they rejected it<sup>9</sup>—apparently because they thought it was still possible to fight for and to attain fundamental changes in the Mandate itself, and it was therefore pointless to set up a body which would work within the limits imposed by the provisions of the writ of Mandate. Nevertheless, Herbert Samuel promised that administrative affairs brought to his attention would be looked into; the basic principles of the Mandate, however, had been determined and confirmed by the Allied Powers and could not be changed.

In order to prove to the High Commissioner that the AE represented the population, in January and February a campaign was organized consisting of letters to the newspapers and announcements by various public bodies—municipalities, chambers of commerce, religious leaders and professional people—to the effect that the AE represented them and its stands expressed the opinion of the entire community; in Nāblus there were even organized demonstrations of solidarity.<sup>10</sup>

Eventually, however, a certain pattern of relations was formed between the AE and the Government. The frequent meetings, the memoranda presented and the readiness to listen to the opinion of the AE gave this body a representational significance in the eyes of both Government and community. When the Government saw clearly that the stand of the AE would have some bearing on one of its measures, as in the case of the 1922 census and the elections to the Legislative Council in 1923, it tried to avert its opposition, and thus recognized the AE, for all practical purposes, as spokesman for the Palestinian Arab community.<sup>11</sup> Nonetheless, the Government did not consent to recognize the right of the AE to act as representative of any given resident or group of residents which saw itself injured by some government activity and wanted to express its grievance.<sup>12</sup> At the end of the 'twenties the Government actually gave full recognition to the AE as representative of the

Palestinian Arab population. The Shaw Commission which investigated the disturbances of August 1929 requested the AE to appoint lawyers who would direct for the Arab side, the examination of witnesses, and thus this body was clearly thought of by the Commission as representative of the Palestine Arabs.<sup>13</sup> Later the Government went much further in this direction and requested the AE to appoint the Arab members of various public committees set up by the Government. It is no wonder, then, that during the early 'thirties the AE believed, with good reason, that the Government had officially recognized it as representative of the population.<sup>14</sup>

Along with the effort to win recognition as representative of the populace, the AE tried to effect far-reaching changes in the pro-Zionist policy of the Government. The visit of Winston Churchill, the new Colonial Secretary, to the Middle East and Palestine in March 1921 was seen as a suitable opportunity for this purpose. The AE took care that the various associations in the country which were linked with it informed Churchill in advance of their demands, and that when he arrived in Palestine they presented their petitions and arranged demonstrations in the cities he visited.<sup>15</sup> The AE itself sent its leading members to Cairo to meet with Churchill, but in the end the meeting took place in Jerusalem, since Churchill refused to receive them in Cairo.<sup>16</sup> The AE delivered to Churchill a detailed memorandum explaining the Palestinians' opposition to Zionism and repeating the main demands made by the Third Congress, i.e. the setting up of a native (*waṭaniyyah*) government and the rejection of Zionism. Churchill turned down their demands completely and stressed the Government's commitment and his own personal adherence to the Balfour Declaration. He went some way towards a compromise with the Arab position when he emphasized to the delegation that "the establishment in Palestine of a National Home for the Jews" did not mean "to make Palestine the National Home for the Jews", and that the difference between the two phrasings was of great importance. Churchill stressed that the success of the National Home was dependent upon Zionism's ability to bring about prosperity in Palestine; if it succeeded in this the whole country would benefit, but if it failed, then there was no hope for its enterprise. In any case, "we cannot tolerate the expropriation of one set of people by another or the violent trampling down of one set of national ideals for the sake of creating another".<sup>17</sup>

This reply did not satisfy the AE, and it is likely that other nationalist bodies began looking for a more efficient means of convincing the British government of the fact that the Palestinian population was fiercely opposed to the pro-Zionist policy, since

Churchill's answer and his refusal to meet them in Cairo left the impression that he was treating rather lightly the strength of this opposition. The Arab outbreak in May 1921 in Jaffa and its environs and in the Ṭul-Karm-Ḥadera region showed clearly how great the opposition to Zionism and the Jews really was and how easy it was to incite the urban, rural and Bedouin inhabitants to violence.<sup>18</sup>

The question naturally arises whether these riots broke out spontaneously, as a chain reaction to the appearance of Jewish May-Day demonstrators in an Arab quarter in Jaffa, with hatred for the Jews as their motivating force—or whether this was an organized act worked out in advance, having a political aim, and directed by the AE or by some other nationalist organization? The Haycraft Commission concluded that the first interpretation was the correct one and was joined in this opinion by the AE, which for years argued that it had acted solely within the bounds of the law.<sup>19</sup> This conclusion notwithstanding, there are several signs which point to the fact that a certain organization was behind these outbreaks.

Beginning in early 1919 an underground organization was set up in Jaffa, led by some of the local notables, which controlled large numbers of the urban population and members of the underworld. The organization was initially called *al-Kaff al-Sawdā'* (the Black Hand), but changed its name in May 1919 to *al-Fidā'iyyah* (the Self-Sacrificers). In the course of 1919 the organization spread throughout the country and set up branches in Jerusalem, Gaza, Nāblus, Ṭul-Karm, Ramleh and Hebron; Jaffa, however, remained its centre. The organization was at that time connected to *al-Nādi al-'Arabi* and *al-Muntadā al-Adabi* and was partner in their political aims. It appears that its task was to be, like *al-Ikhā' wa-al-'Afāf*, to act as the executive arm of the national movement in view of the possibility of a pro-Fayṣal revolt in the country.<sup>20</sup> The organization continued to exist in various forms up till 1923 at least in some places in the country and was greatly influenced by al-Ḥājj Amin al-Ḥusayni. Its members swore to give their lives for him! The conclusion over its continuity is strengthened by the fact that two of the heads of the extremist associations of 1919–20, Aḥmad al-Shanṭi of Jaffa and Maḥmūd Dabbāgh of Jerusalem, remained prominent in this organization during the early 'twenties, and the list of those suspected by the Government of organizing forbidden activity is almost identical with the list of active members of the extremist associations of 1919–20.<sup>21</sup>

The existence of such an organization is not of course proof in itself that the outbreak was organized and directed by it. However,

its existence does strengthen the impression that the outbreak was organized, an impression formed by the following combination of details: In April 1921 an anonymous informant wrote to the High Commissioner to the effect that 'Ārif al-'Ārif, aide to the Governor of Jenin, had set up "a secret revolutionary society" composed of Jenin notables, with branches in the villages of the sub-district, Rumānah, Umm al-Faḥm, Ya'bad and others.<sup>22</sup> Some of the men who joined this association and the majority of the notables of the villages in which branches had been set up were active in early May in inciting the villagers to attack Jewish settlements, arguing that the Jews were about to attack *them* and therefore it was necessary to prepare for such an eventuality.<sup>23</sup> In late May it was reported that in one of the villages of the Jaffa sub-district a *Fidā'iyyah* group was organizing; there were also reports of trafficking in weapons and stock-piling.<sup>24</sup> Salīm 'Abd al-Raḥmān al-Ḥājj Ibrāhīm of Ṭul-Karm, one of the heads of the Damascus *al-Nādi al-'Arabi* during Fayṣal's rule, was accused of participating in the attack on Ḥadera and of directing the attack of the Bedouin tribesmen of Abū-Kishek on Petaḥ-Tikvah, although he did not take part in it personally, even putting in an appearance the same day at the Governor's house in order to give himself an alibi—thus bearing witness at least to the fact that he had known of the attack beforehand.<sup>25</sup> On the eve of the attack on Ḥadera a meeting took place in the house of 'Abd al-Laṭīf Abū Hanṭash, village head of Qāqūn, and on the following day several members of this family were closely connected with the events in Ḥadera.<sup>26</sup> Before this attack there was systematic propagandizing for it in Ṭul-Karm, the chief instigator being 'Abdāllah Samārah, the moving spirit in the nationalist movement in this area for years and the head of *al-Nādi al-'Arabi al-Waṭani* in the Ṭul-Karm sub-district.<sup>27</sup> In the opinion of S. Symes, Governor of the district, all the villagers and the Bedouin tribesmen between Ṭul-Karm and Ḥadera took part in this attack.<sup>28</sup> The villagers were recruited for the action by spreading rumours among them that the Jews were killing Arabs in Jaffa and that several Ṭul-Karmites had been arrested as hostages by the Jews in Ḥadera.<sup>29</sup> The rapid spread of these rumours leaves room for the possibility that in the Ṭul-Karm area, as in the Jenin villages, their diffusion was being organized. In the course of the attacks in the coastal plain an attempt was made to incite the Nāblusites and the youth of Jerusalem and Silwān to join the attacks and to avenge "their brethren in Haifa and Jaffa who are being killed, while you sleep, by the Zionist foes".<sup>30</sup> Before the outbreak, Shakīb Arslān, the Syrian leader in exile in Berlin, wrote to his colleagues in Jaffa that an uprising in the form of riots would

be far more useful than sending a delegation to the West. 'Isā al-'Isā, who reported this, stated that "in fact the uprising was carried out".<sup>31</sup> Finally, in 1925 Ṭāhir al-Ḥusayni, son of Kāmil al-Ḥusayni, the former Mufti of Jerusalem and nephew of al-Ḥājj Amīn al-Ḥusayni, stated that his uncle, al-Ḥājj Amīn al-Ḥusayni, was the organizer of the Jaffa riots in May 1921 and of the attempt to turn the 2nd of November demonstrations in Jerusalem into an attack on the Jews<sup>32</sup>—an attempt which was foiled by the police and the Jewish defence.

It seems that two central features stand out from all this: three out of the four main leaders of the extremist-unity movement in 1919–20, al-Ḥājj Amīn al-Ḥusayni, 'Arif al-'Arif and Salim 'Abd al-Raḥmān (Sheikh 'Abd al-Qādir al-Muẓaffar was not mentioned), were reported to have been connected in one way or another with the organization of the anti-Jewish outbreaks of May 1921: and the discovery that it was possible to turn the local outbreak in Jaffa into a whole series of outbreaks over a much wider area, not so much by nationalist slogans as by the spreading of false rumours that the Jews were slaughtering Arabs<sup>33</sup> and apparently also by the chance of possibly plundering the Jewish settlements.

These outbreaks had several important political consequences. The AE and the Jaffa MCA hurriedly disassociated themselves from them.<sup>34</sup> The President of the Jaffa MCA, 'Umar al-Bayṭār, and another notable of the city left for the Ṭul-Karm-Qalqiliyah area to refute the rumours being spread there, while the important leader Sheikh Sulaymān al-Tāji al-Fārūqi, the promoter of the Third Palestinian Congress in Haifa, published an appeal to the villagers in which he stated that "there is no truth in the rumours that atrocities were committed against your brethren in Jaffa" and called upon them to preserve peace and order. In a similar vein he preached a sermon in the Great Mosque in Ramleh.<sup>35</sup> The paper *al-Karmil*, which at that time was close to AE circles, denounced the outbreaks severely, seeing them as the work of hooligans.<sup>36</sup>

This conduct created tension between the young militant elements in Jaffa and the MCA leadership and community notables in general. Salim 'Abd al-Raḥmān al-Ḥājj Ibrāhīm, who was apparently behind the outbreak, attacked the MCA for its idleness and negligence, and this dispute led to a weakening of the activity in Jaffa.<sup>37</sup>

The dispute did not prevent the heads of the AE from exploiting what had happened in Jaffa for their own purposes. On the contrary; the outbreak was represented as decisive proof of the Bolshevik danger inherent in Zionist immigration and provided an

opportunity to demand that it be stopped,<sup>38</sup> even though the outbreak clearly did not only fail to win the AE's encouragement but was also censured by it. During the debates of the Fourth Palestinian Congress, in late May and early June 1921, Mūsā Kāzīm al-Ḥusaynī took care that the matter of the Jaffa disturbances should not be discussed at the plenary session and proposed to accept the "Government conclusion" that they broke out because of the Jewish Bolsheviks.<sup>39</sup>

The Government's reaction to the outbreaks was also important. The British Army was active in Ḥadera and Petah-Tikvah and prevented the destruction of these settlements. Many rioters were arrested and indicted in Jaffa, a special court of three judges being set up for these trials.<sup>40</sup> Several ships of the Royal Navy were hurriedly diverted to Palestine, the first arriving off the coast of Jaffa on 5th May. Jaffa and Tel-Aviv were put under martial law; it was forbidden to carry weapons; and the military forces in the country were reinforced by units from Egypt.<sup>41</sup> On Ṭul-Karm, Qāqūn, Kafr Sābā and the tribes of Wādi al-Ḥawārith and Abū Kishek collective fines were imposed amounting to 6,000 Egyptian pounds per village.<sup>42</sup> It should be noted that this collective fine, the arrests and the searches for arms and stolen goods which were carried out by the British Army in the Ṭul-Karm sub-district sufficed to cool the nationalist fervour in this area.<sup>43</sup> The Government hastened to create a legal instrument which would enable it to deal with this sort of offence—namely, the Ordinance for the Prevention of Crime, which sanctioned collective punishments.<sup>44</sup>

Alternatively, the Government took steps to appease the Arabs. The High Commissioner ordered the temporary cessation of Jewish immigration on 14th May, and even prevented the arrival of 150 immigrants who were already on their way to Palestine.<sup>45</sup> On 3rd June, the King's Birthday, the High Commissioner delivered a detailed speech in which he stated that from then onwards the level of Jewish immigration to Palestine would be dependent upon the state of the country's economy, and immigrants would be permitted only in accordance with the overall benefits they would bring to the country; he also promised that the inhabitants would have a say in administrative matters.<sup>46</sup> This speech constituted an official announcement of the policy of the British Government and was ratified by the British Cabinet and Parliament. Thus the principle of economic absorption capacity as the regulator of immigration was officially recognized. In the eyes of the Zionist movement this matter, and the dropping of the adjective "National" before the term "Home", appeared to be an abandonment of the original intention and spirit of the Balfour Declaration.<sup>47</sup>

One should not conclude from the fury of the Zionist reaction that the Arab side was enthusiastic. The halting of immigration in May did indeed make a positive impression on the Arabs,<sup>48</sup> but this was only a temporary measure. As to the principles enunciated by the High Commissioner on 3rd June 1921, the AE stated that they were not sufficient to assuage the Arabs' fears and reiterated its fundamental demands for the annulment of the Balfour Declaration, the prohibition of Jewish immigration and the establishment of a national government.<sup>49</sup> Not only had the announcement not included any concession in these matters, but it had not even promised the Arabs anything concerning the proposed status in the writ of Mandate for the Zionist Organization. In the opinion of Wyndham Deedes, Chief Secretary of the Government, the Arab fear was in the main a product of Article 4 of the writ of Mandate, which recognized the Zionist Organization as an official agency whose task was to advise the Government about everything connected with the realization of the National Home.<sup>50</sup>

These political consequences are important for an understanding of why the Palestinian national movement did not, up to 1929, harshly resort to violent attacks on the Jews. The outbreaks had, it is true, revealed the strength of the opposition to Zionism, but the Government's response was to send in the Army to quell the riots, and in the end the number of Arabs killed was no less than the number of Jewish dead (forty-one Jews and forty-four Arabs). Many of the rioters were tried, and the collective fines imposed on Tul-Karm and other villages were most effective in tempering the stormy spirit there. The Government's political concessions were not far-reaching, and it is highly doubtful if they encouraged further outbreaks. In any case, as we shall see in the next section, more mature moderate leadership took over, and in the Fourth Congress at the end of May 1921 it was determined that action should be taken through political means.

It seems that the young militant groups were not satisfied with this approach and in late summer 1921 tried to prepare the ground for further outbreaks. In September, meetings were held in different places in the country during which they tried to recruit the village notables in the coastal area, Haifa, Galilee and Judea for attacks on Jewish settlements and neighbourhoods.<sup>51</sup> The enthusiasm of the participants was great but remained verbal. On the other hand, in Jerusalem the extremists got their wish and succeeded in turning the protest demonstration of 2nd November into an anti-Jewish outbreak, which was checked only by virtue of the readiness of the Jewish defence force.<sup>52</sup> The AE and the traditional leadership

of the Jerusalem Arabs called for the maintenance of order and the cessation of disturbances and promised the Government to work in this direction.<sup>53</sup> However, their influence on the young extremist elements of *al-Nādi al-'Arabi* was not great, it seems, and the latter succeeded in recruiting a group of boys under the age of eighteen. The response of the police was immediate. The organizers of the demonstration, most of them members of *al-Nādi al-'Arabi*, were arrested, tried before special courts and severely punished, while the Arab leadership disassociated itself from the outbreak and even praised the police for its success in suppressing it.<sup>54</sup> This outbreak was the swan song of the extremists of *al-Nādi al-'Arabi* as far as violent action went; when one of their prominent colleagues, Kāmil al-Budayri, tried later to recruit the tribes of Transjordan and Najd for attacks on the Jews in Palestine, no action resulted.<sup>55</sup>

The reasons for the cessation of violent outbreaks from November 1921 until 1929 are partially seen in the outbreak in Jerusalem on 2nd November 1921 itself. The fact was that the traditional leadership was completely opposed to this method of action and apparently succeeded in influencing the community in this direction. The extremists won the support only of young men. No less important is the fact that after both the May 1921 disturbances and the November outbreak of that year, the Government reacted forcefully, punishing a considerable number of the participants in the riots. The punishments inflicted on the villages which had taken part in the May disturbances sufficed to dampen their enthusiasm and showed them that the chance for plunder held considerable risks for them.<sup>56</sup> The forceful reaction in Jerusalem immediately after 2nd November 1921 seemingly destroyed the foundation of the already limited influence which the extremists of *al-Nādi al-'Arabi* possessed.

However, these are not the only reasons for the peace which reigned in the country from late 1921 onwards. An important factor to which I will return was the group of pro-Arab British politicians who attained prominence in 1921. These men enjoyed great influence over the Palestinian leadership and advised them to refrain as much as possible from violent outbreaks, since these could only make the Palestinian-Arab movement odious to outsiders, showing it to be unworthy of self-rule.<sup>57</sup> The Palestinians were greatly impressed by this group, and hoped, at least until 1923, that it would have the power to change the Balfour Declaration policy; the AE cited this group's existence in its appeal as a reason for keeping order and refraining from violent outbreaks,<sup>58</sup> and there were also echoes in the press of this reasoning.<sup>59</sup>

No less important were two developments in Palestine itself. At the end of 1921 the Government agreed to bestow upon the Bedouins of the Beisan Valley the ownership rights over the lands of Sulṭān 'Abd ūl-Ḥamīd II, which had been confiscated by the Young Turk government (*mudawwarah* lands).<sup>60</sup> This affair was considered by the Palestinian nationalists as "a matter in which the native inhabitants [*al-Waṭaniyyūn*, i.e. the Arabs] had won out over the Zionists",<sup>61</sup> and was influential in creating considerable confidence in the Government's intentions towards the Arab population in general and the rural population in particular.<sup>62</sup> Last but by no means least was the setting up of the Supreme Muslim Council (see the following Chapter) in January 1922. The establishment of the SMC and its far-reaching and independent powers satisfied the demands of the Palestinian Muslims in a sphere crucial for them, and was regarded by them with great satisfaction.<sup>63</sup> What is more, al-Ḥājj Amin al-Ḥusayni, the leader of the young extremists from the beginning of the *al-Nādi al-'Arabi* days, was chosen as President of the SMC. Al-Ḥājj Amin began from then on to devote his energies to consolidating his position as President of the SMC and to turning it into an instrument of his own. For this purpose he needed the consent or at least the acquiescence of the Government to his position and activity in the SMC. He therefore completely reversed his stand on violent action and from then onwards worked, together with his supporters, to prevent the recurrence of violent outbreaks.<sup>64</sup>

The curbing of violent action on the part of the Palestinians at the end of 1921 and their reliance upon political activity greatly influenced the subsequent development of the anti-Zionist struggle of the Palestinian Arabs. When at the end of 1923 it became clear to everyone that the political effort to effect a change in the pro-Zionist policy of the British Government had failed, the reaction of many Palestinians was one of disappointment, despair, and sometimes a search for ways to get some good out of the situation by a policy of co-operation with the authorities (see Chapter Six). Under these circumstances it was difficult to resort to violence again. In this fashion Zionism gained seven years of undisturbed activity in Palestine, in the course of which it succeeded in nearly doubling the size of the Jewish *yishuv* and in enlarging the area of its map of settlement.

It is difficult to determine what would have happened had the violent Arab outbreaks not ceased, but one cannot escape the impression that certain developments, favourable from the Palestinian-Arab viewpoint, might well have come about ten years earlier than they did. In January 1930, under the influence of the August

1929 disturbances, the High Commissioner at the time, Sir John Chancellor, proposed such far-reaching changes in the writ of Mandate and in the pro-Zionist policy that, of the entire matter of the National Home, almost nothing would remain.<sup>65</sup> These proposals apparently had considerable influence upon the formulation of Government policy which was set out in the October 1930 White Paper. Also, in November 1921, under the influence of the May and November 1921 disturbances, Wyndham Deedes proposed an important change in the tentative writ of Mandate (which was ratified by the League of Nations only in July 1922)—namely, the removal of Article 4, which recognized the Zionist Organization as the official Jewish agency. In complete contrast to Chancellor, Deedes was one of Zionism's closest allies among the members of the Palestine Government, and his proposal, although not accepted, left an impression on the Colonial Office in London.<sup>66</sup> An atmosphere of pessimism prevailed at the time in the Colonial Office over the prospect of implementing the Balfour Declaration. It was stressed that the Government of Palestine lacked a police force sufficient to suppress disorders and that the only remedy was to improve the political situation and dispel the doubts of all sides. The outbreaks of November 1921, limited as they may have been, were considered a bad omen.<sup>67</sup> It appears that additional outbreaks would have strengthened the tendency of both the Palestine Government and the Colonial Office to take steps towards meeting the Arab demands.

It can of course be argued that just as in 1931, when Zionist pressure succeeded in countering the anti-Zionist turn taken in the White Paper of October 1930, so such pressure could have prevented a similar turn in 1922. However, it seems that the ten years that had passed had given real substance to the pro-Zionist policy of the British Government in two important respects. Firstly, policy followed by the government in Britain for thirteen years was extremely hard to reverse. The tendency to continue the policy of the previous government was strongly felt by all the British governments of that period. No less important was the fact that in 1922 the National Home was but an experiment in its early stages, the very existence of which was dependent upon the goodwill of the British Government, whereas in 1931 the dimensions of the National Home in Palestine and the strength of the Zionist movement abroad were far greater. This difference can best be illustrated by the stand which the Zionist movement took on the proposal for a legislative council. In 1922, when the proposal was first mooted, British pressure and Herbert Samuel's threat to resign sufficed to bring the Zionist Organization to accept the proposal; whereas from the

early 'thirties on, the Zionist Organization was determined to oppose this plan, and it was this opposition which brought about the failure of the proposal in early 1936.

#### THE FIRST DELEGATION TO BRITAIN

The main matter which occupied the Fourth Congress (end of May 1921), after it was decided to work towards the realization of national aims in legal ways only, was the selection of a delegation which would depart for Britain to work towards changing the pro-Zionist policy of the British Government. Various authors have claimed that the convening of the Congress and the decision to send a delegation to London received encouragement from the temporary cessation of Jewish immigration on 14th May and from Herbert Samuel's announcement of 3rd June of Government policy regarding the realization of the National Home.<sup>1</sup>

The truth is that the Congress should have been convened *before* the May 1921 disturbances, and the idea of sending a delegation had also come up before.<sup>2</sup> Already in March 1921 it had been tentatively decided by the Palestinian AE to send a delegation to Britain in order to bring the Palestinian claims to the attention of British public opinion, and the paper *al-Karmil* had begun campaigning in favour of sending the delegation.<sup>3</sup> The Palestinian leadership was encouraged by the existence of an English committee in support of the Palestine Arabs. This committee included a large group of clergymen, businessmen, former soldiers and politicians—among them Lord Sydenham and Lord Lemington, owners of the *Morning Post*, who encouraged the AE to send a delegation to London. The Palestinian leadership felt that the Balfour-Declaration policy could still be changed, and the existence of various factions throughout the world who were opposed to the ratification of the writ of Mandate containing that Declaration strengthened this feeling. They also certainly drew inspiration from the fact that several officials of the Palestine Government, including E. T. Richmond, Assistant Chief Secretary for political affairs, the Jaffa Governor, the Nazareth Governor, the aide to the Haifa Governor and others, were opposed to the policy of the National Home and sympathized with the Arab stand. In April 1922 Lord Milner (Churchill's predecessor in the Colonial Office) passed on to a Palestinian delegation information which was not meant to be published; the information implied that the whole idea of the National Home was no more than an experiment, and "if practical experience will show it to be impossible, there will be no escape

from altering the policy. I consider the entry of Jews into Palestine an experiment, and if they do not succeed and failure follows I shall recognize that a mistake has been made"—although, he stressed, it was still too early to determine if such a mistake had indeed been made.<sup>4</sup>

These facts undoubtedly contributed to the Palestinians' feeling that it was still possible to go to London in the hope of changing the policy on Zionism. The fact that the writ of Mandate was to be debated in May 1921 in the British Parliament supplied another important reason for sending the Delegation, but difficulties in raising the money and the May disturbances postponed the convening of the Congress until the end of that month.<sup>5</sup>

The discussion during the Congress regarding the sending of the Delegation was lengthy and tiresome, and until agreement had been reached on the manner of its selection many delegates from various districts refused to hand over the money which had been collected in their districts for financing the Delegation.

Two problems constituted obstacles in the way of assembling the Delegation: how to provide extensive representation for the Christians and for the various districts of the country. Najīb Naṣṣār, Editor of *al-Karmil*, demanded that the Delegation include two prominent clergymen: Bishop Ḥajjār, the head of the Greek-Catholic community in Palestine, and Sheikh Sulaymān al-Tāji al-Fārūqi, the well-known 'ālim from Ramleh. Their inclusion would help to highlight the religious opposition to Zionism and the struggle for the preservation of the sanctity of the Land. This proposal was rejected, in the opinion of Najīb Naṣṣār for personal reasons, because of Mūsā Kāzīm al-Ḥusayni's desire to be the head of the Delegation.<sup>6</sup> Finally on 2nd June it was decided to choose the Delegation by elections. Those elected were Mūsā Kāzīm al-Ḥusayni (50 votes), Tawfiq Ḥamād (48 votes), Amin al-Tamīni (45 votes), Mu'īn al-Mādi (41 votes), Fu'ād Sa'd (leader of the Greek-Catholic community in Haifa—31 votes) and Ibrāhīm Shammās (Greek-Orthodox from Jerusalem—29 votes). Rūḥi 'Abd al-Hādi and Shibli al-Jamal (a Jerusalem Protestant) were elected as Secretaries of the Delegation.<sup>7</sup>

The Delegation's election did not bring to an end the controversies over its composition. *Al-Karmil* continued to argue that its composition was not right, since it included no experts in the fields of politics, economics and law, nor speakers of foreign languages. Others had personal claims.<sup>8</sup> These controversies sufficed to delay the Delegation's departure until July.<sup>9</sup> When it finally departed, it was without Fu'ād Sa'd of Haifa and Rūḥi 'Abd al-Hādi. The former apparently refused to go in protest

against Bishop Ḥajjār's not having been chosen for the Delegation,<sup>10</sup> while the latter preferred to accept a position in the Palestine Government staff, in whose service he remained until the last days of the Mandate.<sup>11</sup> The Delegation was authorized by a special committee working for the Congress "to demand the rights of the Arab people in Palestine in all parts of the civilized world, and to make use of what means it deems suitable to defend the country and to attain its natural, economic and political rights. The Delegation is forbidden to decide upon any of the important matters which have been entrusted to its care before consulting the opinion of the Palestinian people."<sup>12</sup>

On 23rd June the Delegation met the High Commissioner at its own request in order to receive permission to depart for London. The HC attempted to convince its members that it was preferable that they remain in the country and cooperate with him in preparing the country's constitution. He drew their attention to his announcement of 3rd June and informed them of the Government's intention to establish an advisory council on an elective basis. However, the Delegation's aim was to effect the annulment of the Balfour Declaration and the pro-Zionist policy, rather than changes and improvements in the constitution of the country. It had reached the conclusion that only in London could it attain these goals. The HC did not try to delay its departure, but emphasized that it would not be recognized in London as an official representative Delegation.<sup>13</sup>

The possibility that the HC would carry on negotiations regarding the constitution with members of the AE who had remained in the country during the time that the Delegation was in London had to be forestalled. The AE and the Delegation thus decided, in the wake of the conversation with the HC, that "the AE will not enter into negotiations with the Government with respect to the constitution and other important political matters without bringing the matter before the Palestinian Arab Congress in plenary session".<sup>14</sup> And in fact, when the HC attempted in August 1921 to set up a committee of Palestinian notables which would present to him the positions of the Arab population respecting the constitution, the AE succeeded in preventing those invited from participating in the work of drafting the constitution. The latter informed the HC that only an elected parliament would be able to decide upon the drafting of a constitution in Palestine.<sup>15</sup> In this fashion all was prepared for the Delegation's departure: the goals to be attained in London were outlined, and the united support of the Palestinian hinterland was secured.

Following these birth pangs and the difficulties in collecting funds to finance the journey, the Delegation departed from Pales-

tine on 19th July. On its way to London it met with the Pope in Rome and strengthened his anti-Zionist approach.<sup>16</sup> Upon its arrival in London, the Delegation began in August 1921 to carry on a series of meetings and exchanges of letters with the heads of the Colonial Office, although it was not officially recognized as a delegation representing the Arab population of Palestine.<sup>17</sup>

The British stand on the negotiations was to refrain from entering any discussion on the basis of the pro-Zionist policy and the Balfour Declaration, but rather to direct the attention of the Palestinian Delegation to the declarations defining the Balfour Declaration, pointing out that it was two-sided and that the British Government "adhere equally firmly to the other part of the pledge, viz. that nothing shall be done which may prejudice the civil and religious rights of the existing non-Jewish communities".<sup>18</sup> Churchill stressed to the Government that there were difficulties in executing the Balfour pledge, but that he was prepared to take this path if that was the decision of the Cabinet.<sup>19</sup> The Cabinet concluded that the honour of the British Government was tied to the Balfour Declaration; a retreat from its pledges would involve a loss of prestige for Britain in the eyes of Jews all over the world.<sup>20</sup>

As to the constitution for Palestine, at this stage the British intended to propose a constitution which would enjoin the establishment of an advisory council, not a legislative council, as they later proposed; only three-quarters of the representatives of the population would be elected, the rest being appointed.<sup>21</sup> During the meetings of the committee of experts from the Colonial Office reviewing the proposed constitution that Norman Bentwich, the Legal Secretary of the Government of Palestine, had brought with him, it was clear to everyone that to carry out the pro-Zionist policy it was necessary to restrict the representative institutions of the country. However, the opinion current in the committee was that it was desirable to go beyond the establishment of an advisory body and to set up a legislative body with a majority composed of representatives of the population, though a few of them would be appointed. In like manner they determined that the guarantee for carrying out Government policy would be that central matters of the administration would remain exclusively in the hands of the HC,<sup>22</sup> and it would thus be possible to set up a legislative council which would be for the most part elective. The uncompromising stance of the Arab Delegation was the factor influencing them to offer this concession.<sup>23</sup>

In contrast to the British Government's stand—that there would be no retreat from the principles of the Balfour-Declaration policy—the Arab Delegation came armed with far-reaching demands. On

12th August it presented Churchill with a memorandum detailing its demands as follows: the setting up of a native (*waṭaniyyah*) government, responsible to a parliament elected by the inhabitants; the annulment of the plan for a Jewish National Home in Palestine; the cessation of Jewish immigration until this government was set up; the enforcement of the laws from the Ottoman period and nullification of the new laws until the formation of the above-mentioned government; and the free association of Palestine with its Arab neighbours.<sup>24</sup>

Following the presentation of this memorandum, three meetings took place in August (on the 12th, 22nd and 23rd) between Churchill and his aides and the Delegation; in the course of the meetings it became clear how great was the gap between these demands and what the Government was prepared to offer. Churchill said he was prepared to consider enlarging the political rights of the Palestinian population, if guarantees were given against the utilization of these rights for hindering the execution of the Government's promises to the Jews. Another matter he stressed was that the meaning of the Balfour Declaration had been given official and public confirmation in the address of the HC on 3rd June 1921, and that it was possible to reach a practical arrangement over the proportions of Jewish immigration for the next five years and then later to discuss the matter anew. In the meantime, representative institutions would be set up, and if the Palestinians were prepared to participate in carrying out Britain's obligations it would be possible to make them partners in the administration of the country. The Delegation's position that the Balfour Declaration must be annulled was in direct opposition to this, although it is possible to speculate from statements by some of its members that they would have been satisfied with a new and very limited interpretation of it.<sup>25</sup> As to the setting up of representative institutions, the Delegation did not insist during the course of the talks upon the principle of establishing a national government (*Hukūmah Waṭaniyyah*) but was prepared to enter discussions over several alternatives for representative bodies proposed by officials of the Colonial Office.

In the third conversation, on 23rd August, Major Young detailed these alternatives. The gist of them was that executive authority would remain in the hands of the HC, but the representatives of the population would have the right to criticize administrative policy. It was suggested that the Delegation choose one of three possibilities: 1) The establishment of a legislative body having the right to enact all laws of the country, but with the HC having the right to delay confirmation of a law and to pass the matter on to the Government in London. In such a case the international

obligations of Britain would be outside the authority of the legislative body. The Government representatives would not constitute a majority in the legislative body, but would be able to determine the result whenever the two elements of the population were split. 2) The establishment of an elected advisory body, without any Government representatives, but also without authority. 3) The establishment of a broader advisory body, but with some of its members appointed, so that the Government could keep a majority in it.<sup>26</sup> The Delegation as a unit refused to respond to these proposals during the meeting, although two of its members favoured accepting the first alternative<sup>27</sup> (see below); and on 1st September 1921 it sent a written reply. In this reply the Delegation rejected all the proposals, since they did not bestow executive authority on the inhabitants of the country; the proposed bodies did not fully represent the inhabitants of the country; the authority to enact all the laws was not given any of the proposed bodies; and the proposed legislative branch was devoid of control over the executive authority.<sup>28</sup> This reply is in the spirit of the demand to establish a government responsible to an elected parliament, with the presence of the Mandatory Government taking the form of advisors and counsellors in government departments and a High Commissioner as supervisor of the activities of the local government—the system put into effect in Iraq. Nevertheless, the impression left on British Government circles was that the Delegation was likely to be content with an Arab majority in the legislative body, although the Government tended not to agree with this.<sup>29</sup>

This reply brought the first stage of the talks to a standstill, although in September another meeting took place between Sir John Shuckburgh and other officials of the Colonial Office and several members of the Delegation, in the course of which Shuckburgh explained that their letter of 1st September had put an end to the possibility of continuing the talks. The Delegation moderated its tone slightly and requested that the talks be renewed.<sup>30</sup> On 22nd October 1921 the Delegation again addressed Churchill in writing and suggested a renewal of the talks. The tone of the letter was more conciliatory now. Instead of the annulment of the Balfour Declaration they proposed an agreement which would secure the rights, the interests and the freedom of the Palestinian people (in the Arabic version of the letter: "the rights of the Arabs") and at the same time would make provision for securing Jewish religious aims (in Arabic: "sentiment"), excluding all exclusive political advantages which would necessarily injure the rights of the Arabs. The Delegation proposed that the representative government set up would supervise internal affairs but would act accordingly to the

advice of the assisting power. Control of security would be in the hands of a local gendarmerie, thus saving the British Treasury much money. Control of immigration would be in the hands of the Palestinian people. They reiterated their opposition to the Government's policy of allowing foreign immigrants to continue to flow into the country; promises of future changes did not lessen this opposition.<sup>31</sup>

The response of the Colonial Office to this letter, which it interpreted as being something of a retreat, was to try once more to get the Delegation to meet with the heads of the Zionist Movement—after they had totally rejected this idea in August. It was also stressed that there was only a slight chance that the talks with the Delegation would be of any use; it was felt by the Colonial Office that they were unable to depart from their rigid stand because of the internal lack of confidence prevailing among its members and the advice of their English supporters. Instead, the principles of British Government policy should be phrased in such a way as to allay the fears of the Arabs over the Balfour Declaration and to give them publicity in an official manner.<sup>32</sup>

As we have seen, the meeting with Dr. Chaim Weizmann was fruitless. Thus from December onwards the talks and exchanges of letters between the Delegation and the Colonial Office were marked by an attempt on the part of the British to win the support of the Delegation for the principles of British policy—made public by Churchill in June 1922 (and included in Cmd. 1700)—and for the plan for a legislative council, as officially published as an Order-in-Council in August 1922.

The British intention was to give a more binding force, with respect to the manner of their publication, to the principles which had been included in Herbert Samuel's speech of 3rd June 1921. Thus, there would be a rejection of the interpretation that the Balfour Declaration had promised the Jews the establishment of a Jewish state in Palestine; emphasis on the fact that what was involved was a national home in Palestine and not Palestine as a national home; and basing the level of immigration on economic criteria and the degree of prosperity among the inhabitants of the country. However, just as in June 1921 the Palestinians were not satisfied by these principles, so they now hastened to explain that they could not accept a policy which treated the Arab natives of Palestine and the Jews who were not indigenous to the country as two groups with equal political rights, and that the matter of immigration must be transferred to the hands of a national government, which would know better than any other group to what extent the country could bear the burden of immigration.<sup>33</sup>

In early February Churchill let the Delegation in on the secret of the proposed fundamental constitution for Palestine (Order-in-Council, 1922), which based itself on the Balfour Declaration according to the above interpretation and included the proposal to establish a legislative council. The Delegation's response to this proposal was negative. Its stand was primarily a product of its opposition to recognizing the special tie existing between the Jews and Palestine, and their right to immigrate there, even were this right to be regulated by economic criteria. In their opinion the economic aspect was irrelevant, since "even if we assume that Palestine is not hurt economically by Jewish immigration, there is still no doubt regarding the harm that their presence [that of Jewish immigrants] necessarily causes Arab interests". As to the legislative council, the Delegation stated that "if it is not authorized to control vital affairs of the community, such as immigration, it will be valueless and impotent". In summation they reiterated their stand that a government should be set up which could be responsible to a parliament elected proportionately by the Muslim, Christian and Jewish inhabitants of the country who had lived there before the war. "We shall not feel secure until we have won this lawful right of ours."<sup>34</sup> In order to emphasize that the essential factor in their eyes was the matter of immigration, they demanded that this be stopped as long as the negotiations continued over forming guarantees against immigration, for the benefit of the inhabitants of Palestine.<sup>35</sup>

Churchill interpreted this stand as meaning that whether the Delegation accepted the proposal for a constitution or rejected it would be determined by the question of control of Jewish immigration. He therefore brought up the proposal—later included in the Order-in-Council and the policy declaration of 3rd June 1922—that an "immigration committee" be formed from representatives of the population in the legislative council, to advise the HC in matters concerning immigration. If differences of opinion arose between it and the HC, the controversial questions would be decided upon by the British Government.<sup>36</sup> However, this concession too was a long way from satisfying the Delegation, which demanded that immigration matters be turned over to the supervision of the representatives of the local population. Moreover, in their second letter to Churchill on the proposed constitution they phrased their opposition in more general terms, which were not at all limited to the question of immigration.<sup>37</sup>

Once these positions had been taken, all subsequent communications and talks became barren and of merely polemical content. Why did they nevertheless go on until June 1922? There were two

reasons for this: the Delegation kept hoping that it would be possible to convince other British statesmen of the justice of its demands; pro-Arab articles which appeared in several newspapers, including *The Times*, reinforced this belief. The second reason was that officials of the Colonial Office believed that talks should be maintained with the Delegation in order to prevent its returning to Palestine empty-handed before the tense holiday season in April (Passover, Easter, and al-Nebi Mūsā), and therefore drew the matter out for a few more months.<sup>38</sup>

When the policy declaration of 3rd June 1922 (Cmd. 1700) received the support, much sought by Churchill, of the House of Commons,<sup>39</sup> the AE decided to recall the Delegation to Palestine; thus in July 1922 the activities of the First Palestinian Delegation in London came to an end.<sup>40</sup> Ratification of the writ of British Mandate over Palestine by the League of Nations at the end of that month showed the measure of the Delegation's failure. Its only achievement was to win the support of a group of statesmen, mainly peers, who supported its demands and who succeeded in passing a pro-Arab resolution in the House of Lords.

It should be noted that the Delegation was not of one mind with respect to the various British proposals brought before it. Mu'in al-Mādi (a Muslim from Ijzim, near Haifa) and Shibli al-Jamal (a Protestant) leaned towards accepting the proposal of a legislative council, although they wanted to continue to bargain over its measure of jurisdiction;<sup>41</sup> the other Christian member, Ibrāhīm Shammās (Greek-Orthodox), was also a partner to these moderate views and took pains, upon his return to Palestine, to inform the Jerusalem Governor, Ronald Storrs, of this.<sup>42</sup> Shibli al-Jamal even said that "there should be an agreement between us and anybody else who wants to come to the country".<sup>43</sup> Regarding immigration he declared that until the establishment of the national government "laws should be made for control of immigration in accordance with the capacity of the country".<sup>44</sup> However, these stands did not influence the Delegation's position as a body. The three other Muslim members, and in the main Tawfiq Ḥamād of Nāblus, set the tone in the course of the talks; the moderate positions were not even mentioned in the Arabic versions of the proceedings, which were distributed among the members of the AE.<sup>45</sup> In Palestine rumours were being spread that extremism paid off and that the British Government was giving in to the demands of the Delegation.<sup>46</sup>

Long afterwards, during the storm of argument between the two camps of the Palestine Arabs, the opponents of the leadership exaggerated the extremism of those who set the tone in the First

Delegation.<sup>47</sup> Their accusations to the effect that the First Delegation had rejected British proposals to limit Jewish immigration to 3,000 immigrants a year and to restrict the National Home to a small area comprising a mere forty square miles had no basis in fact. In the light of the position taken by the Colonial Office officials at the talks, it would be reasonable to conclude that the lack of any mention whatsoever of proposals such as these can only mean that such proposals were never brought up.

The extremist position within the Delegation triumphed, it seems, owing to two main factors. Firstly, the Muslim members represented the decisive element in the population, whereas the Christians represented only a small minority. Among the Muslim members were to be found the President of the Delegation and his deputy, Tawfiq Hamād. Shibli al-Jamal, the Christian member, was attached to the Delegation only as Secretary, mainly because of his good command of English—since the other members of the Delegation did not speak the language. A second factor which contributed to the triumph of the extremist position was the pressure exerted on the Delegation from Palestine. This pressure revolved around several points: not to compromise to any degree in the matter of opposition to Jewish immigration to Palestine;<sup>48</sup> not to agree to talks with the heads of the Zionist Movement;<sup>49</sup> not to accept the constitution proposed for the country in February 1922;<sup>50</sup> and towards the end of the negotiations, when their failure was already obvious, to again demand the independence of the country and Arab unity, and not be content with opposition to the Balfour Declaration alone.<sup>51</sup> Another factor already mentioned was the advice of the committee of English supporters to adopt extremist positions, and the hope that the Lloyd George government would fall and in place of the coalition would come a Conservative government, which would change British policy with respect to Zionism. A final factor was the nature of the Delegation's authorization. The need to obtain the Congress's prior confirmation of any arrangement which the Delegation was likely to make with the Colonial Office substantially weakened the hands of the moderates. They feared that in any confrontation between them and the extremist members of the Delegation, the moderates would be denounced before the Congress as traitors and no attention would be paid to their stand. This sort of authorization, which bore witness to the lack of mutual confidence between the community and its leaders, was characteristic of the lack of integration which at that time marked Palestine's Arab population.

The Palestinian Delegation's struggle to win the complete annulment of the Balfour Declaration policy or at the least its limitation

to a significant degree was not carried on only against the British Government. The Zionists were an important partner to this struggle. The Government's position was, as we have seen, that things were not so bad and that the Arab fear of the content of the Balfour Declaration was without foundation. For this reason the Government needed to prove that the Zionist Organization was a moderate group, whose demands did not exceed the limits of the official interpretation of the Balfour Declaration. And indeed, the moderation of the Zionist Organization during this period was an important factor in the rejection of the far-reaching demands of the Palestinian delegation. In contrast to the Arab Delegation's demand to deny the Jews any rights at all in Palestine, the Twelfth Zionist Congress in Carlsbad adopted a resolution in September 1921 stating that "the absolute desire of the Jewish people is to live with the Arabs in conditions of unity and mutual honour and together with them to turn the *common homeland* (author's italics) into a flourishing land, the consolidation of which will ensure each of its peoples undisturbed national development";<sup>52</sup> as opposed to the Arab Delegation's refusal to enter negotiations with the Zionist leaders, the latter agreed immediately to the request of the Colonial Office to hold such talks; and in contrast to the Arab Delegation's rejection of the proposal for a constitution and of the declaration of British policy, the Zionist Organization accepted them.<sup>53</sup>

#### BOYCOTT OF THE ELECTIONS TO THE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

The ratification of the Mandate in July 1922 constituted a bitter disappointment for the Palestinian nationalists. After over three years of struggle against it, the Jewish National Home had now won widespread international approval, and even the last-minute efforts of the Vatican to secure rejection of the ratification were to no avail. The disappointment was the greater because only a few months earlier the AE had believed that the Delegation "had lately achieved rapid progress".<sup>1</sup> The Delegation itself was at the time no less optimistic than the AE in Palestine.<sup>2</sup> In such an atmosphere of disappointment it was obvious that the declaration of British policy in June 1922, the main points of which had been rejected by the Delegation in the course of the talks, could not have been a reassuring or moderating factor for the Palestinian nationalists. A mood was created in favour of taking stronger measures to attain the national goals, including non-payment of taxes and civil disobedience.<sup>3</sup> During the debates in the Council of the League of Nations over ratification of the Mandate, strikes

were held in the cities of Palestine, in accordance with the decision of the AE, and it was openly announced that the Palestinian population did not accept the Mandate based upon the Balfour Declaration.<sup>4</sup> The demands for complete independence for Palestine and dissatisfaction with mere opposition to the Balfour Declaration re-emerged.<sup>5</sup>

Nevertheless, the AE was far from wanting a split with the Government. Before the strike of 12th–13th July it did everything possible to explain to its supporters that care must be taken to keep the peace and to refrain from any step which might lead to riots, and it made an arrangement with the Government respecting division of labour in preserving order.<sup>6</sup>

The disappointment caused by the failure of the Delegation's activities and the ratification of the Mandate on the one hand, and the desire to avoid a violent split with the Government on the other, formed the background for the convening of the Fifth Palestinian Congress on 22nd August 1922. Originally it was planned to convene the Congress a month earlier, on 20th July, in Jaffa, the assumption being that by then the Delegation would have returned to Palestine,<sup>7</sup> but the delay in the Delegation's return forced a postponement. It seems that this delay was not accidental, but rather a product of the Delegation's perplexity over the policy which should be adopted towards the Government. We have seen that it was not united during the course of the negotiations. Following the failure, the President of the Delegation and the AE, Mūsā Kāzīm al-Ḥusayni, refused to go very far in adopting a strong line towards the authorities. As opposed to this, in Palestine an extremist mood was emerging which was destined to be dominant at the Congress. Therefore, the moderate members of the Delegation tried to gain time in the hope that tempers would cool.<sup>8</sup> However, the extremists at home urged the Delegation to return as soon as possible and not to stay in Egypt on its way to Palestine—in order to hold the Congress on the second date that had been fixed.<sup>9</sup> It appears that the transfer of the site of the Congress to Nāblus also met with the approval of the extremists, inasmuch as this purely Muslim city was known for its extreme anti-Zionist position, and Tawfīq Ḥamād, the most extreme member of the Delegation, was in charge of the nationalist camp there. It should be noted that the explanation of the change of location given to the Government was the desire to avoid provocations which were likely to be caused by holding the Congress in a mixed city.<sup>10</sup>

Typical of the spirit prevailing among the Congress's organizers was the attempt to include in the Congress the extremist circles of Transjordan and the tribal heads there, who were at the time

involved in a conflict with 'Abdāllah, the newly-appointed Emir.<sup>11</sup> This was the first and only attempt—which proved unsuccessful—to recruit the population of Transjordan to the national struggle in Palestine. In years to come 'Abdāllah was to involve himself in Palestinian affairs and he was to be supported by the oppositional segment of the Arabs of Palestine and not by the AE.

In the previous chapter we noted that because of this mood the Fifth Congress had a more extremist character than its predecessor. Aside from the phenomena mentioned there, the important and central topic of debate was the question of boycotting the elections for the legislative council, which was to be set up according to the fundamental law (Order-in-Council, 1922) issued on 10th August 1922, and which had been previously rejected by the Delegation. At the Congress various proposals were made as to how to make the boycott effective, and in the end it was decided to approve this policy.<sup>12</sup> Characteristic of the atmosphere prevailing at the Congress was the fact that the three delegates who dominated it were 'Abd al-Qādir al-Muẓaffar, 'Izzat Darwaza and Salīm 'Abd al-Raḥmān al-Ḥājj Ibrāhīm—all three of them leaders of the militant unity movement from the days of "Southern Syria".<sup>13</sup>

Among the various measures proposed at the Congress to implement the boycott of the elections, three were later revealed to be extremely effective. The Delegations to London and the Hejaz (see Chapter 7) were required to travel through the country directing propaganda against the elections; it was determined that the *imāms* in the mosques were to be guided, so that the Friday sermons "would suit the need"; and it was decided that written obligations were to be obtained from the village *mukhtārs* stating that their villages would take no part in the elections.<sup>14</sup>

Mūsā Kāẓim al-Ḥusayni and the moderates in the Delegation were unhappy over this development.<sup>15</sup> At the end of 1922 contact was made between Mūsā Kāẓim and Kalvarisky, and we have seen that the former promised Kalvarisky to refrain from extremist anti-Zionist activity. However, the course of events before and during the Congress showed that he was far from being omnipotent and that the radical spirit at the Congress was too strong for him to hold in check; this, at least, was the opinion of the two heads of the Government in Palestine, Herbert Samuel and Wyndham Deedes.<sup>16</sup> The moderates in the Delegation tried to prevent the boycott of elections in September and October 1922 by seeking certain governmental concessions. Ibrāhīm Shammās explained in a conversation with Ronald Storrs, the Jerusalem Governor, that the source of the Delegation's opposition to the constitution and to participation in the elections was Article 4 of the Mandate (which

recognized the Zionist Organization as an official advisory body to the government in matters connected with the National Home); were this article to be annulled, the situation would change. Ibrāhīm Shammās chose this matter precisely because he knew that the HC (and the Chief Secretary) had proposed in late 1921 and early 1922 to abrogate this article, which appeared to them to be the chief cause of Arab opposition to the Mandate.<sup>17</sup> Another compromise proposal of the moderates, which was indirectly brought to the attention of the Government, was that the Government should recognize the Delegation as representing the people of Palestine, and following this recognition would consult it about the possibility of cooperation and participation in the elections; no positive response was forthcoming from the Government and thus the last obstacle was removed from the path of the boycott.<sup>18</sup>

We have seen that the prime motive force behind the aim of boycotting the elections was the young militant element. Their ability to impose their will on the AE, the Congress and the vast majority of Palestinians resulted from several causes. Their argument, that participation in the elections for a legislative council on the legal basis of the Mandate and the Balfour Declaration was equivalent to the acceptance of these documents, contained much truth. The authority of the legislative council was limited, every matter which contradicted the Mandate being out of its jurisdiction, such as bills for the cessation of immigration and the sale of land to the Jews—although it was decided that an immigration committee would be set up from among the elected members of the council to advise the HC on immigration quotas. However, its proposed composition was such (ten Government officials plus the HC and twelve members elected by the community, of whom eight were to be Muslims, two Christians and two Jews) as to allow the combined votes of the Government officials and the Jewish representatives to defeat resolutions hostile to the National Home. Thus, claimed the opponents of the legislative council, the compensation for what could be interpreted as acquiescence to the Mandate and the Balfour Declaration was very small indeed.

It should be noted that a larger measure of compensation might well have brought the members of the AE to accept the proposal. In any case, Jamāl al-Ḥusayni was prepared in the summer of 1923 to accept the plan for a legislative council on condition that all its members be elected; an upper chamber would be set up with equal representation for the Government and the Jews on the one hand and the Arabs on the other; the elected council would supervise Government activities, including immigration; immigration would be permitted to members of *all* religions in accordance

with the economic absorptive capacity of the country; in the case of differences of opinion between the elected council and the HC, the upper chamber would decide; if its decision was also rejected by the HC, the matter would then be referred to the League of Nations. The acceptance of this proposal would not be interpreted as acquiescence to the Mandate or the Balfour Declaration.<sup>19</sup>

The victories of the Turks under the Mustafa Kemal over the Greeks this time aroused a great deal of enthusiasm among the Muslim population. The community understood that the Treaty of Sèvres would be annulled, and perhaps with it the Balfour Declaration; thus the call for a resolute stand and for non-cooperation with the Government in the matter of the elections fell on fertile soil.<sup>20</sup> The Government of Palestine understood that these expectations from the Lausanne Conference were not furthering the matter of participation in the elections and therefore proposed to the Colonial Office to consider putting them off until after the Conference—when it would be clear that the status of Palestine had not changed in the wake of the Conference. However, the Colonial Secretary stated that as nothing would change at the Conference with respect to the Mandate over Palestine, there was no reason to postpone the elections—an act which the Palestinians would interpret as simply a sign of weakness.<sup>21</sup> A third reason was that in January 1922 the SMC was set up and Amīn al-Ḥusayni, the Mufti of Jerusalem since 1921 and one of the leaders of the young militant element, was elected as President. We shall see below how this body helped carry out the resolution to boycott the elections.

The Government's practical measures towards holding the elections began with the census of October 1922. At first the AE agreed to the census, but then changed its mind and made its support for it conditional upon registration of Palestinians abroad as well. Under the AE's pressure the Palestine Government accepted this demand, and the AE appealed to the Arab population to take part in the census—since exposing the Arab majority in Palestine was likely to serve the Arab cause. This affair showed the ability of the AE and its supporters to confound the Government's purposes; the Government's wooing of the AE and the pressure put upon the AE to persuade the community to take part in the census served only to strengthen its position.<sup>22</sup>

After the census, the Government began making administrative preparations for holding the elections. The preparation of lists of voters and their distribution made the help of the *mukhtārs* indispensable, and they were used by the Government in their official capacity. The Government was also at pains to distribute several propaganda pamphlets stressing the benefit which the Palestinians

would derive from the establishment of the legislative council. It was stressed that an immigration committee would be set up to deal with the question of fixing quotas for immigration, that nearly all legislative acts would have to receive the confirmation of the legislative council, and that participation in the elections did not mean agreement with the Balfour Declaration. The Chief Secretary, Wyndham Deedes, toured the Samaria area and tried to explain these matters personally to the village *mukhtārs*.<sup>23</sup>

The Government did not force the community to take part in the elections, nor did it attempt to entice it into doing so by making government aid or other benefits conditional upon such participation. The policy was not to exert pressure either upon those who did or those who did not want to vote, although propaganda against participating in the elections was permitted.<sup>24</sup> The Chief Secretary announced this policy in a circular to all the District Governors, and generally speaking the latter adopted this principle of neutrality.<sup>25</sup> The number of Arab complaints against Government officials who attempted to bring about participation in the elections by exerting pressure was very small.<sup>26</sup>

This neutrality on the part of the Government, which had not been customary in Palestine when elections for the Ottoman Parliament were held, was mistaken by many for a lack of desire on the part of the Government for the population to participate in the elections; at least those circles which did want to take part in the elections were bitterly disappointed with the Government, and interpreted its stance in this way.<sup>27</sup> There were even several cases in which Arab officials of the Government, serving as district officers, advised the populace not to take part in the elections or revealed to the opponents of the elections the names of the candidates for secondary electors, thus enabling them to exert pressure against the latter.<sup>28</sup> The fact that E.T. Richmond, the Assistant Chief Secretary for political affairs, was a fierce opponent of Zionism and of the policy of the National Home also apparently contributed to the Government's neutrality being interpreted far beyond its original intention. The Palestinian moderates even accused him of advising the Palestinian leaders not to participate in the elections.<sup>29</sup>

In contrast to the Government's neutral-liberal stand, the Palestinian AE began to organize a vigorous campaign immediately after the Fifth Congress to persuade the population not to take part in the elections.<sup>30</sup> The first step, in September 1922, was a resolution that the members of the Delegation would make trips throughout the cities of Palestine to explain to the community the damage participation in the elections could bring.<sup>31</sup> A crucial role in

organizing the boycott was held by the Muslim-Christian Associations (in Jerusalem also *al-Nādi al-'Arabi*) which in late 1922 existed in most of the cities. Urban leaders went to the villages and directed their propaganda mainly at the *mukhtārs* and the local notables. A central argument which had much cogency concerned the Kemalist victory. The villagers were told that the Turkish National Pact enjoined holding a plebiscite to determine the will of the Arab lands. If a legislative council composed of a Jewish and English majority were to be elected, this body would then be the legal spokesman for Palestine.<sup>82</sup> The associations saw to it that the village heads of the *ḥamūlahs* in the towns and cities signed declarations obligating them to boycott the elections; they even made them send telegrams to the Government in this spirit.<sup>83</sup> When the arts of persuasion failed, the nationalists turned to physical pressure, threats, uprooting of crops and similar acts against those who refused to add their names to these declarations.<sup>84</sup>

The nationalist activists of Nāblus, headed by Tawfiq Ḥamād and Ḥāfiẓ Ṭawqān, played an important role in ensuring the boycott would take place even outside their district. From the start of the campaign it was clear to them that in the Ramleh sub-district and in the North there were elements which were prepared to take part in the elections and they therefore went to great lengths to persuade the heads of the community in these areas not to do so. They went several times to the areas and met with the heads of the religious communities, but their success was much smaller than in their home district.<sup>85</sup>

The most potent factor in the boycott of elections was the Muslim religious establishment with its various components. The mosques became the most important stages for propaganda; the *imāms* and *khaṭībs* brought the matter of the boycott into their sermons, presenting it as a religious duty; the congregations assembled for prayer swore collective oaths not to take part in the elections; and against any who would dare to participate threats were made to the effect that they would be excommunicated and their dead not brought to burial. The Government on the other hand was unable to make use of the pulpits of the mosques for propaganda in favour of the elections and was even prevented from putting up its announcements in the mosques, which were the most important—and sometimes the only—places of communal gathering.<sup>86</sup>

At the head of the campaign were the local muftis. They delivered sermons and encouraged the religious functionaries in their locations to work for the success of the boycott. Three muftis (those of Haifa, Tiberias and Safed) were members of the Palestinian AE; obviously, it was difficult, and often impossible, to distinguish

the occasions when they acted as mufti and those when they acted as members of the national movement.<sup>37</sup>

In the midst of all this activity, Sheikh 'Abd al-Qādir al-Muẓaffar was particularly conspicuous. The fact that he was an *'ālim*, a talented orator and a veteran of much national activity gave his activities special weight. From the moment of his return to Palestine from his mission to Turkey (see following sub-chapter) in early 1923, he devoted all his time and energy to propagandizing against participation in the elections. He went from city to city, meeting everywhere with the heads of the community and the religious leaders and delivering fervent sermons in the mosques during Friday prayers. One of his arguments was that if the Government were to fail in the elections, the present HC would go and would be replaced by an Arab HC. He finished his sermons by making the community vow not to participate in the elections. A Jewish observer who was familiar with the Arabic press and public life described al-Muẓaffar's work thus: "When the AE wanted to influence the masses not to take part in the elections, it sent 'Abd al-Qādir al-Muzghar [al-Muẓaffar] to make speeches in all the cities and all the important villages. The Muslim Council hastened to send orders to all cantors in the mosques to forego their sermons in favour of his political sermons. The masses were of course influenced by this, especially when threats were made against those who 'separated themselves from the community' to the effect that in the future they would not be allowed to pray in the mosques and especially not in the Temple [al-Ḥaram al-Sharīf] in Jerusalem and in the Cave of Machpela [al-Ḥaram al-Ibrāhīmi] in Hebron, and that their dead would not be buried in the Muslim cemeteries."<sup>38</sup>

The Government saw clearly that al-Muẓaffar's part in this propaganda was central, and recognized its character.<sup>39</sup> One might therefore ask why it permitted this activity to continue. It appears that the answer lay in the general policy of the Government towards the SMC (see Chapter Four), namely complete avoidance of any interference in Muslim religious affairs in general and in the SMC in particular. Only when it became apparent that things were going too far, when al-Muẓaffar appeared in the main mosque of Palestine, al-Aqṣā, and caused a storm there—only then did the Government direct the attention of the SMC to the fact that it was undesirable that places of worship be used for political activity. The President of the Council agreed to take steps to prevent the recurrence of such cases, but in actual fact al-Muẓaffar made a second appearance in the al-Aqṣā pulpit, and it was only when he attempted this a third time that he was prevented from doing so.<sup>40</sup>

The use made of the mosques for propaganda purposes and the

harnessing of the Muslim functionaries to this end could not have been done without the agreement and the encouragement of the SMC. What brought the SMC to adopt such a policy? The accepted version was put forward by the opponents of the SMC and the AE leadership and was published years later in their journal *Mir'āt al-Sharq*. They claimed that the President of the SMC did not want any organized political body that was officially recognized by the Government other than the SMC. He thus feared that the Muslim members of the legislative council would interfere in the affairs of the SMC and would diminish its freedom of action.<sup>41</sup> Even more widespread was the opinion that the opposition of the SMC and the AE to the legislative council was a product of family interests; the al-Ḥusayni family wanted to keep its monopoly of leadership positions.<sup>42</sup>

There is undoubtedly some truth in these explanations, but it seems that they do not fully explain the matter. It should be recalled that Amīn al-Ḥusayni was not alone in his violent opposition to the setting up of a legislative council; a whole group of nationalists, former "Southern Syria" men, were the prime motive force behind the resolution to boycott at the Fifth Congress, and they played a major role in its execution ('Abd al-Qādir al-Muzaffar, 'Izzat Darwaza etc.). No less important is the fact that the nationalists of Nāblus stood out by their activities towards the implementation of the resolution in their district and outside it. The latter were by no means among the family or the loyal supporters of Amīn al-Ḥusayni, and in certain conditions, as we shall see in Chapter Five, even lent a hand to his rivals in the Palestinian community. The al-Ḥusayni family was not all of one mind, and we have seen how Mūsā Kāzīm al-Ḥusayni, the President of the AE, maintained "special relations" with Zionist elements and was not as extreme in his views as Amīn al-Ḥusayni. In the late 'twenties and early 'thirties the split between the two widened. What is more, the success in organizing the boycott of the elections bears witness to the fact that the strength of the SMC and the AE was at the time great enough to win the support of the majority of the population for their policy; had they wanted it could they not have succeeded, in having members and supporters of the al-Ḥusayni family elected to the legislative council? It thus seems an exaggeration to ascribe the opposition to the elections to the al-Ḥusayni family interest only; in my opinion, what was at work here was a consistent anti-Zionist conception of a militant group, to which was joined the desire of its leader to attain a position of dominance and to secure the position of the SMC as the central leadership body.

The AE emerged the victors in this unequal contest between a

neutral-liberal government on the one hand and the national movement making use of intensive propaganda and religious pressure to attain its goal on the other. In the elections which took place in late February 1923, and which were extended for another week, only a small minority of the Palestinian Arab population participated. This non-participation was manifested in two ways: abstention from nominating candidates for secondary electors, who would elect the members of the legislative council; and non-participation of primary electors in the voting in areas in which there were more nominations than there were secondary electors. The Muslim community was allowed 663 secondary electors, but the number of candidates even after the extension of the nomination period was only 107. The Christians were allowed 59 secondary electors; there were 19 candidates (in the Jewish and Druze communities candidates were nominated according to the number of electors fixed upon, 79 and 8 respectively). The elections were actually held in only 20 constituencies, and the percentages of participation were, according to the communities: 18% Muslim and 5.5% Christian (among the Jews the percentage reached 50%). The boycott was almost total in the Southern district, in Samaria and in the sub-district of Jaffa (excluding the Ramleh region); there was some participation in the Jerusalem sub-district; in the Northern district and in the Ramleh region there was considerable participation.<sup>43</sup>

The variance among the regions was in the main a product of the uneven distribution of the elements opposing the SMC and the AE ("the opposition" discussed in Chapter Five). The latter were found for the most part in Jerusalem and the North. It is also striking that total boycott occurred in wholly conservative Muslim areas (the South and Samaria) that were united in opposition to the elections, where the boycott had been presented as a religious precept and Muslim enthusiasm over the victories of Mustafa Kemal was particularly fervent. It is likely that in areas which were more mixed from the religious standpoint, the inhabitants were open to more varied influences, and their conduct was thus not so uniform.

Years later the opinion was voiced in various quarters that by boycotting the elections and causing the failure of the idea of a legislative council the Palestinians forfeited an important instrument that might have aided them in their national struggle.<sup>44</sup> One of the arguments used by the British Government in its talks with the Palestinian Delegation was that the Delegation was not an official body and had no right to claim to be the authorized representative of the Palestinians. Such an argument could hardly have been used against a legislative council acting officially. Another argument

is that the Government would not have ignored the stand of the majority of the population's representatives in this body, but would have been inclined to hear their demands. True, it would have had a majority in the Council so long as the Jewish representatives supported it, but it is most unlikely that it would have been willing to rely for long on the Jewish votes against the votes of the representatives of the vast majority of inhabitants. In this manner the Palestinians could have influenced legislation on everyday administrative matters and perhaps could have impeded the development of the Jewish National Home. The immigration committee which was to have been set up alongside the legislative council was likely to have been influential in fixing quotas for Jewish immigration.

On the other hand, it must not be forgotten that the council would have been without the right to debate and decide upon matters opposed to the Mandate, and that the degree to which the administration would have been subordinate to the council was almost nil. Moreover, participation in the council could indeed have been described as acceptance of the Mandate and Balfour Declaration—and this would have been too bitter a pill for the Palestinians to swallow, even though they might see the benefits of such a body. It should be recalled that at that time they expected that political circumstances, international and British, would bring about a change of policy: namely the abrogation of the Treaty of Sèvres in the wake of the Kemalist victory, and the fall of Lloyd George's government in October 1922. Clearly, they wanted to avoid creating the impression of being resigned to the Mandate.

By February 1923, when it was clear that the Government of Bonar-Law would continue the Palestine policy of its predecessor, feeling had reached such a pitch that retreat was impossible.

It seems that the Palestinians' mistake was to believe that participation in the legislative council meant acquiescence to the Mandate and the Balfour Declaration, while everyday cooperation with the Government and acceptance of jobs in it were considered axiomatically permissible. The boycott of the legislative council could perhaps have been effective if it had been the high point of a policy of non-cooperation with the Government. Had they refrained from manning its staff and made the Government rely solely on Jewish officials—which would have aroused much bitterness in the country—and had they refused to act within the framework of the municipalities and the SMC and forced the Government to run these intermediary bodies itself, then boycotting the legislative council would surely have achieved better results. But as the Palestinian community was not able or willing to adopt such

a policy, which would have demanded a large measure of sacrifice and solidarity, there was little point in boycotting only the highest echelon of the Government.

If we attempt to judge the boycott of the council in the light of developments in Palestine in later years, we are forced to conclude that the importance of the boycott lay in the fact that it demonstrated the degree of influence attained by the AE and its supporters among the Palestinian community. However, the boycott contributed very little to further developments in Palestine, as the history of the years that followed shows.

Even had the Palestinians taken part in the elections and the council been set up, the change effected would have been slight. True, the council was likely to have influenced to some degree the Government's stand on everyday administrative matters and even on legislation, but in reality the pace of development of the National Home was determined by factors which were beyond the control of the Government of Palestine. One of these factors was the British Government, which until the late 'thirties was not inclined to take the advice of the Palestine Government to moderate the pro-Zionist policy (e.g. Herbert Samuel's advice to annul Article 4 of the Mandate, or Sir John Chancellor's advice in January 1930 to do away with most of the provisions on Zionism in the Mandate)—and when it did take a step in this direction in October 1930, it was only to repent it in February 1931. The second factor was the external pressure which impelled Jews to immigrate to Palestine, a pressure which alternately grew and abated (cf. the anti-Jewish economic legislation in Poland in 1924-5, and the Nazi rise to power in Germany). The third factor was the ability of the Zionist Organization to call upon financial resources to finance Zionist activity (compare the poverty of the early 'twenties and 1926-8 with the situation from 1929 on, after the setting up of the enlarged Jewish Agency).

#### THE SECOND DELEGATION—THE APPEAL TO THE TURKS

The ratification of the Mandate in July 1922 occurred just before the decisive Turkish victories over the Greeks in Anatolia (September 1922). This coincidence in time was one of the reasons why the ratification of the Mandate did not lead to despair and political apathy. News of the Turkish victories aroused great enthusiasm among the Palestinian Muslim population. Newspapers printed articles in praise of Mustafa Kemal. One of them appealed to the Palestinians as follows: "Learn from Kemal, follow in his

footsteps and free yourselves of your illusions and your traditions. Make strong your will and keep up your activities if you wish to gain recognition.”<sup>1</sup> On one occasion the streets of Jerusalem were decorated with pictures of Mustafa Kemal.<sup>2</sup> When the extent of the Turkish victories became known, enthusiasm for Kemal, who was regarded as the saviour of Islam, flooded the entire country. Following the recapture of Izmir from the Greeks, celebration parades were organized in Nāblus and Gaza and Turkish flags hoisted. Festive prayers for the Turks were held in the mosques, and a large thanksgiving gathering took place in the al-Aqṣā mosque in Jerusalem.<sup>3</sup> Contributions were also collected (about £500) for Turkish war victims.<sup>4</sup>

Alongside the joy which the Palestinian Muslims felt over the triumph of the Turkish Muslims, there was the hope that this triumph would directly influence the question of Palestine.<sup>5</sup> Their hope was not unfounded. The Treaty of Sèvres was one of the cornerstones of British policy towards the Arabs. In the opinion of the British it was this Treaty—which had left in the hands of the Allies the fate of Arab lands previously belonging to the Ottoman Empire—which was decisive and not Article 22 of the Covenant of the League of Nations. The British believed that this article should be interpreted so as to be consistent with the Treaty.<sup>6</sup> Now that the Turks had won and the whole question of the Treaty was to be debated again at a new peace conference, the Palestinians believed that the foundation of the Mandate had collapsed and the question of Palestine had been re-opened. Palestine had in their opinion reverted to the status of “occupied enemy territory”, and its future was dependent solely upon the will of its inhabitants.<sup>7</sup> The fact that the Turkish National Pact had made the principle of self-determination of the Arab lands one of its bases (Article 1 of the Pact) enhanced their belief in the correctness of this viewpoint.<sup>8</sup>

On the surface the joy over the Turkish victory seems perplexing. Only a few years before, the *Sharif* Ḥusayn had rebelled openly against the Turkish authorities and called on all Arabs to join in. After the war, the Arabs of the entire Fertile Crescent had not ceased extolling this revolt, claiming to have joined it in their thousands. Their demand for independence was largely based on this argument, with the Palestinians especially making use of it, while the Ḥusayn-McMahon correspondence became part and parcel of their arguments on the Palestine question. Now, no sooner had the Kemalists triumphed than the Palestinians began to show great enthusiasm and to attach great hopes to the results of this victory. Was this just expediency, or did the wave of

happiness and hope reveal more basic feelings and trends? Certain evidence points to the second explanation.

We have seen that before the First World War the Arab national movement was extremely limited in scope, comprising no more than 150 active members. It took root in Palestine only to a very small degree. For the most part, the Muslim population lived contentedly under Ottoman-Muslim rule. Dissatisfaction and bitterness developed mainly during the First World War as a result of difficult conditions, famine, and the iron rule of Jemal Pasha. The appearance on the scene of the Sharifian rebels and the establishment of their semi-independent regime in Damascus helped transform the dissatisfaction with the Turks into Arab nationalist feeling.<sup>9</sup> However, the political developments in the Fertile Crescent came nowhere near the expectations of the Arab nationalists. In place of Muslim rule there came European-Christian rule, bringing dreams of Arab independence to nought.

For many of the Palestinian notables, this political change was a personal blow; under the Ottomans many of them had served as governors, senior officials, department heads, members of Parliament and officers, whereas now all the high offices in the Palestinian administration were taken over by British people, a few of whom were Jews. This fact certainly helped prompt their enlistment at the head of the nationalist movement, which strove to do away with Zionism and to enlarge the measure of self-rule; but when it became clear that the British Mandate, along with its Zionist elements, was of lasting duration, feelings of regret over the dissolution of the Ottoman Empire and a longing for the more rosy past began to emerge.<sup>10</sup>

It is not surprising, therefore, that in 1920 various critics were already bringing claims against the Hāshemites to the effect that they were responsible for the break-up of the Arab world and the exchange of Muslim rule for Christian.<sup>11</sup> Several years later a Palestinian newspaper stated that with the fall of Faysal's regime many Palestinians turned once again to the Turks and carried on propaganda in the country in favour of their rule.<sup>12</sup> Others claimed that the afflictions of British rule, such as its interference in Muslim affairs, were but a punishment for rebelling against the Muslim government of the Caliphate.<sup>13</sup> The renewed mention of the name of the Ottoman Sultan in the Friday prayers in the mosques of Palestine, in late 1920, was another sign of these feelings of regret. Until then the prayers had been held in the name of an anonymous *Amīr al-Mu'minīn*.<sup>14</sup> The reinstatement lasted until the abolition of the Ottoman Caliphate in early 1924 and the attempt by Ḥusayn, King of the Hejaz, to take up the mantle of the *Khalīfah* himself.

The SMC had Ḥusayn mentioned in the Friday prayers as the *Khalīfah*, but with his eviction from the Hejaz by the Wahhābīs the Muslims of Palestine returned to their previous practice of holding prayer in the name of an anonymous *Amīr al-Mu'minīn*.<sup>15</sup>

Another matter which perhaps bears witness to second thoughts on Ottoman rule was the fact that the Palestinians stressed repeatedly in their protests and memoranda to the British authorities that their position during the period of Ottoman rule was better than under British Mandatory rule. The main topic of comparison was the existence of self-ruling institutions (*Majālis al-Idārah*, i.e. the district administrative councils), which enjoyed fairly broad rights of supervision over the district administration during the Ottoman period, as opposed to the absence of anything similar under British rule. The large number of British officials, in comparison with the minute number of Turks previously (generally the governors of provinces and provincial judges) was also stressed. The Palestinians also pointed to their participation in the Ottoman Parliament (three delegates from the district of Jerusalem, one from Nāblus and one from Acre), as compared to the absence of a self-legislating body following the end of Ottoman rule. In the area of everyday administrative activities, the Palestinians represented the Ottoman period as a glorious time compared with the dark days of British rule: there had been a worsening in the sphere of education; the efficiency of the administration had lessened, despite the fact that the number of officials had increased immeasurably; the degree of public security had declined, although there had been a rise in the number of soldiers; the burden of taxes had become heavier beyond all comparison, etc. etc. Generally speaking, they claimed "that the Turkish rule in Palestine had not been unduly oppressive and was fairly satisfactory".<sup>16</sup>

Though the exaggerations in this argument were of course presented for polemical purposes, there is still no doubt that with the passing of the years some of the more unfavourable aspects of Ottoman rule had been forgotten, and only the pleasant memories remained. Moreover, if it is recalled that the authors of these memoranda were members of the social élite of the *a'yān*, '*ulamā*', landowners, government officials and merchants, then it is easier to understand why they particularly remembered the positive sides of Ottoman rule.

With this in mind, one need not wonder that the Turkish national movement under Mustafa Kemal was looked upon with sympathy from its outset, and with its increasing successes this sympathy deepened in Palestine and Syria. Disappointment with the Allies and the sense of Muslim solidarity were enough to offset the hatred

felt for the Turks during the war.<sup>17</sup> The success of the Kemalist movement planted in the hearts of the nationalists in Syria and Palestine a feeling of confidence that it was possible to triumph over the Allies or at least to prevent them from forcing their will on the Arabs.<sup>18</sup>

The joy of late summer 1922 in Palestine was not, then, a passing phase, but an expression of a deep feeling of Muslim sympathy for the Turks. What is more, this joy made possible open political demands not consistent with the usual aims of the Palestinian national movement or the Arab movement in general. A group of Jerusalem notables called for the reinstatement of Turkish rule in the form of a mandate in late 1922 and appealed to the Kemalist-Turkish delegation at the Peace Conference in Lausanne to work towards attaining this end. It is true that the organizers of this appeal, headed by Sheikh Yūsuf al-'Alami, and the prominent men who joined it were from circles opposed to the SMC and the AE<sup>19</sup> (members of the Nashāshibi, al-'Alami, Dajāni, Khālidi and Nusaybah families); however, there were other less obvious signs that this position was also common among supporters of the AE. When the paper *Lisān al-'Arab* printed in March 1922 that the First Delegation had protested in London against the possibility of the Holy Places being placed under Turkish control, it aroused bewilderment and apprehension in Nāblus, and the Delegation was asked to deny it. The Director of the Nāblus MCA even wanted to come out against this paper, that had dared to find fault with the Ottoman Caliphate and looked upon the Ottoman *Khalīfahs* as foreigners in Palestine.<sup>20</sup> Of significance also is the opinion of 'Abd al-Qādir al-Muzaffar, that Palestine was at peace in late 1922 because the inhabitants trusted in the Lausanne Conference and hoped for Turkish intervention in the affairs of Palestine.<sup>21</sup> It should be noted that Mustafa Kemal's prestige was so great that even after the failure of the Palestinians' attempt to gain his assistance (see below) he was cheered in nationalist demonstrations, and Turkish flags were waved at popular gatherings. Only in late 1923 and early 1924, when his aim of abolishing the Ottoman Caliphate became apparent, did his popularity in Palestine begin to decline.<sup>22</sup>

This, then, is the background to the decision of the Palestinian AE in late September 1922 to send a delegation to Istanbul and to the Peace Conference in Lausanne to work towards winning the support of the Turks for the Palestinians' demands. The AE was aware that the Turks might well show coolness towards representatives of an Arab community after the mutual enmity that had developed during the war, and therefore turned to the Indian

“Khilafat Committee”. This body was trying to strengthen the Muslim Caliphate and had good relations with the Turks. The fact that the Muslims of India had not shown sympathy for the revolt of the *Sharif* Ḥusayn against the Ottomans undoubtedly helped this group’s prestige in Turkey. The AE stressed that there was a strong tie between the Palestinian question and the religious aspect of the Kemalist movement, and that if the Turks were to support the Palestinians they would prove by this their good intentions towards the Muslims of the entire world.<sup>23</sup>

Also among the activists in Palestine there was much awareness that the Turks should be appeased over what had happened during the war. One of them, Sab’ al-‘Aysh of Jenin, suggested explaining to the Turks “that the revolt of King Ḥusayn and the enlistment of the Arab people on his side were directed only against the late ‘blood-thirsty’ Jemal. It would be best to let alone whatever happened in the past and the bad relations which developed between the two peoples.”<sup>24</sup>

The Christian members of the Palestinian Delegation to London, which was now supposed to depart for Turkey and Lausanne, opposed its departure, since they were aware of the Islamic motives behind this. They also opposed the attempt to make connections with the Turks—which could be interpreted as an anti-British step<sup>25</sup>—although Shibli al-Jamal did not dare to oppose this explicitly, justifying his non-participation by reference to private business matters.<sup>26</sup> Mu‘in al-Māḍi, the moderate Muslim member of the Delegation to London, also came out against sending a delegation to Turkey. For him the decisive fact was that the true intentions of the Turks towards the Arabs generally and the Palestinians in particular were still not clear.<sup>27</sup> Thus when the Delegation left Palestine in early November it consisted of Mūsā Kāzīm al-Ḥusayni, Amin al-Tamūmi and ‘Abd al-Qādir al-Muẓaffar, who joined it because of the good connections he had made with several Turkish leaders during his activity in Syria in 1918–20.<sup>28</sup> In late November Shibli al-Jamal also joined the part of the Delegation which had arrived in Lausanne, thus succeeding in avoiding going to Turkey.<sup>29</sup> He also went with the Delegation to London, but left it there at the conclusion of its activities in order to leave for New York on business.<sup>30</sup> It is most likely that the lack of a unanimity on sending this Delegation accounted for the difficulties in gathering funds to finance it.<sup>31</sup>

The Palestinian Delegation arrived in Istanbul on 14th November 1922, following a few days’ delay in Egypt, and at once made contact with the Governor of Istanbul, Rafat Pasha. The Palestinians tried to persuade the Turks to stand firm on the execution of

Article 1 of the Turkish National Pact (right of self-determination for inhabitants of the lands taken from the Ottoman Empire) and stressed the religious bond between the Turks and the inhabitants of Palestine. Rafat Pasha promised them that the Turkish Government intended to insist on the fact that the provisions of Article 1 of the National Pact applied to Palestine.<sup>32</sup> The Palestinian Delegation was encouraged by this promise and decided that it should leave for Lausanne, as the Peace Conference was about to open there; but it was decided to leave 'Abd al-Qādir al-Muzaffar in Turkey in order to continue talks with the Turks in Ankara.<sup>33</sup>

'Abd al-Qādir al-Muzaffar kept up his activity in Istanbul, meeting there with Bekir Sami, the former Turkish Foreign Minister, delegates to Parliament, writers and journalists, and receiving many promises. Some of them even published articles in Turkish newspapers in favour of the Palestinians and their demands. Al-Muzaffar's contacts with different elements—formed during his service in the Ottoman Army as a religious functionary—stood him in good stead. Elements of the government also promised him that the Turks would insist on the execution of Article 1 of the National Pact.

But al-Muzaffar was sceptical over these promises. In October 1921 the Franco-Turkish Treaty was signed, according to which all of Cilicia was evacuated by French forces, so that the new boundary between Turkey and Syria was far more favourable to Turkey than that determined in the Treaty of Sèvres. Secondly, the Turks continued to demand the annexation by Turkey of the province of Mosul, which was mainly Arab. Al-Muzaffar saw this as proof that the Turks would endeavour to realize their national aims without taking the Arabs into consideration. What is more, there were other journalists at the time who explained in their papers that the Arabs were the cause of Turkey's defeat in the war. Al-Muzaffar even tried to interest the Persians and the Afghans in the Palestine question by appealing to their religious sentiments and stressing the need to defend the Holy Places of Islam, but it seems that he received little comfort for his pains. For this reason and also because of the poor state of his health, he decided to cut short his stay in Turkey and to return to Palestine without going to Ankara, as he had originally intended.<sup>34</sup> Upon his arrival in Palestine he joined, as we have seen, the campaign for boycotting the elections to the legislative council. Under these circumstances he probably thought it unwise to reveal to the community the truth about the Turkish stand. Whatever the reason, in his report to the AE and his comments in a public gathering al-Muzaffar related that the Turks had promised not to forsake the Palestinians in their

struggle for independence and that he was certain that the Turks would aid Syria, Palestine and even Egypt.<sup>35</sup>

Mūsā Kāzīm al-Ḥusayni and Amin al-Tamīmi continued on to Lausanne, arriving there on 20th November 1922. Their activity at the Lausanne Conference was concentrated on efforts to persuade the Turkish Delegation, headed by Ismet Pasha (Inönü), and other delegations, of the justice of the Palestinian demands, after their request to appear at the Conference itself had not been accepted. In its first meeting with Ismet Pasha, the Delegation won an encouraging response from him. He promised to insist upon the right of self-determination of the Arabs and even to demand that the Delegation to be given a chance to express itself at the Conference.<sup>36</sup> However, before long there was disappointment. After the first meeting Ismet Pasha managed to evade further ones, and it became clear to the various Arab elements (including the Egyptians) who were looking to the Turks for help that the Turks were resigned to the *status quo* created in the former Ottoman territories and were not demanding a renewed discussion of this question at the Conference. One of the members of the Turkish Delegation, Reshad Nehad Bey, even informed the Palestinian Delegation openly that they would take a neutral position on the Arab question, as there was one faction in their midst which aimed at taking revenge on the Arabs. He explained that they lacked the power to come out against Britain, whose vote was decisive at the Conference; Britain had even succeeded of late in enticing France into a common stand with her on the questions discussed at the Conference. After their bitter war the Turks could only concentrate on their own national interests. The Turkish representative gave the Palestinians to understand that in view of the circumstances the Turks would agree to the provisions of Article 95 of the Treaty of Sèvres respecting Palestine (i.e. ratification of the Mandate and the Balfour Declaration).<sup>37</sup> A further meeting with other members of the Turkish Delegation was of no avail, and it became clear to the Palestinians that the Turks had decided to allow the Allies to do as they pleased in the Arab lands.<sup>38</sup>

This hardening of the Turkish position towards the Arabs became obvious as the deadlock reached at the Conference in January 1923 drew closer. The Turks, who were up against the uncompromising position adopted by England and France on other questions (protection of the minorities, the Ottoman capitulations and others), apparently decided to ignore the Arab question in general, including the question of Palestine, which was not crucial for them. Later, when the controversy between the AE and its opponents was raging in Palestine, the opponents of the AE pro-

duced an explanation of their own for the change which occurred in the Turkish stand. In their opinion this happened because the Delegation had expressed in its memorandum to the Conference its bitterness over the fact that the Allies were treating the Turks—their former enemies—well, while they scorned the Arabs, who had fought at their side. This explanation is without foundation, and the AE was quite right in denying its truth.<sup>39</sup>

The Palestinian community was given a quite different account of affairs: the Delegation instructed the AE not to publish the unequivocal statements of Reshad Nehad Bey,<sup>40</sup> and the official report of the Delegation mentioned only Ismet Pasha's promise to support the Arabs, and not the true position taken by the Turks and revealed immediately thereafter. In order to give this stand a consistent character, a declaration of Ismet Pasha's to the effect that Turkey recognized the independence of the Arab lands which had been taken from the Ottoman Empire—a declaration made during the period of deadlock between the first and second parts of the Conference—was given much publicity.<sup>41</sup> This declaration, which was no more than a Turkish stratagem during the deadlock, was completely forgotten after the re-opening of the Conference and the progress in negotiations. Probably the wish to give encouragement before the elections for the legislative council was behind this report, but there was also a certain reluctance to admit the failure of all the political efforts which had been invested in order to bring about changes in the political fate of the country.

Along with its efforts to persuade the Turks, the Palestinian Delegation attempted to convince other delegations at the Conference to support its demands. Although they won a few promises here and there, nothing of substance came from these contacts.<sup>42</sup> As a result of the general indifference, the question of the Mandates and the Palestine question were not discussed at all at the Conference, which accorded with British wishes and their announcement on this matter.<sup>43</sup>

Since the Delegation had failed in its efforts at Lausanne to bring about a change in the status of Palestine by using the Turks, it decided once more to act in London. On 19th October 1922 the coalition government of Lloyd George had resigned and a Conservative government headed by Bonar-Law was set up in its place. Lloyd George and Balfour, the two fathers of the Balfour Declaration, and Winston Churchill, its energetic defender, were not included in the new government. The Conservative government won an overwhelming victory in the general election on 15th November 1922, thus securing its position in power. Among the Conservatives in Parliament a considerable number supported the

Arab stand on Palestine. Churchill, the forceful defender of the pro-Zionist policy, lost his seat in Parliament and news of his defeat was received with much rejoicing by the nationalist circles in Palestine. It appeared to them that new possibilities for action had opened up in London and that the absence from the Government of the outstanding supporters of the Balfour Declaration would make it easier this time for them to effect a change in the Palestinians' favour.<sup>44</sup> The pro-Arab circles in London started encouraging the Palestinians in the belief that there were good grounds for sending another delegation to Britain.<sup>45</sup> However, the decision to do so had not yet been taken. The AE apparently thought that working through the Turks was likely to be more beneficial; pro-Turkish sentiment, then at its height, certainly helped them to reach this decision.

Only in Lausanne, when the bitter truth of the Turkish position had become clear, did the Palestinian Delegation decide to continue to London. This decision was made after the Arabs' friends in London, headed by Lord Sydenham and Lord Islington, had got in touch with the Delegation and explained how important it was for it to come to London at that time. They explained that the pro-Arab element in Parliament had grown larger as a result of the recent elections and that the Government was preparing to discuss anew its policy on the Palestine question.<sup>46</sup> The Palestinian Delegation accepted this advice and arrived in London on Christmas Eve. It immediately began a series of meetings with English friends, with representatives of those sections of the press that were sympathetic to the Arabs (mainly the *Morning Post* and the *Daily Mail*), and had a resumé of the correspondence between Ḥusayn and McMahon printed in one of the papers. Following these efforts to influence public opinion, the Delegation met on 11th January 1923 the Duke of Devonshire, the new Colonial Secretary. The Delegation co-ordinated its activities closely with its English supporters, presenting on their advice a moderate version of their demands: the setting up of a native (*wataniyyah*) government elected by all the inhabitants of the country which would direct all internal affairs, including immigration; the constitution of the country would be determined by an elected constituent assembly; this government would carry on negotiations with the British Government on "the form of advice and aid which the British Government will wish to render the native government". In talks the Delegation added that it rejected the Balfour Declaration entirely.<sup>47</sup> The radical decision of the Fifth Congress to demand once again complete independence was apparently abandoned owing to the influence of the English supporters, and the more

moderate version was presented to try to enable the new Government of Britain to find a way to retreat from its policy.

Nevertheless, the Duke of Devonshire, acting on the advice of the Middle Eastern Department at the Colonial Office, decided to continue the policy of his predecessor. He informed the Delegation that he would look upon the policy statement on Palestine of June 1922 (Cmd. 1700) as the basis for the policy of the new government, although minor changes were likely,<sup>48</sup> and in February, he distributed a memorandum to this effect among members of the Cabinet. The memorandum stressed that Churchill's declaration in June 1922 had made concessions to the Arabs and had won the agreement of the Zionists. To abandon the pro-Zionist policy completely would necessarily mean handing the Mandate back to the League of Nations and abandoning Palestine. The League of Nations would not be likely to find another mandatory power, in which case the Turks would once again rule Palestine. In such a case, Britain's position as a Christian state which had abandoned the Holy Places of Christianity to the Turks would be most unenviable.<sup>49</sup> It turned out, then, that the victories of Mustafa Kemal, which aroused such great hopes among the Palestinians, served in the end as an argument for continuing with the British Mandate and the pro-Zionist policy!

This memorandum reveals how weak the basis really was for the decisions of the British Government on its policy in Palestine. All the assumptions which this document makes are assailable. Had Britain actually decided to change its policy on Zionism and therefore made changes in the writ of Mandate, it is highly doubtful if the League would in the end have opposed this. Even if it had opposed it, it would have been powerless to force Britain to leave Palestine, since the Mandates had been allocated not by it but by the Council of the Allies at San Remo in April 1920. If Britain had abandoned Palestine, it is most unlikely that France and Italy, which were both anxiously trying to strengthen their hold in the Eastern Mediterranean basin, would have been unwilling to take her place. Finally, even after the Turkish victories of autumn 1922 in Anatolia, it is hard to see how they could have succeeded in returning to Palestine. Would they have invaded by way of Syria, which was being held by their allies, the French? The lack of a good navy ruled out the possibility of invasion from the sea. The memorandum is even more amazing if it is recalled that in 1923 the General Staff of the British Army declared that Palestine was not vital to the defence of the Suez Canal.<sup>50</sup> It appears that what won out in the end was the convenience of continuing a policy which had already been formulated and the recognition that the

Balfour Declaration was an explicit commitment which had received international approval, and which could not be abandoned without risking a loss to Britain's prestige and status as a world power.

The Delegation responded to this expression of policy by pressing the AE in Palestine to do all it could to block the elections to the legislative council. Since the new government was to debate the question of its Palestine policy, a revelation of the Arab population's opposition to the pro-Zionist policy was likely to have decisive influence.<sup>51</sup> It is almost certain that a hope such as this strengthened the hands of those who were working in Palestine against the elections, but this could not eradicate the failure of the efforts of the Second Delegation, which arrived back in Palestine in the second week of March 1923.

#### MORE BRITISH PROPOSALS AND THEIR REJECTION

The final decision regarding a continuation of Britain's policy on Palestine was postponed until July 1923, when a special Cabinet Committee was set up for this purpose. The death of the Prime Minister, Bonar-Law, in May 1923 and the appointment of Stanley Baldwin to the post were responsible for this postponement. Meanwhile, there was urgent need for a decision by the Government in Palestine on further steps to set up self-governing institutions: this resulted from the failure to set up the legislative council after the boycott of the elections to this body. The Palestine Government and the Colonial Office were most perplexed. Various proposals were reviewed for establishing the legislative council by using the secondary electors who *were* chosen. Another suggestion was to leave some of the places in the council vacant for the meantime or to appoint members to them. However, when these proposals were scrutinized carefully, it became apparent that there was no escape from abandoning, at least temporarily, the idea of setting up a legislative council until such times as the Palestinian-Arab population were ready to take part in elections. There was need, then, to issue a new Order-in-Council, which would make the necessary constitutional changes. In place of the legislative council there would again be set up an appointed advisory council, the establishment of which would not require that elections be held and the members of which would not be considered as the representatives of the population. Its composition would be identical with that of the elected part of the legislative council. Responsibility for the non-establishment of an elected representative body would be placed squarely on the shoulders of the Palestinians.<sup>1</sup>

This period of hesitation was used by E. T. Richmond, Assistant Chief Secretary for political affairs and a systematic and avowed opponent of Zionism. On 12th March 1923 he prepared a detailed memorandum stating that no self-ruling bodies should be set up against the will of the population. He actually justified the population's refusal to take part in the elections and argued that it was necessary to win its goodwill. He therefore proposed to revise the writ of Mandate in such a way that no preference be given the Jews over the other communities in the country, and to set up an administration "which cannot rightly or wrongly incur in respect of its personnel, the criticism of partiality". In other words, Richmond really accepted the Arab argument that the present administration was Jewish and therefore prone to favour the Jews.<sup>2</sup> His far-reaching proposals were a long way from being thought acceptable by the British Government at the time, but they are important in that they reveal Richmond's attitude towards a policy which he, among others, was charged to carry out. Moreover, the accusation which the groups opposed to the AE in the Arab community brought against Richmond—that it was he who had advised the boycott of the elections—is partly supported by these facts.<sup>3</sup>

The decision to set up an advisory council and to postpone indefinitely the establishment of a legislative council was made by the Colonial Office in late April, and on 4th May the Privy Council ratified the necessary constitutional document (Order-in-Council, 1923, which revised the 1922 Order-in-Council with respect to the legislative council). The publication of this document was put off until late May. The intention of the authorities was to publish the Order-in-Council only after the consent of those appointed to serve on the advisory council had been obtained. This time the Government wanted to avoid a head-on collision with the nationalists and tried to win their approval for this constitutional step. On 20th March 1923, when the HC met with representatives of the AE, he inquired whether they would be willing to cooperate with the Government in administrative matters. *Inter alia* he mentioned the setting up of an advisory council, which would deal with non-political matters.<sup>4</sup> Two days later the AE replied that it was prepared to cooperate with the Government in all administrative questions not connected to the application of the constitution, and to the present policy of the Government both of which had been rejected by the nation.<sup>5</sup>

The Government saw this reply and other statements, such as those of Mūsā Kāzīm al-Ḥusaynī, as agreement to its proposal and on 8th May sent letters to eight Muslims and two Christians with the proposal that they be appointed as members of the advisory

council. The letter proposing the appointments noted that an Order-in-Council would soon be published revising the present Order-in-Council with a view to setting up an advisory council. The letter described in detail the composition of the advisory council—*identical* with that of the legislative council—and ended by stating that if any controversy were to arise in which the members would prefer not to be involved, they could choose not to take responsibility (as had been the case in the advisory council which had been active since the early days of civilian administration).<sup>6</sup> The appointees were in no hurry to reply and busied themselves in consultations among themselves and with the leaders of the community, and by the time the Order-in-Council was published on 29th May 1923 all had given their consent.<sup>7</sup>

It is not clear what oral assurances these appointees had been given by the representatives of the Government,<sup>8</sup> but when the new Order-in-Council was published events took a different turn. The Palestinian-Arab community raised an uproar against the proposed body and against those who had consented to accept an appointment to it. On 4th June the AE convened a plenary session and discussed the situation together with delegations from the cities of Palestine and the appointees to the advisory council. The discussion revealed differences of opinion among the appointees over the stand to be taken. The majority were prepared to accept the decision of the AE and the delegations and to refuse the appointment, but a few insisted on accepting.<sup>9</sup> Heavy pressure was exerted upon those who refused to resign, letters were sent off to friends of the appointees in the hope they would influence them, and delegations were sent to the appointees themselves.<sup>10</sup>

Finally, eight of the ten Arab appointees (two of them, Maḥmūd Abū Khaḍrā' of Gaza and Sheikh Frayīḥ Abū Madyan, "were not in Jerusalem at the time and were unable to sign") sent a letter to the Chief Secretary in which they announced that their basic conditions for accepting the appointment had not been fulfilled. As long as the situation continued as it was, they were unable to take part in the council. Their reasons were that the new body was identical with the legislative council and that it supported the constitution which had been rejected by the nation. There were good grounds for speaking of identity because of the fact that the new Order-in-Council required the HC to *appoint* the two Jewish representatives in the Council after consultation with the Jewish *Va'ad Le'umi* (National Council) and the 79 *Jewish secondary electors* who had been chosen in the elections for the legislative council.<sup>11</sup>

The Government did not regard this letter as being a complete

rejection of the proposal and decided to continue trying to set up this council, but they misinterpreted the intention of the AE which was totally opposed to the advisory council. The AE's reasoning was that the advisory council was simply a poorer substitute for the legislative council. Accepting the substitute would negate the effect of the boycott of elections and would create the impression of resignation to a constitution for Palestine based on the Mandate and the Balfour Declaration.<sup>12</sup> In order to give substance to this view the appointees who had resigned were extolled during the sessions of the Sixth Congress (16th–20th June 1923); and the Congress decided to expel anyone who accepted the appointment.<sup>13</sup>

Let us try to clarify the causes of this *volte-face*. In the letter where the Government proposed the appointment to the ten Arab notables it was stated explicitly that a new Order-in-Council would soon be issued enabling a body such as this to be set up; the composition of this body was also described in detail. Thus when these matters became public, they were no innovation for the appointees or for the AE. However two things, apparently, were not to their taste. In the first place, the Government had erred in decreeing that the Jewish members would be appointed to the advisory council after consultation with the *Va'ad Le'umi* and the *Jewish secondary electors*. It had thus created the impression that the Arab appointees were also representatives of the Arab community.<sup>14</sup> Secondly, it seems that the AE was prepared to accept the establishment of an advisory council, since it saw in this a retreat from the idea of a legislative council. Such a retreat, caused by the boycott of elections, would certainly be interpreted as a victory for the AE and its supporters in the community. But now it became known that in the new Order-in-Council the idea of establishing a legislative council had not been abandoned, but merely postponed indefinitely. The AE apparently feared that the establishment of an advisory council, similar in its composition to the legislative council, was simply the first step towards the setting up of a legislative council. The advisory council's task would be to create an atmosphere of cooperation with the Government and to facilitate the acceptance of the body which had been previously rejected. In this manner—the AE reasoned—the Government would get around the boycott of elections and nullify its effect.

It seems that another factor which constantly recurs in the history of Mandatory Palestine was at work in this case, namely political change in Britain. On 23rd May a new Prime Minister, Stanley Baldwin, took office. The AE might well have thought that this presented a new opening for political work in London aimed at bringing about a change in British policy on Palestine. Participation

in an advisory body set up according to the constitution was likely to be misinterpreted in London, thus removing the possibility of a change in policy.

Since the Government did not interpret the letter from the appointees rejecting the proposal as expressing a final resignation, it continued its efforts to win acceptance for the proposal. It should be noted that in April 1923 the Chief Secretary Wyndham Deedes was replaced by General Sir Gilbert Clayton. The new Chief Secretary belonged to the group of British officers and officials, former members of the "Arab Bureau" in Cairo, who were trying to find a common denominator for British interests in the region and Arab nationalist aspirations. He began his term of office by expressing his desire to enlarge the number of Palestinian Arabs in the administration, in the hope of lessening their discontent.<sup>16</sup> In July 1923, as he was standing in for the HC (who was in England at the time), he wrote: "Is the present state of affairs to be allowed to continue with the risk of producing a situation which can only be dealt with by force, entailing a serious economic loss to Palestine and probably heavy expense to the British taxpayer? Or can a way be found, by modifying objectionable Articles in the Mandate, or, at least by removing all possible grounds for any charges of partiality or bad faith, to dissipate the present fear and distrust of the Arabs, and thus enable Zionism to develop by its own inherent merits unhampered by political difficulties and without prejudice to the interests of the population of Palestine?"<sup>16</sup> Clayton, who badly wanted to turn over a new leaf in his relations with the Palestinian Arabs, did all he could to make the plan succeed; his appointment in late June as acting HC gave him an excellent opportunity for this.

And in fact, from the moment the appointees' letter of rejection was received until the end of June, Clayton carried on talks with the appointees on the one hand and with the Colonial Secretary on the other. The Arab appointees demanded unequivocal confirmation of the fact that their participation in the council did not mean recognition of the constitution. Clayton agreed to this and even requested the Colonial Office to allow him to promise them that the Government would give serious consideration to their demands, but it seems the Colonial Office was not agreeable to this. Finally, Clayton assembled the appointees in July and informed them that their consent to be members in the advisory council did not imply acceptance on their part of the constitution. He also stressed to them that the advisory council would not have the authority of the legislative council and that the members of the council, including the Jews, were not representatives of their communities but simply men appointed by the HC to assist the Government in its dealings

in administrative and general affairs. The appointees were requested by Clayton to give him their reaction by the end of July.<sup>17</sup>

On the surface it seemed that the obstacles to setting up the advisory council had been removed. It had been stated that participation in the council did not mean acceptance of the constitution, and it was possible to see in the council a purely administrative instrument, participation in which would be no more than an expression of cooperation with the Government in the realm of administration, in accordance with the stand of the AE from March 1923. Nevertheless, the AE and its supporters still opposed the setting up of this body, in the wake of new political developments in London.

In early July a special Cabinet Committee in London began reviewing British policy on Palestine. In the Sixth Palestinian Congress, from 16th–20th June, it was resolved to send another (Third) Delegation to London to deal with the matter of the British-Hejazi treaty, which had some bearing on the question of Palestine. In London, the Delegation requested on the 24th to appear before the Committee to explain the Palestinians' position. In the opinion of the Delegation, the setting up of the Committee was "a step towards a just and fitting solution of the question of Palestine on the part of the British Government".<sup>18</sup> However, the Committee refused to hear the representatives of the Delegation.<sup>19</sup> The formal reason for this refusal was that a Cabinet Committee did not listen to witnesses who were not government officials, but the real reason was Herbert Samuel's opposition to its being heard. He believed that hearing the Delegation would be interpreted as giving official recognition to it, which could weaken the moderates who were willing to take part in the advisory council. What is more, the Delegation was less representative, in his opinion, than the one which had been active in the previous year, since two of the more moderate members, Shibli al-Jamal and Mu'in al-Māḍī, had been left out of it.<sup>20</sup> As a result of a misunderstanding, the Delegation did not meet with the Colonial Secretary and did not carry on talks with any government officials, although it did present a number of detailed memoranda.<sup>21</sup>

On the surface, this failure should have weakened the Delegation, but its stand was actually quite optimistic. It informed the AE in Palestine that there were good chances for success and repeated its demand for action towards blocking the advisory council. The Delegation succeeded in creating the impression that a change in the Government's position was imminent, and consent to serve in the council would therefore only be harmful. The Delegation's ability to influence Dr. Nāji al-Aṣīl (the representative of King

Ḥusayn in the negotiations over the British-Hejazi Treaty which were being carried on at the time), to insist upon the Palestinians' demands also undoubtedly contributed to this optimism. While the appointees knew the truth of what was going on in London by way of Government officials in Palestine, they were still afraid that if they agreed to take part they would be accused of being responsible for the Delegation's failure.<sup>22</sup> It must be noted that until the publication of the Government's announcement of its intention to set up an "Arab Agency" in early October 1923 (see below), the Delegation was ignorant of the conclusions of the Cabinet Committee; thus its optimism was not totally without foundation. However, more important is the fact that during the period in which the Delegation was active, it became apparent that the strength of the pro-Arab element in Britain was quite impressive. Apart from the committee of politicians, officials and former military men, which had been active since 1921, and aside from widespread support in the House of Lords, a group of 120 Conservative MPs emerged in the House of Commons which presented their Conservative Government with a memorandum requesting it to fulfil the demands of the Arabs.<sup>23</sup> One of the heads of this group, Sir William Joynson-Hicks, was appointed Minister of Health at this time and was thus a member of the Cabinet. The Delegation was most impressed by all these developments, and there is no doubt that this was the source of its optimism and its opposition to the advisory council.<sup>24</sup>

Armed with optimistic information and under pressure from the Delegation to do everything possible to ensure the failure of the advisory council, the AE and its supporters worked towards this end, while Clayton kept trying to persuade the appointees to accept the offer. As before, their method was to exert influence and pressure on the appointees and their families,<sup>25</sup> and at the end of July only six of the ten appointees were still willing to serve on the council. The ones who refused to do so were: Ismā'il Bey al-Ḥusayni, Sulaymān 'Abd al-Razzāq Ṭawqān (of Nāblus), Amin 'Abd al-Hādi (of Haifa) and Anṭūn Jallād (a Greek-Orthodox of Jaffa).<sup>26</sup> Clayton now began to wonder whether it was worthwhile to continue his efforts, so long as nothing had been published about the debates or conclusions of the Cabinet Committee. The Colonial Office did not pressure him, leaving the matter to his judgement.<sup>27</sup> He tried to find representative substitutes for the four appointees who refused to take part, but without success. On the other hand, the AE kept up its pressure, in the wake of which two more appointees, Maḥmūd Abū Khaḍrā', Mayor of Gaza, and Sheikh Frayīḥ Abū Madyan, resigned in August. With their resignations Clayton abandoned his efforts, and when Rāghib al-Nashāshibi,

the Jerusalem Mayor, also resigned the appointment, the whole idea was abandoned.

It may be noted that the existence in early August of six men who were agreeable to participating gave the Government a chance to set up the council either on a more limited scale or by finding men willing to serve on it from the ranks of the opponents of the AE. However, Clayton wanted to establish a body which would be more or less representative, and he assumed that a council on which the AE and the Delegation were not represented would not be in the least representative. Such a body, so he believed, would only stiffen the opposition of the nationalists to the Government's policy.<sup>28</sup>

The Cabinet Committee concluded its debates on 27th July 1923, and four days later the Cabinet approved its recommendations.<sup>29</sup> It reached the conclusion that whether or not the Balfour Declaration had been a wise move, it was impossible to retreat from it now that six years had passed and it had been approved by the Allies at San Remo, by the USA and by the League of Nations. Moreover, were the Balfour Declaration to be annulled it would be necessary to abandon the Mandate of Palestine, in which case France, Italy, or Turkey would almost certainly take Britain's place. Each of these three possibilities would be harmful to Britain, even though the strategic value of Palestine had been estimated by the Imperial General Staff to be less than previously thought. Nevertheless, steps should be taken to allay the Arab impression—however incorrect it might be—that the Jews had a preferential position. Therefore, the Committee recommended the establishment of an "Arab Agency" parallel to the Jewish Agency, to act as an advisory body to the Government with respect to all non-Jewish interests in Palestine. What is more, the functions of the Immigration Committee which was to have been set up by virtue of Article 84 of the 1922 Order-in-Council, together with the legislative council, would be transferred to the proposed "Arab Agency".<sup>30</sup> At the same time, the Colonial Office was considering a proposal to limit Jewish immigration to a maximum of 10,000 a year. Herbert Samuel agreed to this, but argued that there was no need for a special arrangement, since the arrangements made by the Palestine Government ensured this.<sup>31</sup> In the Committee's recommendations, therefore, no numerical limit was placed on the extent of Jewish immigration. It is likely that Chaim Weizmann's strong opposition to placing a predetermined annual limit (although he did not oppose determining such a limit *each* year) contributed to the abandonment of this proposal.<sup>32</sup>

The proposal of an Arab Agency, which was made to safeguard

Arab interests, was not based on the Constitution, and no-one suggested that it be amended in order to include the new proposal. The Agency was also not a Government body, although it was clear that the HC would appoint it. Nevertheless, this proposal too was rejected by the Arab representatives when the HC mentioned it unofficially on 5th November 1923, and again several days later, when it was officially and publicly suggested.<sup>33</sup> Three main reasons were behind the rejection of the proposal. The first was the same as previously discussed, namely the encouragement felt by the Palestinians because of the many supporters of their cause in London. They were of the opinion that the greater opposition to them grew, the more supporters they would have in London, in which case the Government would have to make far-reaching concessions to them.<sup>34</sup> The spokesmen for the Palestinians even told the HC that in contrast to the past, "our problem now rests on the fact that the English understand it"; and since they had been promised that the proposal for an Arab Agency would be brought before the League of Nations for approval, in order to give it the same degree of validity as the Jewish Agency, they responded by saying that they would now be able to attain still greater achievements in the League of Nations.<sup>35</sup>

However, it seems that another reason, less explicit but perhaps decisive, was at work. After a long period of struggle against the Balfour Declaration and the Mandate with its pro-Zionist clauses and the constitution of the country, the AE and the delegations had succeeded merely in getting a governmental proposal that, while not being based on these constitutional documents and not entailing acceptance of them, still did not abolish them as such. Moreover, the bodies that had been proposed previously had been based on the constitution, but nevertheless had shown by their very composition that the Arabs were the overwhelming majority of the inhabitants of Palestine. The proposal of an Arab Agency, in complete contrast to those bodies, created the impression that the status of the Arabs was being made equal to that of the Jews by the setting up of two advisory bodies with equal competence. The HC announced—so wrote Mūsā Kāzīm al-Ḥusaynī—"the setting up of an Arab Agency after the example of the Jewish Agency, and to make our status equal to that of the Zionists, by giving us this present (so he argues, and this is what he considers this Agency to be)".<sup>36</sup> The Palestinians almost certainly feared that agreement to this would be interpreted as recognition of the status of the Jewish Agency—and this recognized status of the Jewish Agency was perhaps the article of the Mandate most hated by the Palestinians.

Moreover, the Palestinians actually possessed a body which

actively defended their rights—the SMC. The broad autonomy which the Government had given the SMC enabled it to be active in some of the ways that the British Government had wanted the Arab Agency to be. The advantage implicit in the SMC was that its existence left no room for the impression that its activity paralleled that of the Zionist Organization (the “Jewish Agency” recognized in the Mandate).

It seems that the Colonial Office believed that it was only the first factor which motivated the Palestinian leadership to reject any British proposal, even one which attempted to take a step towards meeting their demands.<sup>37</sup> It therefore reached the conclusion that the right way to act at the time was to ignore the demands of the Palestinians and to direct the country’s affairs without the help of any representative bodies. “It is my conviction”, cabled the Colonial Secretary to the High Commissioner for Palestine, “that the time has arrived when we must take a firm stand and make the Arabs realise that, while we were ready to go to the utmost limit to meet what may be reasonable in their demands, we are not to be turned from our fixed purpose of carrying out our international obligations. If they [the Palestinian Arabs] refuse to cooperate with us on these lines we shall be compelled however reluctantly to go on without them.”<sup>38</sup> The Cabinet approved this political line, and instructions were accordingly sent to the HC in Palestine.<sup>39</sup>

We have already mentioned that one of the aims in convening the Sixth Palestinian Congress (16th–20th June 1923) was the question of the Palestinian stand on the proposed Anglo-Hejazi Treaty. The question of making such a treaty had arisen in late 1920 and had gone through various stages until the publication of the draft treaty in June 1923.<sup>40</sup> One of the primary goals which Britain was striving to realize in its relations with King Ḥusayn was his recognition of the Mandate system, thereby to circumvent the Arab argument that the Mandates were in contradiction to the promises given to Ḥusayn in October 1915.<sup>41</sup>

Two obstacles turned up in the course of these negotiations: the question of the boundaries between Hejaz and the territories of the rulers of ‘Asīr and Najd in Arabia, and Ḥusayn’s recognition of Britain’s “special status” in Iraq, Transjordan and Palestine. The second matter was largely solved when Britain showed readiness to recognize the right of Hejaz, Iraq, Transjordan and Palestine to join an Arab “association”; but the boundary question was a serious obstacle. King Ḥusayn was under constant pressure from the Palestinians not to sign the Treaty,<sup>42</sup> and in fact the King introduced various emendations into the draft of the treaty which he signed, stressing the “complete independence of the Arab countries”.<sup>43</sup>

Since Ḥusayn had publicly announced that he had attained all his demands and Britain had agreed to recognize the independence and unity of the Arabs, the British were forced to respond, and on 4th June the Government of Palestine made public a resumé of the draft treaty that had been signed in April by Lord Curzon and Nāji al-Aṣīl, Ḥusayn's representative in London.<sup>44</sup>

This Government announcement was a shock for the Palestinians. The truth was revealed, and Ḥusayn's calculations were torn to shreds. The Palestinians were dumbfounded and started addressing demands for explanation to Ḥusayn and 'Abdāllah.<sup>45</sup> Suspicion of Ḥusayn began to grow, 'Abdāllah's activity in late 1922 towards winning recognition as the Emir of Palestine, in exchange for acceptance of the pro-Zionist policy (as clarified in Cmd. 1700), was another reason for the loss of confidence in the Hāshemites.<sup>46</sup> As a way out of this entanglement the demand was made for a hasty convening of the Sixth Palestinian Congress, in order to present to the world the official stand of the Palestinians on the Treaty.<sup>47</sup>

This was no simple demand. The members of the AE and other leaders of the community feared that the debates of the Congress might turn into attacks upon, or even denunciation of, King Ḥusayn. Even though not one of them supported what had been decided in the proposed British-Hejazi Treaty with respect to Palestine, some of them still did not want Ḥusayn to be openly insulted. This careful, balanced approach was expressed by members of the SMC and by 'Abd al-Qādir al-Muẓaffar and Amīn al-Tamīmi. These men were apparently guided by the consideration that everything must be done to convince Ḥusayn not to sign the Treaty in its present form, and they understood that a public assault on him was likely to bring about the opposite effect. They well knew that Ḥusayn's signature on the Treaty would invalidate one of their most important arguments in the controversy with the British, namely the promises made to Ḥusayn in 1915. It seems that even Mūsā Kāẓim al-Ḥusayni, the President of the AE, was a party to this cautious approach. It also seems that the past record of the holders of this opinion, including the President of the SMC, in the service of Ḥusayn's son Fayṣal, contributed to this. Nevertheless, bitterness in Palestine was too great; the majority of the MCAs demanded that the Congress be convened at once, and the AE was unable to resist the pressure. On 16th June, twelve days after the publication of the main points of the Treaty, the Congress was assembled.<sup>48</sup>

The differences of approach were seen at the Congress itself. There were some who spoke with the utmost caution about the King

and the Treaty ('Īsā Bandak, a Greek-Orthodox from Bethlehem, 'Abd al-Qādir al-Muẓaffar, Mūsā Kāẓim al-Ḥusayni of Jerusalem, 'Umar al-Bayṭār of Jaffa and Amin al-Tamimi of Nāblus), while others treated him with a greater or lesser degree of scepticism and even suspicion (Rāghib al-Imām of Jaffa, Najib al-Ḥakīm, a Greek-Orthodox of Haifa, Wadī' al-Bustāni, a Maronite from Haifa).<sup>49</sup> In any case, it was unanimously decided in the second session to send a cable to Ḥusayn stressing the contradiction between Ḥusayn's announcement with respect to the Treaty and the announcement of the Palestine Government, and informing him that "this conference has decided to bring the complaint before Your Majesty, believing that it is impossible for You to agree to such a project, which will never be accepted by any Palestinian. We beg of Your Majesty to point out to representatives of the country what their position is under the treaty before taking a definite decision."<sup>50</sup> A similar announcement of the rejection of any Treaty "which will not ensure the just demands of this people in its holy homeland" was made public.<sup>51</sup>

Those who looked on Ḥusayn with suspicion and lack of confidence were not content with this alone. Wadī' al-Bustāni, who stood out among these men, demanded that the British Government be cabled immediately regarding the stand taken by the Congress. However, Amin al-Tamimi delivered a speech against making the matter public outside Palestine and cutting ties with Ḥusayn before conferring with the King. It was resolved, then, to turn to 'Abdāllah for clarification of the situation and to delay sending off the cable to London until the last session.<sup>52</sup> It is not known what reply 'Abdāllah made; in any case, on the third day of the Congress, 18th June 1923, the cable was sent off to the British Prime Minister, announcing unequivocal opposition to the treaty and to any suggestion "not ensuring its [the nation's] demands".<sup>53</sup>

The following day a reply was received from Ḥusayn asking for confidence in him. The reply was not regarded with any degree of trust, and Ḥusayn's critics were now joined by some who had been cautious towards him previously ('Abd al-Qādir al-Muẓaffar, Salīm 'Abd al-Raḥmān al-Ḥājj Ibrāhīm, 'Īsā al-'Īsā and Yūsuf al-Yāsīn—all four of them former "Southern Syria" men who had been active in Damascus under Fayṣal's rule; and also Jamāl al-Ḥusayni).<sup>54</sup> Nevertheless, the consideration which outweighed the others was the need to keep up contacts with Ḥusayn and to work towards revising the Treaty by private pressure upon him. The Congress resolved to continue the attempts at clarification with Ḥusayn and to get from him a copy of the draft treaty and his emendations. It also resolved to send a delegation at once to Lon-

don to follow the negotiations between Dr. Nāji al-Aṣīl and the British Government representatives and to work, as we have seen, towards changing Britain's policy in Palestine.<sup>55</sup>

These difficulties showed up clearly in the process of selecting the Delegation. By secret ballot the two most prominent spokesmen of the two approaches were elected by a wide margin: Amīn al-Tamīmī (60 votes) and Wadī' al-Bustānī (59 votes). Mūsā Kāzīm al-Ḥusaynī, the President of the Congress and the AE, won only third place—with 52 votes.<sup>56</sup>

The controversy did not end with this. Ḥusayn's sympathizers tried to delay the Delegation's departure for London and in the meanwhile to keep up the contacts with him and with 'Abdāllah. They pointed out that the British Parliament was then in recess and claimed that there was no sense in sending the Delegation at such a time. Another reason used to justify the delay in the Delegation's departure was the AE's inability to gather the necessary funds. But as soon as the AE learned that a Cabinet Committee had been set up in London to discuss the Palestine question, it quickly overcame its hesitations and its financial difficulties and on 15th July sent off the Delegation—after many voices had begun making themselves heard in Palestine demanding that the Delegation should not be delayed.<sup>57</sup>

Immediately after its arrival in London, the Delegation cabled King Ḥusayn requesting that he instruct his representative in London to show them the draft of the Treaty and the King's proposals. Even after a second appeal to him they were left without a reply until mid-September, when they returned to Palestine.<sup>58</sup> However, they did succeed in making contact with Dr. Nāji al-Aṣīl, the King's representative, to whom they passed on copies of their statements and correspondence with various British factions. The Delegation informed al-Aṣīl that the purpose of its activity was "to establish in Palestine a representative government on the basis of the Anglo-Arab obligations, along with the creation of strong ties and deep friendship between the two nations".<sup>59</sup> The Delegation was of the opinion that as a result of this "Dr. Nāji al-Aṣīl will carry on the negotiations subject to the resolutions of the Sixth Arab Congress".<sup>60</sup>

After the Delegation's return to Palestine, one of its members, Amīn al-Tamīmī, remained behind in London. He did this—so he wrote—since Nāji al-Aṣīl had requested him to assist in the negotiations and to keep him constantly in touch with Palestinian views.<sup>61</sup> Amīn al-Tamīmī, we should recall, had been opposed at the Congress to any step likely to be injurious to King Ḥusayn. He now pressured the AE from London not to publish the documents of the Delegation, although the material had already gone to print

and this fact had already been publicized in the public report of the Delegation; he also objected to the report of the Delegation's activities which the AE had composed.<sup>62</sup> Clearly, then, al-Tamimi had decided to continue his activity in London towards maintaining contact with King Ḥusayn's representatives, with the aim of ensuring the interests of Palestine but also of trying to prevent any injury to the King.<sup>63</sup>

The Palestinian pressure, which took various forms, made for difficulties in signing the Treaty. When this pressure became stronger, the British negotiators began stressing more than ever that Ḥusayn's recognition of British policy in the territories of the mandates, and particularly in Palestine, was for them the *raison d'être* of the whole Treaty. This fact was undoubtedly a product of the growing strength of the public and parliamentary pressure of the Arabs' friends in Britain—pressure which was directed first and foremost at "violations of the pledges made to Ḥusayn", and which reached its climax in the summer of 1923.

The readiness of the British to go some way towards meeting Ḥusayn's demands reached its limits with their stand on the matter of the boundaries of Arabia; the matter of Palestine now became, in contrast to the earlier stages of the negotiations, an obstacle which could not be overcome.

During the second half of 1923 Ḥusayn kept up his duplicity, showing to the British a readiness to compromise while promising the Palestinians that he would steadfastly pursue their demands; however he merely succeeded in lessening British admiration for him and with it any desire on their part to bring the negotiations to a successful conclusion.

In 1924, on the eve of his fall, Ḥusayn made renewed attempts to keep favour with both sides; in this he failed, and when the Wahhābis attacked him, he found himself without allies or supporters.<sup>64</sup>

An instructive conclusion stands out from the history of this complicated affair with respect to the relations among the leaders of the Palestinian AE and the Hāshemites, and the chances of the latter to establish an Arab confederation. As long as the Palestinians believed that it was possible to look to the Hāshemites for assistance in defeating Zionism, they gave them their support and maintained close links with them. However, it never really occurred to them to soften their stand on Palestine and Zionism to make things easier for Ḥusayn in the treaty with Britain. The fact that this treaty was likely to secure the Hāshemite throne and to lead to a British commitment to help establish an "association" between Iraq, Transjordan, Palestine and Hejaz, with the possibility of setting up a

confederation among them, did not matter to them. What we saw to be the case with respect to the Palestinians' attitude on the question of Pan-Syrian unity is also true here: they were concerned with driving Zionism from Palestine, and the question of Arab unity as a goal in its own right did not impell them to take any steps towards advancing or realizing this end.

In this respect the Palestinians had achieved something important. Their pressure on Ḥusayn and their intervention in the course of the negotiations led in the summer of 1923 to a hardening of Ḥusayn's stand with respect to the Treaty's provisions about the British Mandate in Palestine. If before this the problem of the boundaries of Hejaz, Najd and 'Asir had been the primary obstacle to ratifying the Treaty, now the Palestinian question took its place. This summer marked the last stage of Britain's willingness to ratify the Treaty, and since under the pressure of the Palestinians Ḥusayn passed it up, the possibility that the Treaty would be ratified was lost forever. Ratification of the Treaty would have meant for the Palestinians loss of an important, central element in the development of their national myth—the feeling that Britain had deceived them in 1915—and of an important argument in their case before British and world public opinion.

This development constitutes the only achievement which the Palestinians gained in their political struggle during the first years of the Mandate, and even this had a negative character. The main goals—annulment of the Balfour Declaration and establishment of independent or quasi-independent patterns of government, such as those that had developed in Transjordan and Iraq—were not attained. Instead, the Mandate with its Zionist elements was ratified and in September 1923 came into force, following the removal of the various international obstacles that had been placed in its path by the League of Nations. This failure to attain the goals did not cause immediate demoralization, and the 2nd November 1923 was marked by protest strikes throughout Palestine;<sup>68</sup> but not much time was to elapse before the various influences of this failure made themselves felt, leading to the gradual paralysis of the national movement.

## Chapter Four

### THE EMERGENCE OF AL-ḤĀJJ AMĪN AL-ḤUSAYNI\*

#### HIS APPOINTMENT AS MUFTI OF JERUSALEM

Amīn al-Ḥusayni first appeared among the leadership of the Palestinian Arabs in 1918. It was in this year that he left the Ottoman army and began to serve as recruiting officer for Fayṣal Ibn Ḥusayn's forces, which were then operating in Eastern Transjordan. This took place with the knowledge and encouragement of the British Army Command which saw it as an important means of winning the Arab population over to its side.<sup>1</sup>

After the war al-Ḥajj Amīn al-Ḥusayni turned to politics and became the President of *al-Nādi al-'Arabi*, but in the 'twenties he did not openly intervene in politics but was known rather as the holder of the highest religious Muslim office in Palestine—the President of the SMC and the Mufti of Jerusalem. In the following pages I shall examine how he managed to obtain these appointments and the political aims which guided him in office.

At the beginning of the seventeenth century the Mufti of Jerusalem was 'Abd al-Qādir Ibn Karīm al-Dīn al-Wafā'i al-Ḥusayni. But as he appears to have died leaving no sons,<sup>2</sup> the office passed from his family. It was held in the eighteenth century first by members of the al-'Alami family, and then by members of the Jārāllah family.<sup>3</sup>

However, as 'Abd al-Qādir Ibn Karīm al-Dīn al-Wafā'i al-Ḥusayni's daughter, Dunyā, happened to be married to the *Imām* of the al-Aqṣā mosque, Yaḥyā Sharaf al-Dīn, her descendants were enabled to retain their *Sharīfi* lineage and the title al-Ḥusayni.<sup>4</sup> They did not however immediately return to the office of Mufti of Jerusalem. This was most probably due to the fact that the members of another branch of the al-Ḥusayni family had acquired the post of *Naqīb al-Ashrāf*, which they held until the beginning of the eighteenth century.<sup>5</sup> Bearing in mind that these were the two highest offices in the Ottoman local administration open to

\* This chapter is based on my article "Al-Ḥājj Amīn al-Ḥusayni, Mufti of Jerusalem—His Rise to Power and the Consolidation of His Position", *Asian and African Studies*, Vol. 7 (1971), pp. 121–56.

local inhabitants, it was highly unlikely that the members of any one family would be allowed to hold them both. (In autonomous areas local inhabitants could and did rise to higher officers, including that of Governor—but not in Jerusalem, which was subject to direct Ottoman rule.)

Again at the beginning of the eighteenth century 'Abd al-Qādir al-Wafā'i al-Ḥusayni's line was without a male heir. But as the surviving daughter, Ni'ma, was married to a member of the al-'Asali family, the title al-Ḥusayni was once again preserved in the family. Incredibly this happened yet again when Ni'ma's daughter, Nasab, married into the same family of sheikhs that Dunyā, her maternal ancestor had done four generations before. The son born of this marriage thus continued to bear the title al-Ḥusayni.<sup>6</sup>

It is generally accepted in Islam that the *Sharīfi* lineage does not pass to the descendants of a *Sharīf's* daughter who marries a commoner. There have, however, been cases where descendants of such marriages did continue to consider themselves *Ashrāf*.<sup>7</sup>

In the eighteenth century, for reasons that are not clear, the other branch of the al-Ḥusayni family lost the office of *Naqīb al-Ashrāf*, which passed to the al-'Alami family. This is probably why the office of Mufti of Jerusalem passed from the al-'Alami to the Jārallah family. At any rate, during the first half of the nineteenth century, it was these two families (al-'Alami and Jārallah) that held the offices of Mufti and *Naqīb al-Ashrāf* in Jerusalem.<sup>8</sup>

Not much is known about the al-Ḥusayni family during this period. It is known, however, that in the middle of the nineteenth century the family was able to persuade the Ottoman Governor in Jerusalem to appoint one of its members to the office of Mufti. Marriage ties with the Jārallah family lent strength to the legitimacy of their claim. At any rate, it is clear that the family was always highly esteemed and was certainly looked upon as the forerunner of the social élite from whose ranks would emerge muftis throughout the Fertile Crescent.<sup>9</sup>

This, then, was how the al-Ḥusayni family became ensconced in the office of Mufti of Jerusalem. Three members of the family held the post until the beginning of the 1920s: Muṣṭafā al-Ḥusayni, Amīn's grandfather; Ṭāhir al-Ḥusayni, his father; and Kāmil al-Ḥusayni, his elder brother by another mother. Obtaining the office of Mufti was part of the great social advance made by the family—its sons rose to high administrative positions, on several occasions that of Mayor of Jerusalem, and one of them was later elected to represent the Jerusalem *Sanjaq* in the Ottoman Parliament.<sup>10</sup>

This family background served as a fine springboard for a keen,

shrewd and ambitious young man like Amīn al-Ḥusaynī. We must be careful, however, not to impute to the office of Mufti of Jerusalem in Ottoman times the same dominant status it was later to acquire under the Mandate. The Mufti of Jerusalem was not considered to rank very high in the hierarchy of the Empire's muftis, Jerusalem being in those days little more than a remote country town that had never served as the capital of a province (*iyālet*, or as it was later called, *vilāyet*). But the increasing international importance of Jerusalem from the middle of the nineteenth century and its reconstitution as a district linked directly to Istanbul undoubtedly enhanced the importance of those holding office in the city.

No less important was the great change which took place in the status of the town mufti in Ottoman society. At least until the latter part of the nineteenth century he was considered to be out-ranked by the *qāḍī* of his town in the '*ulamā*' hierarchy of the Empire. The *qāḍī* received his salary directly from the Central Treasury, while the mufti lived off the fees he charged for each *fatwā* that he issued. Despite this, the mufti even then had one important advantage over the *qāḍī* with respect to their social status in the town. The *qāḍī* was appointed by the central government and sent to his seat of office, where he did not usually remain for more than a year. The mufti, on the other hand, was a member of one of the notable families in the town, steeped in a long tradition of Muslim learning. These families were generally of *Sharīfī* origin, and during the eighteenth century, with the weakening of the central government and the *Sipāhī* system, they came to constitute a dominant factor in the social and economic life of the Empire.

The increasing importance of the urban mufti was further accelerated by the process of secularization which swept over the Ottoman Empire from the mid-nineteenth century onwards. The judicial authority of the *qāḍī* fell victim to this process: whereas up until this time his authority had extended to every area of daily life and he had served as the chief administrative officer in his district, the *qāḍī* was now restricted to the handing down of judgement on personal matters only, the civil courts (*nizāmi*) gradually assuming most of his former powers. What is more, during the latter years of the Ottoman Empire and during the Young Turk period an even more far-reaching trend began to emerge—the tendency to view Islam as a purely spiritual religion concerned primarily with the relationship between Man and his Creator, a view deriving above all from the thinking of Zia Gökalp. It is clear that the mufti, his basic function being that of guidance rather than the passing of judgement (a function commanding

authority), stood to gain from these developments. This change in status was given formal expression in the "Temporary Law Concerning the Appointment of Sharī'a Judges and Officials" of 19 *Jumādā al-Ulā*, 1331 A.H. (April 26, 1913). Paragraph 37 of this law laid down that "the muftis stand at the head of their local '*ulamā*' ".<sup>11</sup>

Two important factors should, however, be borne in mind: firstly, the local mufti, in the present case the Mufti of Jerusalem, remained throughout the Ottoman period subordinate to the *Sheikh ūl-Islām* in Istanbul, and secondly, his pre-eminent status among the local '*ulamā*' was restricted to the Jerusalem district alone, the two other districts of Palestine, Nāblus and Acre, being attached throughout the nineteenth century not to Jerusalem but to Beirut (before this, up until the Egyptian conquest, the Acre district was usually part of the *iyālet* of Sidon, while the Nāblus district formed part of the *iyālet* of Damascus). It was precisely in these two respects that the British occupation of Palestine and the disintegration of the Ottoman Empire affected the status of the Mufti of Jerusalem: the link with Istanbul was severed, and Jerusalem became the chief city of Palestine, seat of the Government and the Supreme Court.

These developments were hastened by another important factor, this time of a more personal nature. The Mufti of Jerusalem when the British entered the city happened to be Kāmil al-Ḥusaynī. From the outset, Kāmil al-Ḥusaynī went out of his way to aid the British occupation authorities, particularly when it came to working out some sort of suitable arrangement between themselves and the local population, and he made it very much easier for the latter to get used to the idea of a Christian power ruling in Jerusalem.<sup>12</sup> He saw to it that the question of naming the Muslim ruler during Friday prayers did not develop into a political issue.<sup>13</sup> and even his attitude to the Jews and his relations with them were friendly and correct.<sup>14</sup> During the period of tension that followed the April 1920 disturbances, he appealed to the public in the course of a sermon at the al-Aqṣā mosque to maintain law and order and to rest assured that the British Government, as was their policy everywhere, would do nothing to hinder the Muslims in the practice of their religion.<sup>15</sup>

The British authorities, first military and then civil, were indebted to Kāmil al-Ḥusaynī for his exemplary conduct. One of the ways in which their esteem for him found expression was the award made to him of the CMG. During the period of military government the Presidency of the Shar'i Court of Appeal in Jerusalem fell vacant. The authorities departed from the age-old

custom of maintaining a strict separation between the functions of mufti and *qāḍi*, and appointed Kāmil al-Ḥusayni to this post also, his combined salaries reaching a very high figure. He also headed the "Central *Waqf* Council", thereby controlling religious foundations throughout the country.<sup>16</sup> After his death, his family was accorded special treatment by the authorities, receiving a pension far larger than that prescribed by Ottoman law.<sup>17</sup>

Apart from combining in his hands the judicial function with that of *Iftā'*, the British military authorities saw fit to give further public expression to the pre-eminence of his status in their eyes. They afforded him the title "Grand Mufti" (*al-Mufti al-Akbar*), a title not previously current in Palestine, and looked upon him as "the representative of Islam in Palestine".<sup>18</sup> In doing this they no doubt had in mind the example of Egypt, where the mufti hierarchy, headed by the "Mufti of Egypt", was determined independently of the rest of the Ottoman Empire. The experience gained by many of these officers while serving in Egypt was bound to guide them when they came to serve in Palestine.

The military authorities had to solve the problem of Muslim religious organization following the severance of the tie with Istanbul and the consequent cessation of the *Sheikh ül-Islām's* control over the muftis and the shar'ī courts and that of the Ministry of *Awqāf* over the *Waqf* managers. Prior to the British occupation there was no central body in Palestine authorized to do this, and all the various functions of the Muslim community were subject to control from Istanbul. It was against this background, and in view of Jerusalem's transformation into the focal centre of the country and the Mufti's amenable and cooperative spirit, that the interesting developments so profoundly affecting the status of the Mufti of Jerusalem during the Mandatory period took place.

On 21st March 1921 Kāmil al-Ḥusayni died, and the British authorities were faced with a double dilemma: who was to succeed him, and what were to be his successor's duties and powers? The combining of the functions of Mufti and President of the Shar'ī Court of Appeal was apparently considered to be a temporary arrangement only, especially suited to the personal qualities possessed by the late Kāmil al-Ḥusayni. Accordingly, shortly after the death of the latter, Sheikh Khalīl al-Khālidi (a highly respected man with a comprehensive religious education) was appointed to the judicial post without awaiting final settlement of the general problem of Muslim religious organization in Palestine.<sup>19</sup>

As laid down by international law with respect to the administration of occupied enemy territory, election of the new Mufti was to be in accordance with Ottoman Law. This provided for the con-

vening of a meeting of the local 'ulamā' (concerned at this time chiefly with instruction—*tadrīs*), the *imāms* and *khaḫībs* of the larger mosques, and the elected members of the district administrative council (*Majlis al-Idāra*) and the municipality in order to nominate three candidates for the office. These names would then be forwarded to the *Sheikh ūl-Islām*, who would make the final choice. The latter could order new elections if he felt that none of the three candidates forwarded to him was suitable for the office. If a suitable candidate could not be found locally, a notice to this effect would then appear in the press and the body of electors, with the written authorization of the *Sheikh ūl-Islām*, would then appoint the new Mufti after a competitive election between candidates (who were to nominate themselves) had been held.<sup>20</sup>

The elections for the new Mufti aroused a great deal of interest among the Muslim population. Even before Kāmil al-Ḥusayni's death, once it became clear that he would never rise from his sick-bed, speculation about the choice of his successor was rife in various circles.<sup>21</sup> Following his death, the al-Ḥusayni family and its supporters lost no time, and began to campaign vigorously for their candidate, al-Ḥājj Muḥammad Amīn al-Ḥusayni, while their opponents, the al-Nashāshībi family and its supporters, did all in their power to prevent his election, throwing their full weight behind another candidate, Sheikh Ḥusām al-Dīn Jārāllah.<sup>22</sup> When the elections were eventually held, on 12th April 1921, al-Ḥājj Amīn was not one of the top three candidates; Ḥusām al-Dīn Jārāllah polled most votes, while al-Ḥājj Amīn could do no better than run a poor fourth. The Government was taken by surprise.<sup>23</sup>

According to law, the Government should then have appointed one of the top three candidates to the post of Mufti, but as it happened, things turned out somewhat differently. Even before the elections were held, al-Ḥājj Amīn's supporters set about organizing petitions urging the Government to appoint their champion. On the very day of Kāmil al-Ḥusayni's death, the *Qāḍi* of Jerusalem, Muḥammad Abū Sa'ūd al-'Awri, informed the District Governor that al-Ḥājj Amīn was to succeed his brother, and that all the *qāḍis* and muftis of Palestine should be notified that a suitable candidate had been found to succeed the late Mufti. Members of *al-Nūdi al-'Arabi*, which al-Ḥājj Amīn had led until April 1920, got together the following day and began to collect signatures for the petitions demanding his appointment.<sup>24</sup> Thus, these petitions began to pour in from the very day of Kāmil al-Ḥusayni's death. Signatories included many Jerusalem notables and religious dignitaries, *mukhtārs* of villages in the Judean hills and, what is even more interesting, notables, 'ulamā', and different organizations throughout Palestine.

One such petition was even submitted by delegates to the Third Palestinian Congress, which was held in December 1920. Opposition petitions, requesting the appointment of whoever won the elections, were extremely few, and it is hardly surprising that the Government gained the impression that the bulk of the population was in favour of al-Ḥājj Amīn.<sup>25</sup> It should be noted that many people who tended to take a moderate stand towards both the Government and the Jews, men like Sulaymān Naṣīf of Haifa and Muḥammad Sa'ūd al-'Awri, *Qādi* of Jerusalem, were prominent among those supporting the appointment of al-Ḥājj Amīn.

Two interesting arguments emerged from the general confusion clouding the issue: the first, that al-Ḥājj Amīn al-Ḥusayni should be chosen on the strength of his legitimate right to the office—after all, he was a “descendant of the House of *Iftā'* from days of old” and an “offshoot from the family tree of the Prophet himself”;<sup>26</sup> and the second, that it was the right of all the Muslims of Palestine, and not only those of Jerusalem, to have a say in the choosing of the Mufti of Jerusalem, his function being that “of a sort of *Shaykh al-Islām* of Palestine”, or alternatively, “Mufti of Palestine”.<sup>27</sup>

The contradiction between the result of the election and what appeared to be a broad consensus of public opinion in favour of al-Ḥājj Amīn placed the Government in something of a predicament, and they were loth to come to a final decision on the subject of the appointment. Al-Ḥājj Amīn's supporters attempted to force the issue by applying further pressure on the Government, and the flood of petitions reached greater proportions. They enlisted the support of various notables in Transjordan as well as that of the heads of certain of the Christian communities in Palestine (among these, the Greek-Orthodox Patriarch)<sup>28</sup> and, according to a Zionist source, even managed to win over the two Hashemite princes 'Abdāllah and Fayṣal.<sup>29</sup> Within the Muslim community the issue was presented as the need to decide between, on the one hand, a *religious* and *nationalist* candidate, one who was devoted to his religion and the Holy Places, and who just recently had played a leading role in the Third Palestinian Congress, and on the other hand, a candidate who had sold out to the Jews, who was prepared to hand the al-Aqṣā mosque over to them, and who had sworn to help stamp out all trace of nationalism. The candidature of the latter and his success in the elections was passed off as the result of some Jewish plot.<sup>30</sup> What is more, al-Ḥājj Amīn and his supporters challenged the validity of the election, claiming that the composition of the electoral committee was suspect on a number of counts: it included members of the Shar'i Court of Appeal instead of members of the *Majlis al-Idāra*, which was no longer in existence;

the Muslim members of the municipality who had participated in the elections had been appointed rather than elected, which was contrary to the law; there were not to be found at the time any *'ulama* engaged in religious instruction (which according to the law meant teaching the basics of religion to *madrasah* students and did not refer to the type of instruction given in the mosques to the general public) and finally, not all the *imāms* and religious teachers had been invited to participate. Al-Ḥājj Amīn's opponents refuted these claims, and maintained that whoever had not been invited to take part in the elections had been legally omitted, as the law spoke only of the *imāms* and *khaṭībs* of the *large* mosques, and because the stipulation in Ottoman law with respect to "the elected members of the *Majlis al-Idāra* and the municipality" was intended to distinguish between elected and appointed members of the *Majlis al-Idāra*, but did not apply to members of the municipality who were *all* elected during the Ottoman period.<sup>31</sup>

Officials in high government circles took sides in this dispute. E.T. Richmond, Assistant Chief Secretary (Political), was fully in favour of al-Ḥājj Amīn's appointment, while the Chief Secretary himself, Wyndham Deedes, and the Legal Secretary, Norman Bentwich, were opposed to this.<sup>32</sup> This dispute largely encompassed the predicament in which the Government found itself. It appears that the HC also tended to favour the appointment of al-Ḥājj Amīn, as even *before the elections* were held, he had sounded him out on the possibility of his accepting the nomination.<sup>33</sup> The election results considerably upset the HC's calculations. There were, however, other obstacles blocking al-Ḥājj Amīn's way to this exalted office. Amīn al-Ḥusayni was not an *'ālim*; he had not graduated from a higher religious college (although he did spend a short time at al-Azhar) and had not earned the title "sheikh".<sup>34</sup> 'Izzat Darwaza, for many years a close acquaintance of al-Ḥājj Amīn who in the 1930s was appointed by him to the office of "General Administrator of Religious Endowments", described him as follows: "al-Ḥājj Amīn was not one of the religious dignitaries, but he was from among the tarbush wearers [the tarbush being the outward emblem of the Ottoman official class], having received his basic training at the School of Officials, the *Mülkiyye*, in Istanbul and at the Military Academy. But then his brother, the Sheikh Kāmil, passed away and al-Ḥājj Amīn placed a turban (*'imāmah*) on his head and began to sprout a beard. These were the preparatory steps taken to keep this important traditional office in his family".<sup>35</sup>

There is no doubt that it was extremely difficult for the Government to appoint to this lofty religious post a man who did not have the proper training, even assuming that the bulk of the population

was in fact solidly behind him, but it seems that the basic problem lay elsewhere. We have already noted al-Ḥājj Amīn's role in the disturbances of April 1920, for which he was sentenced to a term of imprisonment; although he was pardoned by the HC in September of that same year, having managed to evade serving his term, this did not entirely obliterate the impression created by his past actions and it is clear that the HC harboured certain doubts as to how he would behave in the future. The nature of these doubts emerged in the course of their meeting on 11th April 1921, when the HC discussed with al-Ḥājj Amīn the possibility of his serving as Mufti. After al-Ḥājj Amīn declared his earnest desire to cooperate with the Government and "his belief in the good intentions of the British Government towards the Arabs", he assured the HC that the "influence of both his family and himself would be devoted to maintaining tranquility in Jerusalem, and he felt sure that no disturbances need be feared that year. He said that the riots of the previous year had been completely spontaneous and unpremeditated".<sup>36</sup> It would appear then, that Herbert Samuel was worried that the al-Nebi Mūsā celebrations, due to begin the following week, would once again be marred by disturbances as they had been the year before.

If this were so, then the fact that the celebrations in Jerusalem went off peacefully (in complete contrast to the riots and disturbances which broke out at the beginning of May in Jaffa and its environs and in the Ṭul-Karm—Ḥadera district) was the deciding factor in the final appointment of the Mufti. On 8th May 1921, al-Ḥājj Amīn was informed, apparently by word of mouth, that he had been appointed to the office he so coveted, and the public leaders came to congratulate him.<sup>37</sup> It is very likely that the HC, in making this appointment, was prompted by other considerations, in particular the desire to place in public office a man given to extremism in the hope that the responsibility of office would induce him to take a more restrained and moderate position (a plan which eventually proved successful in the case of 'Ārif al-'Ārif, who had also played a leading role in fomenting the April disturbances); it is also possible that the HC wished to compensate the al-Ḥusayni family for the fact that one of its members had been removed from the office of Mayor of Jerusalem, and by so doing, restore the balance of power between it and the rival Nashāshībī family.

But even once the appointment had been made, the Government's problems were not ended. In order to make the appointment legally valid, it was necessary to find some way of circumventing the election results and to publish a letter of appointment as required by law. Accordingly, in order to have al-Ḥājj Amīn included among the

top three candidates, Ḥusām al-Dīn Jārāllah, who was a government official at the time (Supervisor of the Shar'ī courts, which until the establishment of the Supreme Muslim Council were under the office of the Government's Legal Secretary), was persuaded to withdraw his candidacy. It was Ḥusām al-Dīn himself who prepared the draft of al-Ḥājj Amīn's letter of appointment, which was based on his own withdrawal from the election.<sup>38</sup> E.T. Richmond, who supported al-Ḥājj Amīn, went even further. He accepted al-Ḥājj Amīn's contention that the election had been fundamentally invalid, and urged that he be appointed in view of the fact that the Government had received "petitions from the Mudarisin, imams, ulamas, and numerous individuals throughout Palestine in favour of the appointment of al Hajj Amin al Husseini", or alternatively, "in view of [his] competence for the post".<sup>39</sup>

As long as he did not receive an official letter of appointment, al-Ḥājj Amīn felt that his position was not secure, and he wrote to the Government at the beginning of June explaining why the elections in which he had been defeated were illegal.<sup>40</sup> Meanwhile those opposed to al-Ḥājj Amīn, the al-Nashāshībi faction and its supporters, did not remain idle, and campaigned relentlessly against his appointment. Rāghib al-Nashāshībi, the Mayor of Jerusalem, stated publicly that he would oppose the appointment of al-Ḥājj Amīn at all costs.<sup>41</sup> The HC eventually decided it would be best that such an appointment, being legally suspect, should not receive official confirmation in writing. At any rate, al-Ḥājj Amīn never did receive a written letter of appointment, and his appointment was never officially gazetted.<sup>42</sup>

But this was not the end of the affair. Al-Ḥājj Amīn al-Ḥusayni was not satisfied merely to inherit his late brother's title. He was determined also to inherit his pre-eminent position as leader of the Muslim community in Palestine (a position to which Kāmil al-Husayni had risen due to the deliberate policy adopted by the Military Government), and once again, he found in E.T. Richmond a staunch supporter.

Al-Ḥājj Amīn laid claim to a higher salary than that paid to the muftis of other towns in Palestine. He based his claim on the fact that in Ottoman times Jerusalem had been the capital of a district, and accordingly, its mufti outranked those of the capitals of sub-districts (Haifa or Jaffa, for example). Furthermore, as the district of Jerusalem had been linked directly to Istanbul and did not form part of a larger administrative unit, the importance of the Mufti of Jerusalem, in keeping with this special status, was greater than that of the muftis of the other two districts (Nāblus and Acre). In affording his late brother the title of *Al-Mufti al-*

*Akbar* and paying him a higher salary than that paid to other muftis in Palestine, the Military Government had, claimed al-Ḥājj Amīn, tacitly recognized this fact.<sup>43</sup>

That Richmond accepted this argument without reservation is fully attested in his various memoranda on the subject. Realizing that under the British regime, the district of Jerusalem was administratively no different from the other two districts, he imputed to it a superior status on the basis of religious-spiritual criteria, something that not even al-Ḥājj Amīn had ever dared to do. In Richmond's opinion, "since the Mufti of Jerusalem was generally considered to be the leader of the Muslim community in Palestine, the Government was obliged to recognize this by paying him a higher salary".<sup>44</sup> This view was shared by Ronald Storrs, Military Governor of the Jerusalem District. Both men felt that the Mufti of Jerusalem was entitled to a higher salary not only because Jerusalem was the capital of Palestine, but also because of the city's special status in the Muslim world. Drawing an analogy with the practice of the Anglican Church, Storrs pointed out that just as the Bishop of London received a higher salary than did the Bishop of Chichester, so too should the Mufti of Jerusalem receive a higher salary than did the muftis of other towns in Palestine.<sup>45</sup>

The establishment of the SMC in January 1922, with al-Ḥājj Amīn as President, formally confirmed his status as "Head of the Muslim Community in Palestine".

#### ESTABLISHMENT OF THE SUPREME MUSLIM COUNCIL AND ITS EMERGENCE AS AL-ḤĀJJ AMĪN'S STRONGHOLD

The emergence of al-Ḥājj Amīn as the "Head of Islam in Palestine" did not settle the problem of Muslim religious organization in the country. In Ottoman times, the Shar'i courts had formed part of a broad state hierarchy covering the whole Empire and headed by the *Sheikh ūl-Islām*; the religious endowments (mainly *awqāf khayriyyah*, and to a lesser extent, *dhurriyyah*) had been administered by the Ministry of *Awqāf*. The British occupation severed the link with Istanbul and these institutions, like all other public services, were placed under the control of British administrative officers. The Shar'i courts were incorporated into the department of the officer handling legal matters, while the *awqāf* were placed under the officer in charge of finances. This reorganization adversely affected the Muslim community. The status of the minority communities, on the other hand, was not greatly changed by the cessation of Ottoman rule; being non-Muslim communities in a

Muslim state, their communal organization had not formed part of the central apparatus of the Ottoman Empire (although their activities were defined by Ottoman legislation). As the Muslim religious institutions (Shar'ī courts and *awqāf*) had in fact formed part of the central apparatus of the Empire, the replacement of Ottoman-Muslim by British-Christian rule had the strange result of discriminating against the Muslim community, although the Shar'ī courts, as in Ottoman times, still enjoyed greater jurisdiction than the courts of the Christian and Jewish communities.

The establishment of civil government in July 1920 was to put an end to this situation. It was not long before the Muslim community began to demand that it be allowed to manage its own religious affairs. In the autumn of 1920, when the movement which led to the convening of the Palestinian Congress in Haifa in December of that same year, came into existence, a great deal of attention was paid to the question of the organization of Muslim life. The fact that the Shar'ī courts and the religious endowments were subject to the control of non-Muslims was strongly criticized.<sup>1</sup> The situation was further aggravated by the fact that the legal department was headed by a Jew, Norman Bentwich.<sup>2</sup>

Not much pressure was required to persuade the Government to deal with the situation; the last thing Herbert Samuel wanted was to provide the Muslims with cause for complaint of religious discrimination. The Government was quite prepared to give the Muslim community a free rein, at least with respect to the administration of *awqāf*. But the '*ulamā*' and other public leaders, who had assembled at a nation-wide conference on 19th November 1920, did not press for this,<sup>3</sup> and merely decided to set up a committee composed of '*ulamā*' and a few government officials to look into the question.<sup>4</sup> While this committee was busy preparing its recommendations, more far-reaching claims began to make themselves heard—it was demanded that the controlling authority over the Shar'ī courts be invested in a body elected by the Muslims themselves.<sup>5</sup> Thus, when the original committee came to present its recommendations before another Muslim Conference, called in August 1921, these were rejected and another committee was set up to prepare more far-reaching proposals which would assure the Muslims complete autonomy in the running of the religious endowments and Shar'ī courts.<sup>6</sup>

In direct contrast to what the Government had thought at the end of 1920, the HC this time informed those attending the Conference that it was the Government's wish "to establish a body representing the country's Muslims in order both to assure them complete control over their religious endowments and that the

Muslim community might feel that the Shar'ī courts were being supervised by people of its own choice. The Government does not wish to take the place of the *Sheikh ūl-Islām*." He went on to suggest that a higher Muslim body be elected by representatives chosen by the Muslim secondary electors to the last Ottoman Parliament.<sup>7</sup> On the basis of these pronouncements, the committee elected by the Conference prepared a set of draft regulations for the establishment of a "Supreme Muslim Shar'ī Council". This proposal met with the full approval of the HC, except for a single reservation. He insisted that the dismissal of *qādis* be subject to Government consent. But he accepted the rest of the committee's proposal's, including, most significantly, the right to appoint muftis without the prior consent of the Government. The HC requested that the Colonial Office approve the proposal with the minimum of delay, as "for political reasons, it is urgent that Moslem opinion be satisfied as soon as possible. This satisfaction can best be secured by giving immediate confirmation to these proposals."<sup>8</sup>

The Muslim Conference was prepared to accept the Government's amendment, but only on condition that this was inserted at the end of the draft regulations that *it* had prepared. The HC agreed to this, and the way was paved for the publication of "the Order constituting the Supreme Moslem Shar'ī Council".<sup>9</sup>

The Arab population, particularly the nationalist societies, attached great importance to this development. When the *Qādi* of Jerusalem, Sheikh Muḥammad Sa'ūd al-'Awri voiced his opposition to the placing of the Shar'ī courts under the control of the SMC, he was branded a traitor, and the Government was asked to replace him.<sup>10</sup>

The SMC was eventually set up on 9th January 1922. On that date, 53 of the 56 secondary electors to the last Ottoman Parliament (4 for each of the 14 sub-districts of Ottoman Palestine) assembled in order to elect the members of the Council.<sup>11</sup> They were to choose a *Ra'īs al-'Ulamā'*, to serve as permanent President, and four other council members: two from the Ottoman *sanjaq* of Jerusalem, one from the *sanjaq* of Nāblus, and one from the *sanjaq* of Acre.

Rāghib al-Nashāshībi and his supporters made a last-minute effort to prevent the election of al-Ḥājj Amin (as *Ra'īs al-'Ulamā'*) and his henchmen to the council by waging a vigorous propaganda campaign against them and demanding that the elections be postponed. When they found that only ten members supported them, Rāghib and six of his supporters left the session. Of the forty-seven who remained, forty cast their votes in favour of al-Ḥājj Amin al-Ḥusayni as *Ra'īs al-'Ulamā'*. The election of the four council members was carried out on a district basis, the representatives of

each *sanjaq* choosing their own member of the SMC. The Mufti of Haifa, Muḥammad Murād, was chosen to represent the *sanjaq* of Acre, and ‘Abd al-Latīf Ṣalāḥ was chosen to represent the *sanjaq* of Nāblus, both of them with almost no opposition. The two representatives of the Jerusalem district, however (Sa‘īd Shawā of Gaza and ‘Abdāllah Dajāni of Jaffa), were chosen by a very narrow majority; had Rāghib al-Nashāshībī and his supporters—five of whom came from this district—not left the hall, the result might well have been very different.<sup>12</sup>

It seems that al-Ḥājj Amīn’s election as *Ra’īs al-‘Ulamā’* was a foregone conclusion. We have seen how the status of the Mufti of Jerusalem had developed since the British occupation. When the Government were discussing the question of his salary in the autumn of 1921, one of the chief considerations was that since al-Ḥājj Amīn would at any rate achieve recognition as “Leader of the Muslims in Palestine” by virtue of his election as *Ra’īs al-‘Ulamā’*, there would be no need to provide him with an especially high salary in his capacity as Mufti of Jerusalem. Al-Ḥājj Amīn himself was secretly informed of these considerations, and was well aware of the Government’s stand on the prospect of his election as *Ra’īs al-‘Ulamā’* and the proposed SMC.<sup>13</sup> It is not surprising, therefore, that at the meetings of the Muslim delegates who were preparing for the establishment of the SMC, al-Ḥājj Amīn acted as their leader and spokesman, this being tacitly recognized by the Government which maintained liaison with these delegates through him.<sup>14</sup>

It was the Government’s contention that “the final settlement of Moslem religious questions will be acceptable to the Moslem population of the country and will bring them assurances that the Government decrees in every way that they should have complete control of their own religious affairs and religious endowments”.<sup>15</sup> Thus, the body which was established not only enjoyed full autonomy but was in fact a sort of “state within a state”. The phrasing of the regulations governing the setting up of the new body were far from clear, and this was to lead to many difficulties in the future. They were hopelessly vague on the question of whether the *Ra’īs al-‘Ulamā’* was elected only for the period that the SMC remained in office (i.e. four years), or whether he was chosen for life. Article 2 laid down that “the *Rais el-Ulema* shall be the permanent President of the Council. The Members shall be elected for a period of four years.” The issue is confused, however, by Article 4; it was laid down in this article that the SMC was to prepare a special law governing the election of the *Ra’īs al-‘Ulamā’* by the Muslim community as a whole. This seems to indicate that

al-Ḥājj Amīn's election in January 1922 was only intended to be of a temporary nature and that the distinction between the permanent *Ra'īs al-'Ulamā'* and the council members elected for four years did not in fact apply to him. Article 6 appears to lend strength to the impression that Article 2 was not intended to apply to al-Ḥājj Amīn al-Ḥusayni—this states that “the Rais el-Ulema shall, in the present circumstances be chosen by the General Committee elected by the secondary electors . . .”<sup>16</sup> Although it is quite possible that al-Ḥājj Amīn was not elected President of the SMC for life, the Attorney-General, Norman Bentwich (as the Legal Secretary was now called), was not certain that new elections to this post would in fact be necessary in 1926 as Article 6 did not specifically state that that reference was to the election of a temporary *Ra'īs al-'Ulamā'*; he thus tended to believe that the 1926 election was in fact intended to place the incumbent in office for life.<sup>17</sup> This lack of clarity served greatly to strengthen al-Ḥājj Amīn's position, and he firmly maintained that his election had been for life and that he was not bound to seek re-election, thus managing to prevent the holding of new elections for this office.

The regulations were also not very clear on the question of the Council's powers, but as these came to be exercised in practice, legal consent of sorts was in fact given to the SMC's untrammelled control of the Shar'i courts, the appointment and dismissal of *qādis* and court functionaries, control of local *waqf* boards and their incomes, etc. Article 8 also made it extremely difficult to introduce any changes in the regulations, stipulating that proposals for any such amendments were to be placed before the “electoral committee” by the SMC itself, and only after receiving an absolute majority in this body could they be forwarded on to the Government for approval. The members of the “electoral committee”, who had presided over the establishment of the SMC and who had elected its President and members, were denied the possibility of themselves proposing amendments to the regulations.<sup>18</sup> The result was, in the words of H. Luke, Chief Secretary of the Government in the late 1920s: “that the constitution and these regulations involved a delegation to the Supreme Muslim Council of jurisdiction so extensive and powers so wide as to be to some extent almost an abdication by the Administration of Palestine of responsibilities normally incumbent upon a Government”. The extent to which the Government had forfeited its authority was so great that all the judges of the Shar'i courts and their officials (as opposed to the staff of the *waqf* administration), as well as all the muftis, received their salaries from the Government.<sup>19</sup>

What made the Government adopt this attitude? Part of the

answer may be found in the HC's despatch requesting speedy authorization of the draft regulations for the SMC. He believed it to be essential that the satisfaction of the Muslim community (by far the largest in the country) be achieved, and in his eyes, the granting of full internal autonomy did not seem too high a price to pay. There appears also to have been another factor at work. Extension of British rule over Palestine meant that a Muslim regime was replaced by a Christian one. What is more, the head of the British Administration in Palestine happened to be a Jew, as did his Legal Secretary, who handled all legal affairs of the country. It appears, then, that this made the British authorities extremely chary of any interference in the affairs of the *Shari'ah* and *awqāf*, a vastly different state of affairs from that in other territories under direct British rule.<sup>20</sup>

But this is not the whole answer. It would appear that the major factor determining the attitude of the British administration to the SMC and its powers is to be found in the political aspect of the Palestine imbroglio. The HC, as we have seen, had been very anxious in 1921 about the possible recurrence of disturbances similar to those of the previous April, and had consequently taken the unusual step of proposing the appointment of al-Ḥājj Amin to the office of Mufti of Jerusalem even before the elections had been held. The riots which broke out in the coastal areas in May 1921 made a deep impression on the HC. From that time on, he tended to seek various ways of pacifying the predominantly Muslim Palestinian population. Both the HC and the Chief Secretary, Wyndham Deedes, came to the conclusion that the best way to satisfy the Palestinians, short of rescinding the policy of the Balfour Declaration, would be to strike Article 4 (concerning recognition of the Jewish Agency) from the text of the Mandate. As this proposal was rejected by the Colonial Office, they then set about finding an alternative solution at the local level: if it was not possible to repeal recognition of the Jewish Agency, then a corresponding Arab body should be set up enjoying equal autonomy and powers. The need for such a body became even more apparent after the HC agreed in 1920 to recognize the assembly elected by the *yishūv* as the representative Jewish body in Palestine. This recognition was extended after the Jewish assembly pledged to operate within the framework of the Mandate and to abide by the instructions of the Mandatory. As no similar undertaking could be obtained from a representative Muslim body, the difficulty was averted by agreeing to the establishment of the SMC as it was, in the event, constituted. It was not merely by chance that at the end of 1920 and at the beginning of 1921, when the first steps

were being taken to set up a body to handle Muslim affairs, the Government was not particularly anxious to give this body very much authority in the control of the Shar'i courts; it was only in the summer of 1921, after the May disturbances, that a change took place in the Government's thinking. The Government came to feel, it appears, that the gratification of the Muslims' wishes in this respect and the appointment of al-Ḥājj Amīn al-Ḥusayni to the head of a Muslim council wielding real power, would placate to some extent the opposition to the Zionist aspect of the Mandate, and at least prevent the outbreak of violence.

The population of Palestine received the establishment of the SMC with general satisfaction, and Jamāl al-Ḥusayni, Secretary of the AE, described the event as "a victory for the Nationalist Movement".<sup>21</sup> It is hardly surprising that even his rivals in the Arab camp saw this body as "the vanguard of the Nationalist Movement, despite its being a religious body".<sup>22</sup> The Muslim-Christian Association in Nāblus issued a statement thanking the Government for recognizing "the legitimate rights of the nation" in connection with the *awqāf* and the lands in Beisan. The statement went on to express the hope that this step taken by the Government would usher in a new political era of mutual understanding between the Arabs and the British on all basic issues.<sup>23</sup>

This positive reaction, and even more, the fact that from the beginning of 1922 the country had quietened down considerably (widespread disturbances like those of May and the more limited ones of November 1921 not recurring until the summer of 1929) strengthened the Government in its conviction that the approach it had adopted toward the setting up of the SMC and the extent of its powers had been a wise one.<sup>24</sup> Accordingly, the Government continued to maintain its friendly attitude towards this body. Immediately after it was established, a sum of £11,000, taken from the revenues of the old *awqāf* previously accruing to the Ottoman Government, was put at the SMC's disposal.<sup>25</sup> The Government did all it could to help in the restoration of the Dome of the Rock and the al-Aqṣā mosque, and extended its aid to the missions sent abroad to raise funds for this purpose. In 1926, at the time of the SMC crisis following the annulment of the election results by the Supreme Court, the Government saved the situation; in appointing four new members to serve on a "temporary" council it did not raise the issue of the *Ra'īs al-'Ulamā'*'s re-election, thereby tacitly acceding to al-Ḥājj Amīn's contention that he had in fact been elected for life. Richmond went still further in his policy of fostering the SMC as a religious institution. He worked in 1921 to consolidate the Mufti's status as "Head of Islam in Palestine"; after

the SMC had been set up, he made every effort to impute practical day-to-day significance to the leadership functions implied in the offices of Mufti of Jerusalem and President of the SMC. In 1923, he was provided with a fine opportunity to further his aims. Wyndham Deedes, the Chief Secretary, who was not particularly sympathetic to Richmond's approach, resigned and was replaced by General Sir Gilbert Clayton, a man far more inclined to accommodate the demands of the Arabs. What is more, later that same year Clayton was appointed Acting High Commissioner during Samuel's absence in England. It was then that Richmond set a significant precedent. He consulted, on the Chief Secretary's instructions, the President of the SMC as well as the AE in connection with a civil matter that was completely outside the scope of the SMC's functions and jurisdiction (concerning the Arab stand on a proposal to include local members in a Government committee on taxation).<sup>26</sup> He also saw nothing wrong with the Mufti of Jerusalem bringing before the Government petitions signed by the villagers complaining about police behaviour, this again being a matter well outside the jurisdiction of the SMC. Feeling, however, that some explanation was called for, Richmond stated: "As you know [referring to the Chief Secretary], the custom among villagers of Palestine is to have recourse to the Mufti of Jerusalem in their difficulties".<sup>27</sup> The impression was thus created that in the eyes of the Government, the Mufti of Jerusalem and President of the SMC was in fact the official representative of the Palestinian population, even in matters not strictly within the bounds of his jurisdiction. This was of inestimable importance to the consolidation and entrenchment of al-Ḥājj Amīn's leadership. The Governor of the Jerusalem District, Ronald Storrs, attempted to nip this development in the bud, but failed, it appears, due to Richmond.<sup>28</sup>

This attitude did not evolve by mere chance. Four years of tranquillity in Palestine could not but satisfy the Colonial Office, and Sir John Shuckburgh, head of the Middle East Department, wrote: "The institution of a Supreme Moslem Council in 1921 has, on the whole, been one of the most successful moves in Palestine. It practically gave the Mohammedans self-government in regard to Moslem affairs. The arrangement has worked smoothly and has no doubt done much to reconcile Mohammedans to the Mandatory régime with its unpopular Zionist flavour".<sup>29</sup> Although the events of 1929 caused the British Administration in Palestine and the Colonial Office in London to reconsider the wisdom of this policy, it soon regained its former prestige, and they continued to support the SMC until 1937.

Apart from these political considerations, there was another

factor which helped shape the attitude of the Government towards the SMC and its President—Richmond's undisguised antipathy to Zionism. In his numerous memoranda and in the stand he took on various issues, Richmond consistently supported the Arab position, and his repudiation of Zionism was absolute.<sup>30</sup> It was quite likely, therefore, that his support for al-Ḥājj Amin al-Ḥusayni, who had emerged as an unremittingly anti-Zionist leader during the years 1919–20, stemmed from his own anti-Zionist inclinations. At all events, he helped him in every way possible, notably by regarding him as the official representative of the Palestinian population.

This, then, forms the background to al-Ḥājj Amin al-Ḥusayni's meteoric rise from the beginning of the 1920s into the 1930s, by which time his supreme leadership was firmly established. His family origin, his burning ambition, and his irrefutable ability as a leader all helped this young man (he was just twenty-six at the time) to succeed in his bid for the office of Mufti of Jerusalem; it was the deliberate policy of the Government which transformed the holder of this office into the "Head of the Muslim Community in Palestine" and that enabled him to serve as President of the very powerful Supreme Moslem Council. We shall now see how al-Ḥājj Amin turned the SMC into a tool serving his own personal political ends.

The SMC and its President went along with the British policy outlined above. In return for its establishment, the wide powers vested in it, and British recognition of the pre-eminent status of its President, the SMC strove to prevent the recurrence of disturbances—especially during the al-Nebi Mūsā festivities in April each year, a period particularly conducive to rioting. The President of the SMC maintained good relations with the authorities, and whenever he took a stand which might be contrary to their wishes, this was never obvious and, outwardly at least, he never appeared to step outside the bounds of the Council's jurisdiction. His main concern during the 1920s was the consolidation of his position within the Muslim community itself.

The fact that he controlled *waqf* revenue was an important asset to the President of the SMC. The Council's budget was about £50,000 when it was first established, reaching £62,000 in 1931; 10% of the total revenue accruing to the Government from the 'ushr tax came from *waqf* land, this portion reaching 22% in 1931.<sup>31</sup> The expenditure of such large sums was not without political considerations. For example, the bulk of the money intended for the restoration of mosques and the construction of schools, clinics etc. went to the Jerusalem district followed by

Jaffa and Nāblus, while the Hebron and Haifa-Acre districts were clearly neglected. It should be borne in mind that opposition to the SMC and the AE came chiefly from these latter two districts, and this partly explains the motive behind the Council's uneven distribution of the above funds.<sup>32</sup>

The use of income from the *awqāf* for political purposes appears to have been widespread. Close examination of the SMC's budget provides grounds for suspecting this. In the 1924-5 budget, for example, £1,900 was allocated to "enlightenment" (*tanvīrāt*), in addition to a further £3,250 for the salaries of mosque functionaries who were to give the said "enlightenment". It may well be that "enlightenment", apart from referring to the preaching of sermons in the mosques, was also another name for political propaganda.<sup>33</sup>

Al-Ḥājj Amīn's opponents frequently complained that the sums ear-marked in the budget for the restoration of mosques were manipulated and grossly inflated in order to cover up for money diverted to political goals, such as the staging of demonstrations, granting of subsidies to the Muslim-Christian Association, etc. This was particularly true, they claimed, with respect to the funds raised throughout the Muslim world for the restoration of the Dome of the Rock and al-Aqṣā mosque.<sup>34</sup> Even the money collected to aid the Syrian rebels in 1925-7 was used by al-Ḥājj Amīn to further his own political ends.<sup>35</sup> Political considerations were also evident in the leasing of *waqf* properties. These were distributed on easy terms among relatives and supporters of the President of the SMC, and completely denied to his opponents.<sup>36</sup> Those already holding leases on *waqf* property were obliged to pledge their loyalty to the President of the SMC or face eviction.<sup>37</sup>

Under Article 9 of the Regulations, the body which had elected the SMC could demand reports from the Council (although not from its President) concerning its activities, should one-third of its members request that a meeting be convened for this purpose. In order to prevent such an eventuality, and in order to tighten his control over the electors, al-Ḥājj Amīn saw to it that many of them were given posts subject to the jurisdiction of the Council—*qādis*, *waqf* commissioners, *imāms*, etc.<sup>38</sup> Likewise, those who rejected his policies or opposed him in any way were either relieved of these posts, or under threat of dismissal, were alienated from those organizations hostile to him. He would then appoint his henchmen or members of his own family in their stead. Thus, appointments were also effective as a means of winning opponents over to the side of the SMC, or of repaying political favours. Thus, for example, Ḥusām al-Dīn Jārāllāh was made General Supervisor of the Shar'i courts (after these had been placed under the control

of the SMC) in return for his part in securing al-Ḥājj Amīn's appointment as Mufti of Jerusalem. Similarly, 'Izzat Darwaza was appointed Commissioner of *Awqāf* in Nāblus and later, Director General of Religious Endowments, meanwhile abandoning his former opposition to the President of the SMC. In this way, the Muslim religious organization and *awqāf* administration were transformed into strongholds of support for al-Ḥājj Amīn al-Ḥusayni.<sup>39</sup>

According to the Regulations, the SMC was supposed to inform the Government of such dismissals, but it usually managed to get around this by claiming that no actual dismissal was in fact involved, and all that had happened was that an office had been dissolved or the official in question had been transferred to another post.<sup>40</sup> It was possible in this way to bring about the resignation of an undesirable person—if a high-ranking *qāḍī* were transferred to a more lowly judicial post, for example, he would generally choose to tender his resignation.

Another way in which the SMC and its President, as well as the nationalist majority, managed to enhance their power was by extending financial assistance to private Arab schools in the larger towns such as Jerusalem, Nāblus, Jaffa and Haifa. These schools, especially the *al-Najāḥ* school in Nāblus and the *Rawḍat al-Ma'ārif* school in Jerusalem, instructed their pupils in an extreme nationalist spirit and on the basis of the President of the SMC's virulently anti-Zionist stand. The pupils of these schools, together with the children of the Muslim Orphanage in Jerusalem, took part in the activities of the SMC, staging demonstrations, religious processions, etc. The directors and owners of *Rawḍat al-Ma'ārif* were members of al-Ḥājj Amīn's family, as were many of its teachers, and the school functioned in a building belonging to the SMC. Among the directors of *al-Najāḥ* in Nāblus were to be found at different times the radical Palestinian leaders 'Izzat Darwaza and Akram Zu'aytir.<sup>41</sup>

The overt political activity of the members of the SMC and the religious establishment became apparent to all when the AE organized a boycott of the elections for the Legislative Council at the end of 1922 and beginning of 1923. But this was not all. Members of the SMC (not the President, however) and its high officials participated in the various Palestinian conferences.<sup>42</sup> Al-Ḥājj Amīn used to involve himself in matters of a strictly political nature, such as the staging of demonstrations, for example.<sup>43</sup> When al-Ḥājj Amīn's opponents organized themselves into a political party, the SMC mobilized all its forces to do battle, and in 1927, during the municipal elections, SMC men scarcely bothered to disguise their active interest in the fray.<sup>44</sup> The SMC did all it could to help the AE preserve its leadership when this began to

decline from 1923 onwards, identifying itself politically to an ever increasing degree with this body, and the printing press belonging to the Muslim Orphanage in Jerusalem (which was under the SMC's control) was placed at its disposal.<sup>45</sup> In the 1930s, the SMC and its President spearheaded the vigorous campaign waged by the Palestinian National Movement against the sale of Arab land to Jews. A *fatwā* was issued by the President of the SMC and the '*ulamā*' forbidding the sale of land to Jews, threatening with excommunication and denial of Muslim marriage and burial anyone daring to defy this instruction.<sup>46</sup>

The SMC and its President also took a very active interest in promoting Jerusalem's status in the eyes of the Muslim world, and in enhancing the importance of the city's two great mosques. The Ottoman legacy in this respect was paltry. The Dome of the Rock and al-Aqṣā had been neglected and were in danger of collapse, the income from many of the religious endowments pledged to finance their upkeep having been diverted by the Ottoman authorities to other purposes.<sup>47</sup> Thus, from the start, the SMC gave high priority to the restoration of these two mosques. A comprehensive information campaign was launched throughout Palestine and the Muslim world, stressing the urgent need to save the mosques from ruin, and this was followed by a massive fund-raising drive to finance the reconstruction work.<sup>48</sup> The drive opened with the sending of delegations to the Hejaz (in July 1923, at the time of the *Ḥajj*) and to the Muslims of India (in October of the same year).

The First Delegation also waged a propaganda campaign against the signing of the Anglo-Hejazi treaty, and drove home the need to raise money for the restoration of the mosques by claiming that the Zionists were preparing to take them over.<sup>49</sup> King Ḥusayn threw his full weight behind the drive, putting pressure on his subjects to donate and deducting one month's salary from Government employees. £12,000 was raised in this way, according to the Delegation.<sup>50</sup> The mission to India, which included Jamāl al-Ḥusaynī and Muḥammad Murād (the Mufti of Haifa), as well as Ibrāhīm al-Anṣārī (one of the al-Aqṣā sheikhs),<sup>51</sup> promised the Government that it would not take part in political activity of any kind, al-Ḥājj Amīn al-Ḥusaynī personally underwriting this pledge. Although not entirely happy about the inclusion of Jamāl al-Ḥusaynī, the HC nevertheless lent his full support to the project and did all he could to persuade the British authorities in India to allow the Delegation into that country. Despite the fact that the latter remained opposed to the visit, the HC permitted the Delegation to leave Palestine, thereby presenting the British Government with a

*fait accompli* which it had to accept or face the public outcry which would certainly have arisen had the Delegation been turned back in the middle of its mission.<sup>52</sup> £22,000 was raised in India—the Nizam of Hyderabad alone contributing 100,000 rupees (almost £7,000).<sup>53</sup> Other missions to Hejaz, Iraq, Kuwait and Bahrain during the course of 1924 boosted the sum raised to a total of £84,000.<sup>54</sup> A special contribution of £10,000 came from King Fu'ād of Egypt.<sup>55</sup>

With the aid of this money and at the initiative of al-Ḥājj Amīn, the SMC managed by the end of the 1920s to complete an impressive restoration of the al-Aqṣā mosque and the Dome of the Rock (which was plated with gold). Maintenance of the two mosques was vastly improved in contrast to the outright neglect which had hitherto characterized the *al-Ḥaram al-Sharif*. The SMC also strove to establish a museum of Islamic art and a library of religious works in the area.<sup>56</sup>

The above restoration project was of immense significance. It enhanced the value and importance of the two Jerusalem mosques, both in the eyes of Muslims in Palestine itself, and also in the eyes of Muslims in other countries. The fund-raising drive throughout the Muslim world had attracted international attention, which became focussed in turn on Jerusalem and the rest of Palestine. This fitted in well with al-Ḥājj Amīn's efforts to achieve recognition as a Muslim personage of world standing, which included his participation in the Caliphate Conference meeting in Egypt in 1926; his attempt to mediate between rival factions among the Syrian exiles in Egypt during 1926–7; the convening of the World Islamic Congress in Jerusalem in 1931, and the establishment at this Congress of an international Muslim organization headed by himself. Last, but not least, the restoration project served as an important means of enlisting world-wide support for the Palestinians' struggle against Jewish settlement in Palestine.

No less important was the fostering of the al-Nebi Mūsā celebrations in Jerusalem. These festivities, which took place each year about the same time as the Greek-Orthodox Easter, became, at the initiative of the Mufti, a great national event. As the Mufti of Jerusalem was traditionally the central figure in the celebrations, the mere fact that these were held, even without the significance of the event being emphasized and enhanced, served to demonstrate his importance and standing.<sup>57</sup>

The enhancing of Jerusalem's importance was not restricted to activity in the inner circles of Islam alone. Parallel to the restoration project, the SMC and its President disseminated propaganda among the Muslims of Palestine and other countries to the effect that the great Jerusalem mosques were in danger of falling into the hands

of the Zionists. In linking the two, al-Ḥājj Amīn al-Ḥusayni managed to give considerable substance and credibility to Jerusalem's sanctity and importance in Islam and also to his own image as bearer of the standard of its defence.

There was, however, another aspect to this affair. The restoration project was launched at a time when internal opposition to al-Ḥājj Amīn and his methods was at its height. His opponents spread word of huge sums, donated for the restoration of the two great mosques, which had been used for political purposes. Although these stories were exaggerated, they were given some credence and served as additional weapons in the hands of his opponents.<sup>58</sup> At all events, there is no doubt that the restoration of the mosques and the enhancing of Jerusalem's status was one of al-Ḥājj Amīn al-Ḥusayni's primary political weapons and formed a basic pillar of his policy. The vehemence with which he waged his struggle at the time of the "Wailing Wall" affair cannot be understood without fully appreciating his attitude towards the whole question of the importance and significance of Jerusalem's two mosques.

## Chapter Five

### THE ORIGIN OF THE OPPOSITION AND ITS DEVELOPMENT

The internal political division which marked the Palestinian national movement from the start was above all a product of the structure of Palestinian society. The growth of the power of the urban élite in the course of the nineteenth century stimulated internal competition among the families for positions of influence in the political and social centres of power: municipalities, provincial councils, the administrative and legal apparatus etc. The rise of this élite occurred, as we have seen, at the expense of the rural élite, which was extremely bitter over its loss of power and influence.

The joining of the districts of Jerusalem, Nāblus and Acre into one political unit led to the extension of the hegemony of the Jerusalem élite beyond the limits of its own district until it included all of Palestine—much to the frequent bitterness of the other urban élites. The internal political division in the Palestinian camp was a political expression of this social division.

The varied sources of this split—competition among families, the rivalries existing between city and village, and the various districts—led to a complexity which made the division hard to define. The camp supporting the AE and the SMC (the Ḥusayni group) was, it is true, more or less united in loyalty to the accepted leadership and to a certain political structure. But the opposing camp (the Nashāshībi faction—“the Opposition”) was far more variegated; its leadership was largely local, and the political conceptions current within it were far from being homogeneous. What nevertheless characterizes this camp and allows it to be seen as a phenomenon having more shared elements than differentiating ones, is its opposition to the leadership of the al-Ḥusayni family and to the policy of non-cooperation in self-governing institutions (the legislative council and similar bodies).

#### THE BASIC REASONS FOR THE EMERGENCE OF THE OPPOSITION

The rise of the Nashāshībi family in Jerusalem at the start of the twentieth century and its competition with the families traditionally

pre-eminent in that city (the al-Ḥusayni and al-Khālidi families) made the inter-family rivalry there particularly bitter. The al-Nashāshibi family, which had just recently risen to prominence and whose status was connected more closely than that of the other families to the Ottoman administrative apparatus, was apparently more alarmed than the others over the end of Ottoman rule.

For the al-Ḥusayni and al-Khālidi families, whose members had filled, in the course of generations, various posts in the urban and local religious apparatus, the coming of British rule did not mean a loss of status. The position of the Nashāshibi family was primarily a product of the status of Rāghib al-Nashāshibi as a member of the Ottoman Parliament and Chief Engineer of the Jerusalem district.<sup>3</sup> For this reason the removal of Ottoman rule could have meant the end of its public position. It is no wonder, then, that the heads of the al-Ḥusayni family formed ties, by virtue of their public posts, with the new regime. The younger members of the family, who were prominent in the leadership of *al-Nādi al-'Arabi*, also maintained good connections with the British Military Administration, which at that time was encouraging the Arab national movement which was linked to Fayṣal, Ḥusayn's son. In contrast to this, the members of the al-Nashāshibi family looked upon the rival political factor, the French, as allies; and it should not surprise us that the association, *al-Muntadā al-Adabi*, which they set up and led in the early days of the British Military Administration was tied to the French. These two organizations cooperated with each other because of their common goals, but this idyllic situation ended, as we have seen, in the spring of 1920 with the dismissal of Mūsā Kāzīm al-Ḥusayni from the Jerusalem mayoralty and with the disillusionment over the dream of a Syria united under Fayṣal's rule.

The dismissal of Mūsā Kāzīm al-Ḥusayni (for the circumstances and causes of this event see Chapter Two), the manner in which it was accomplished and the personality of his successor certainly contributed greatly to the exacerbation of tension between the al-Ḥusayni and al-Nashāshibi families. The appointment involved a change in the orientation of the Nashāshibis towards the foreign element. If before this they had enjoyed the support of French agents, they now turned to the British; and it was from their midst and from the midst of their supporters that there came those individuals who called for a policy of cooperation with the British, even after the establishment of the civil government and the ratification of the Mandate.

As we have seen, Mūsā Kāzīm al-Ḥusayni became the out-

standing figure in the Palestinian national movement and President of its Executive Committee. Another rival of the Nashāshībīs, al-Ḥājj Amīn al-Ḥusayni, formerly President of *al-Nādi al-'Arabi*, was elected President of the SMC in January 1922. It would have been unusual had the personal rivalry between these individuals not turned into opposition to the bodies they headed, just as it was inevitable that these bodies would be turned into tools in the hands of their leaders against their personal rivals. In this way, then, internal division within the Palestinian community developed and an element opposed to the leadership and the groups supporting it arose.

The settling of personal and family scores with the heads of the AE and the SMC were not limited to the Nashāshībīs. From the start of the AE's activity, various individuals who had felt themselves deprived or slighted, and therefore lent their support to the opponents of the AE, became conspicuous. This is an important phenomenon, since in this manner the opposition increased beyond the bounds of a narrow family conflict and comprised a larger number of elements. These individuals and their supporters claimed unceasingly that their opposition to the AE was a result of their having been thrust aside and of the exploitation of the national movement by its leaders for their private purposes.<sup>2</sup> Initially, at least, they did not bring up political justifications for their opposition, but in the course of time they also developed political stands of their own. Nevertheless, there is no doubt that the haste with which the heads of the AE accused anyone of treachery who was slow to support them, strengthened the feeling of personal bitterness and was an important factor in the appearance of the opposition.

In this category it is worthwhile to cite some examples. Sheikh Sulaymān al-Tāji al-Fārūqi of Ramleh, who had been the initiator of the Palestinian Congress in December 1920 and had been elected there to the first AE, later found himself to be without any representative function. When the First Delegation was selected at the following Congress he was not among its members, because of the desire to leave the post of President of the Delegation free for Mūsā Kāzīm al-Ḥusayni.<sup>3</sup> This learned *'ālim* was not even re-elected to the Executive charged with handling the affairs of the movement during the Delegation's stay in Britain. Reacting to this, he resigned from the Congress.<sup>4</sup> In early 1922 he still remained outside the SMC and its staff. He took no part in the Fifth Congress, in August 1922. An attempt on the part of 'Umar al-Bayṭār of Jaffa to bring about his election to the AE did indeed succeed,<sup>5</sup> but al-Fārūqi still took no part in its activities. It is no wonder, then, that when

the opposition party was set up al-Fārūqī became one of its leaders and guiding forces for many years.

A similar development occurred with respect to 'Ārif Pāshā al-Dajāni. He had been the first President of the Jerusalem MCA; his status as leader of the national organizations had begun to deteriorate with the growth in the importance of the militant *al-Nādi al-'Arabi*. Mūsā Kāzīm al-Ḥusayni's election as President of the AE removed what was left of his importance as President of the Jerusalem MCA. When the First Delegation departed he was elected to replace Mūsā Kāzīm al-Ḥusayni, who headed the Delegation, in the post of President of the AE; but this in no way compensated him for not having been chosen to the Delegation. He responded by spreading propaganda against the usefulness of the Delegation's activity and by putting difficulties in the way of the collection of funds for it. When a year later it was decided to send a delegation to the Hejaz, he demanded to be put at its head; when this time too he failed to be elected, he came out against the decision of the AE to send it and against its policy. The AE responded by dismissing him from the post of head of the AE, and in this way he too was thrust into the ranks of the opposition.<sup>6</sup> It is not by chance that at that very time his brother, Shukri al-Dajāni, also joined the first body of the opposition, the "National Muslim Association" (*Al-Jam'iyah al-Islāmiyyah al-Waṭaniyyah*) and even stood at its head; this move undoubtedly also affected the status of 'Ārif Pāshā.<sup>7</sup>

The division of the noted families of Nāblus into two rival camps (see Introduction) facilitated the spreading of the opposition to Nāblus. The leader of the first camp was al-Ḥājj Tawfīq Ḥamād; Ḥaydar Bey Ṭawqān headed the second. Ḥaydar Ṭawqān had been Mayor for a long period and in 1912 had been elected to the Ottoman Parliament; however, in 1914 things changed, and al-Ḥājj Tawfīq Ḥamād was elected in his place to Parliament.<sup>8</sup> The causes are not clear, but in any case Tawfīq Ḥamād began to stand out as the main figure in Nāblus and its environs, and when the national organizations (the AE and the Palestinian Delegation) were set up in the early 'twenties, Tawfīq Ḥamād was elected to them. It is not surprising, then, that Ḥaydar Ṭawqān became the chief opponent of the AE in the Nāblus area and the pillar of the opposition organizations there, along with his friends and supporters.<sup>9</sup>

There are many other cases of individuals who had previously filled various posts in the civil or religious Ottoman administration and who, now that they were left without any national or religious function, joined the ranks of the opposition. I will mention only

one more, whose opposition to the AE and the SMC probably had a wider significance—As‘ad Shuqayr (or Shuqayri) of Acre. This individual had filled important positions during the Ottoman period, such as a deputy to Parliament, Head of the “Committee for Clarification of *Shari‘ah* Affairs” in the office of *Sheikh ül-Islām*, and “Mufti of the Fourth Army” (the army in the Syria-Palestine region) during the First World War. He was at that time a fierce opponent of the emergent Arab nationalist trend and wholeheartedly supported the integrity and unity of the Ottoman-Muslim Empire.<sup>10</sup> In this he was not, of course, an exception, but rather typical of the vast majority of community leaders who later became nationalists—like Mūsā Kāzim al-Ḥusayni and al-Ḥājj Tawfiq Ḥamād, for example. Nevertheless, the fact that he had been Mufti of the Fourth Army under the command of Jemal Pāshā at the time when the leaders of the Arab awakening were executed<sup>11</sup> gave his pro-Ottoman stance a special significance. What singled him out from many others was that even after the disintegration of the Empire and the taking of Palestine he did not abandon his views. At the beginning of the renewed Palestinian organizational activity, in autumn 1920, he not only stood apart but even opposed this trend.<sup>12</sup> His ties with various Zionist elements were extremely close, and most important of all, he came out publicly in a large number of articles against the Arab nationalist awakening and the dismantling of the Empire within which the Arabs had enjoyed complete equality and freedom.<sup>13</sup>

As‘ad Shuqayri was one of the main props of the opposition in the northern districts. His Muslim training and his senior status in the past enhanced the importance of his opposition to the President of the SMC and his methods. The question thus arises: was there a connection between his anti-nationalist and traditional Muslim stand and the fact that he joined the less extreme of the Arab camps of Palestine, or was this no more than a coincidence? The answer to this rather complex question cannot be unequivocal, but it seems that the position taken by As‘ad Shuqayri was more common among the opposition than among the circles of the AE and the SMC. Side by side with Shuqayri one finds several additional members of the opposition who maintained their loyalty to the traditional Ottoman-Muslim conception even after the conquest of Palestine—e.g. Ḥaydar Bey Ṭawqān and ‘Abdāllah Mukhlis.<sup>14</sup> We saw above that this position was indeed taken up by numerous groups in the country and reached its peak in 1922, but it is instructive to note that at that time those who set out to restore Turkish rule in Palestine came from the groups opposed to the AE. It is not surprising, then, that when the paper *al-Karmil*

began, at the end of 1923, to support the opposition, it renounced its anti-Ottoman approach, and extolled the days of the Caliphate, admitting that it had erred when in the past it had supported those "seekers of offices and interests in the name of racism (*Unşuriyyah*)",<sup>15</sup> i.e. the Arab nationalists.

It is no wonder, then, that those personalities who were later to be the leaders and spokesmen of the opposition (Rāghib al-Nashāshibi, Ya'qūb Farrāj, 'Ārif Pāshā al-Dajāni and others) stood apart during the period of the "Southern Syria" movement and expressed during the early 'twenties their enmity for the Hāshemites and for their activities in Syria in 1918-20.<sup>16</sup>

Another phenomenon which fits into this picture is the pattern of relations which formed at the start of the 'twenties among the most conspicuous personalities of the opposition and the institutions of the Zionist movement in Palestine. We have already seen how Mūsā Kāzim al-Ḥusayni also maintained "special relations" with this element through H. M. Kalvarisky; but there is no doubt whatsoever—abundant evidence exists in the files of the Zionist Executive—that the majority of the prominent personalities of the opposition benefited from financial support from the Zionists, made use of their help for various personal needs, and, when they came to set up their first political organization, enjoyed the active support of this element.<sup>17</sup>

It seems, then, that alongside the personal-family factor which lay at the foundation of the origin of the opposition to the AE and the SMC there was another, more abstract factor. Generally speaking, the prominent members of the opposition were not in the early 'twenties caught up in the new spirit of nationalism—whether Pan-Arab or Palestinian-Arab—which began at that time to penetrate the Palestinian community. The AE and the SMC gave this spirit a much clearer expression than did the circles of the opposition. The fact that the wealthiest men of the country tended to join the opposition camp rather than the camp of the AE, whereas the few Palestinian intellectuals did the reverse, reinforces this conclusion.

#### POLITICAL AND ORGANIZATIONAL DEVELOPMENT OF THE OPPOSITION

The first manifestation of opposition to the leadership of the national movement was of a negative character. Apparently none of the members of the Jerusalem Nashāshibi family took part in the Third Congress, and none of them were elected to the first AE,

which was chosen at that Congress.<sup>1</sup> Other personalities in the Nāblus area who were beginning to work against the AE and its members (Ḥaydar Ṭawqān, Ḥusni 'Abd al-Hādi) passed around petitions against the Congress, which they claimed was not representative. This activity was carried out in coordination with Rāghib al-Nashāshibi, who received the petitions.<sup>2</sup> In this way the process of identifying the AE and its supporters with one of the rival camps of Arab Palestine began. As the internal conflict grew worse, this identification was strengthened, and the all-embracing representative character of the countrywide Congress decreased.

At the Fourth Congress another important personality conspicuously joined the opposition, namely Sheikh Sulaymān al-Tāji al-Fārūqi. At first the Ramleh MCA, which he headed, did not send representatives to the Congress;<sup>3</sup> and when its representatives finally did take part in it, the matter ended, as we have seen, with Sheikh al-Fārūqi's departure. It is true that one member of the Nashāshibi family took part in the Fourth, Fifth, and Sixth Congresses—Jawdat al-Nashāshibi<sup>4</sup>—but he apparently did so because of a split between him and his family. In any case, his participation in the Fifth Congress was not regarded as healing the split between the two camps, and it was resolved at the Congress to take action towards attracting the faction which had not taken part.<sup>5</sup> It seems that this resolution was no more than lip-service, as the heads of the AE did not encourage the Nashāshibis and their supporters to participate in the Congresses. When *al-Muntadā al-Adabi*, which was under the influence of the Nashāshibis, tried to take part in the Fifth Congress, the AE prevented it from doing so, and its representative, Dr. 'Izzat Ṭannūs, was not allowed into the Congress.<sup>6</sup> Other personalities who were the following year to become the heads of the opposition ('Abdāllah Mukhlis, for example) still took part in this Congress, and thus some of the oppositional circles did participate.<sup>7</sup>

A similar picture recurred at the Sixth Congress, in June 1923. Opposition personalities still participated in the Congress, but this time the opposition groups criticized the arrangements for appointing delegates to the Congress, and one of the delegates to the Congress protested openly against the one-sided composition of the new AE.<sup>8</sup> The first opposition organization, "the National Muslim Association", even sent an announcement to the British Government to the effect that the Congress did not represent the Arab people and that its stands were unimportant. The Arab people—so they announced—desired to work peacefully for the consolidation of Palestine, by cooperating with other residents regardless of race, under British protection.<sup>9</sup> It is not surprising, then, that

the HC reached the conclusion that the Sixth Congress was less representative than the preceding ones.<sup>10</sup>

It is true that the split between the two camps did not develop overnight to the point where the AE and the Congress were only identified with one of them. We have seen that some of the opponents of the AE were still represented at the Sixth Congress. Only with the setting up of the opposition party *al-Hizb al-Waṭani al-'Arabi al-Filasṭīni* (the Palestinian Arab National Party) in November 1923 did the departure of the members of the opposition from the framework of the AE and the associations connected to it receive expression. However, this party was not the first opposition organization. The existence of the "National Muslim Association" before this and the partial support which this association won from the men who were later to set up the "National Party" are evidence of the hesitation and bewilderment that the members of the opposition felt until such time as the majority of them dared to unite in their own political organization. But in order to understand the development of the "National Muslim Association", one must first direct ones attention to another element which was involved in events, namely the Zionist element.

Members of the Zionist Executive (and before it the Zionist Commission) in Jerusalem had already noticed at the beginning of their activity that there were elements that for one reason or another were opposed to the leading figures of the Palestinian AE and Congress. Because of its apprehensions over the Palestinians' anti-Zionist bent, the Zionist Executive began to make approaches to these men and to encourage them, "spiritually and materially", to work against the Palestinian elements which were inimical to Zionism.<sup>11</sup>

In the summer of 1921 a far-reaching attempt was made to organize all the opponents of the AE into a political framework having a programme favourable to Zionism. It seems that it was not by chance that the Arab Department of the Zionist Executive, under H. M. Kalvarisky, began working in this direction at that time. In July 1921 the First Palestinian Delegation had departed for London. Various elements, including the Zionist Organization, argued that it was not representative of the entire Muslim and Christian population of Palestine. The existence of an organization which would deny that the Delegation had a representative character would certainly have strengthened this argument. Thus when the "National Muslim Association" was indeed set up, the Zionist spokesmen in London were able to point to its existence as proof of their argument.<sup>12</sup>

The methods Kalvarisky used in setting up this organization,

generally speaking, included giving personal grants to the founders of these associations in various places and covering their expenses. In other cases loans at normal bank interest rates were arranged for farmers who were exposed to the mercies of usurers, because of the absence of agricultural credit institutions. The initiative for establishing the associations usually came from Kalvarisky, and the ties between the associations and the Zionist Executive were firm.<sup>13</sup> Newspapers which opposed the policy of the AE and which therefore seemed to be preparing the way for the emergence of an organization opposed to it also benefited from the financial support of the Zionist Executive—a phenomenon which was to continue for some time.<sup>14</sup>

Another important means utilized in establishing this Association was the exploitation of Muslim bitterness against the Christians. In the Muslim community there were many who complained that the percentage of Christians in the government administration was out of all proportion to their number in the population. The AE and the MCA, on the other hand, did all they could to present a united front of Arab Muslims and Christians against Zionism. The Zionists of course tried to prevent such a united front; thus the founders of the "National Muslim Association" resorted in their contest with the MCA to the argument that the latter organization included Christians and was in reality their instrument.<sup>15</sup> In places such as Beisan, where the local branch of the MCA was headed by Christians, and in places where Muslim religious functionaries participated in such a campaign, this approach was most fruitful.<sup>16</sup>

Also linked to this approach was the desire on the part of Muslim notables to take the places filled by Christians in the administration. One of the important factors motivating various Muslims to join the "National Muslim Association" was the hope that in this way they would win the support of the Zionist Executive for their efforts to attain government offices.<sup>17</sup>

A survey of the areas in which the Association was set up says much about the causes of its establishment and the potential for opposition to the AE which existed among the Arabs of Palestine. The Association first started in the North—Haifa, Acre, Nazareth, Tiberias and Beisan—and it was there that it was strongest.<sup>18</sup> It was not by chance that the northern district was an important centre of opposition to the AE. It seems that the hegemony of the Jerusalem élite was not accepted with enthusiasm in a district which in the past had never been connected to Jerusalem. The sense of Palestinian solidarity was not yet strong enough to compensate for the bitterness towards Jerusalem's position of hegemony. Several years later this bitterness was even more strongly expressed and, as

we shall see, led additional elements to join the circles of the opposition. The fact that an important figure, Sheikh As'ad Shuqayri, resided in Acre certainly enhanced the power of the opposition in this area. We have already noted how this individual was left without any post and how the active members of the AE and the MCA treated him reservedly and even with hostility. It is not surprising, then, that he and his supporters set up the opposition organization in Acre and were one of the main factors responsible for turning Acre and the entire district of the North into an important centre of opposition.

Other local elements also contributed to the success of the opposition in the North. In Haifa the sense of Muslim-Christian solidarity was apparently quite weak, and even the supporters of the AE there were organized into separate Muslim and Christian associations. The appearance of a Muslim Association which did not hesitate to come out against partnership with Christians in the AE and which included an important religious functionary, Sheikh Yūnis al-Khaṭīb (former *Qāḍī* of Mecca), therefore met with much success there.<sup>19</sup> In Beisan there were two factors in the opposition: the ability to come out against the local MCA branch, which was headed by a Christian; and the traditional approach of Bedouin sheikhs who were far removed from any sense of national solidarity with the other components of the Palestinian-Arab society.<sup>20</sup> In Nazareth there was a strong local family, the al-Fāhūm family, whose rivals in the area, members of the Zu'bi family, inclined towards the AE and its supporters.<sup>21</sup> This combination of local elements with the central factor of resentment towards Jerusalem's position of hegemony made the North into a traditional centre of opposition to the AE.

The "National Muslim Association" also succeeded in spreading to the centre of the country, notably to the Nāblus and Jenin areas. In these areas the organization revolved around members of the Ṭawqān family and a branch of the 'Abd al-Hādi family, who had long opposed al-Ḥājj Tawfiq Ḥamād, the leader of the rival faction in the contest for hegemony in this area.<sup>22</sup> However, in this area there stood out another important factor destined to emerge as a powerful force several years later, namely the strong village families. When the Palestinian national movement was beginning to organize itself, with its leadership coming primarily from among the urban élite, it often happened that members of the rural élite lent their support to the rivals of this leadership. Thus in the Jenin and Ṭul-Karm regions we find the important rural families Jarrār (in the villages of the Jenin sub-district) and Abu Hanṭash (Qāqūn) heading the opposition associations.<sup>23</sup> A similar picture is true of the Hebron

area, where the prime motive force behind the establishment of all the opposition organizations were members of the Hudayb family, the sheikhs of the village of Dawā'imah, and in the Ramleh area, the al-Khawājā family from Na'ālin.<sup>24</sup>

In Jerusalem, where the al-Nashāshibi family was located, the success of the "National Muslim Association" was relatively small. The members of the Nashāshibi family itself did not dare in the early 'twenties to come out openly against the AE and its policy, apparently preferring to accomplish this through proxies. In the summer of 1921 Būlus Shihādah, owner of *Mir'āt al-Sharq* and close friend of Rāghib al-Nashāshibi, and 'Umar Ṣāliḥ al-Barghūthy of the village Dayr Ghassānah and the sheikh of the traditional *Nāḥiyah* of Bani-Zayd, tried to establish an opposition organization; they failed, however, and after some time Būlus Shihādah went back to supporting the AE, although only for a short time.<sup>25</sup> Kalvarisky himself therefore took over the task of establishing the Association, finding as his chief support members of the al-Dajāni family, the head of which, 'Ārif Pāshā al-Dajāni, was at the time President of the AE, but he was beginning to come out against the policy of the First Delegation in Britain. When the Association came into being in Jerusalem in the winter of 1922, it was headed by Shukri al-Dajāni, 'Ārif's brother, and Fā'iq al-Dajāni, there having been no success in recruiting prominent figures from other families.<sup>26</sup>

The political content of this organization was characterized by opposition to the First Palestinian Delegation and its stands. Its active members had their supporters sign petitions against the Delegation and its demands, explaining in their appeals to the community that the Delegation had failed.<sup>27</sup> After a year of organization, when the Association had arrived at some measure of self-confidence, a couple of its branches (the Haifa members and a number of the Jerusalem members) sent a cable to the Colonial Office in which they unequivocally dissociated themselves from the Delegation and denied its right to speak in the name of the Arabs of Palestine.<sup>28</sup> *Mir'āt al-Sharq* also went over at that time (June 1922) to criticism of the Delegation, although years later it came out with a much stronger assault on it and tried to claim that it had always rejected its stands.<sup>29</sup>

On various occasions the Association came out in favour of Jewish immigration and Zionist activity in Palestine,<sup>30</sup> stating "that without Jewish immigration and financial help our country will never develop. This can be demonstrated by the fact that the cities which are partly inhabited by Jews, such as Jerusalem, Jaffa, Haifa and Tiberias, are making rapid progress, whereas Nāblus, Acre

and Nazareth, which have no Jews, are steadily deteriorating.”<sup>31</sup> Obviously, then, the Association was agreeable to British Mandatory rule and saw it as a great blessing for the country.<sup>32</sup> When the Mandate was ratified in July 1922, the “National Muslim Association” did all it could to halt the protest activities which were organized by the AE and the branches of the MCA.<sup>33</sup>

The practical test of this particular position came in the winter of 1923, when elections were held for the legislative council. The Association’s pro-Mandatory stance led to a complete contrast between its positive attitude on the elections and the boycott which the AE declared against them. The Association faced a double test: to what degree would it have the power to carry on a propaganda campaign in favour of participation in the elections, and to what extent would such a campaign succeed?

As soon as the matter of elections became a real issue in August 1922 (when the Order-in-Council was published), it was clear that the “National Muslim Association” intended to take part in them. And in fact, in the power centres of the Association the boycott campaign was carried on in a rather lukewarm fashion.<sup>34</sup> The members of the Association saw to it that candidates were nominated for election, and in those places that required the holding of elections, the members of the Association were the ones who took part in them.<sup>35</sup> However, the AE’s success in bringing about the failure of the elections meant, of course, a disastrous failure for the Association, the weakness of which was now exposed. Moreover, during the height of the propaganda campaign which preceded the elections, it was apparent that the Association’s members did not dare work openly in favour of participation in the elections owing to their fear of the AE and its activists. Various opposition figures, whether they were tied directly to the Association (like Sheikh As’ad Shuqayri) or supported it behind the scenes (‘Ārif Pāshā al-Dajāni and Rāghib al-Nashāshībi), were indeed secretly active in favour of participating in the elections, but publicly claimed otherwise, sometimes even the complete reverse. The stand taken by the paper *Mir’āt al-Sharq*, the Nashāshībi journal for many years, was typical of this approach. At one time the paper announced its support of the elections, at another it expressed agreement with the call to boycott them, and in general it tried to take a stand which could be understood in both ways.<sup>36</sup>

As the date of the elections drew near, various members of the Association also began to abandon their position, and in a gathering held in Jerusalem on the eve of the elections most of the participants voted against taking part in them. The cessation of financial support for the Association by the Zionist Organization, owing to the

financial difficulties of the latter, largely contributed to this revelation of the lack of enthusiasm for so unpopular an action.<sup>37</sup> The Association's failure in the most important political struggle which went on between it and the leadership of the Palestinian movement accelerated the process of its disintegration. During the course of the spring of 1923 many members abandoned it, its branches became more and more scattered, and within a few months it disappeared completely from the scene.<sup>38</sup>

Four main reasons led, it seems, to the failure of this first attempt at organization on the part of those groups opposed to the Palestinian AE and its policy. First and foremost is the fact that the "National Muslim Association" was closely tied to the Zionists.<sup>39</sup> The men of the AE knew of this and exploited it in order to lower its prestige in the eyes of the community. It was represented as a tool of the Zionists, and its members as men who had sold their consciences for money.

The Zionist element itself contributed to the failure of its own creation. The financial capacity of the Zionist Organization was not adequate to support the Association regularly, and when its support ceased, demoralization set in in the Association and its activity began to diminish. Moreover, the decisive figure in the Zionist Executive, Colonel F. H. Kisch, could not resign himself to this policy of gaining supporters by financial grants;<sup>40</sup> his qualms, a striking contrast to H. M. Kalvarisky's lack of scruple, contributed to the cessation of these grants. The assistance which the members of the "National Muslim Association" had hoped to get from the Zionist Executive was not limited to money. No less important was their hope that they would be able, with the aid of the Zionists, to attain respectable positions in the Government; in this realm they were to meet with even greater disappointment.

This brings us to the second reason for the Association's failure, namely the attitude of the Government. The AE and the MCA employed different methods of propaganda and public and personal pressure against the members of the "National Muslim Association" with the aim of hindering them from taking part in it.<sup>41</sup> One of their methods involved repeated appeals to the Government to ban the rival Association, and the utilization of the Arab officials of the Government against it. The Government never went so far as to accept the demand to ban the Association, but it seems that in a number of cases, Government officials (Arabs in the main) worked against the Association and its active members. At times even British governors of districts and sub-districts acted in this way, supposedly out of a desire to prevent conflicts within the Arab community which could lead to strife.<sup>42</sup> The members of the MCA

knew of this Government stand and were undoubtedly strengthened by it in their struggle against their rivals.<sup>43</sup>

One of the main factors responsible for the unsympathetic attitude of many Government heads towards this Association and its members was the feeling of contempt they had for it. The Government knew very well that the "National Muslim Association" owed its existence largely to financial grants from the Zionist Organization and therefore looked upon it as a non-independent factor, of doubtful political value.<sup>44</sup> True, there are no grounds for claiming that the acceptance of monetary grants was a phenomenon restricted only to the "National Muslim Association", as is implied in Richmond's remarks, but there is no doubt that the frequency with which this went on was far greater in the Association. Clearly if the Association was appraised in this manner and if the Zionist Organization's part in its establishment met with a negative reaction on the part of the Government, it is no wonder that the Association was unable to win the Government's sympathies and the Zionist Organization unable to help the members of the Association to attain Government posts.

A further reason for the weakening of the Association was the internal conflicts it suffered. Some of these controversies were at least in part "altruistic"—some of the members opposed the Association's support of Zionist policy and on various occasions dissociated themselves from it or at least resigned their posts in it<sup>45</sup>—but some of the controversies were the result of personal factors or quarrels over the money given to the Association.<sup>46</sup>

Apart from these internal differences, another reason can be discerned. Alongside the "National Muslim Association" there were other elements which leaned towards participation in the elections, but which worked alone, without coordinating their activity with that of the Association; their separate activity made no contribution at all to the growth of a powerful force united behind a common policy. We have seen that several members of the First Delegation leaned towards a more moderate policy upon their return to Palestine and even tried to come to terms with the Government. When their first attempt failed in the autumn of 1922 they still did not give up. Mu'in al-Māḍi, who was the least reticent of the moderates in the Delegation, made public his views in favour of participation in the elections.<sup>47</sup> Together with another member of the Delegation, Amīn al-Tamīmī, he got in touch with Sulaymān Naṣīf, an entrepreneur and rich merchant from Haifa; they recruited several other Muslim public figures and together tried to motivate the Government to agree to a compromise. In return for their participation in the elections they demanded the

creation of an Arab majority (partially appointed) in the legislative council, an annual numerical ceiling to Jewish immigration to Palestine (5,000 to 6,000 immigrants), and the appointment of an Arab Emir as titular ruler of the country. Since the Government was not prepared to accept this compromise proposal, its initiators were left frustrated, unwilling to make common cause with the "National Muslim Association" in favour of the elections but also standing apart from the boycott campaign.<sup>48</sup>

Sulaymān Naṣīf tried again in the summer of 1923 to reach a compromise settlement with the Mandatory Government; this attempt too was fruitless.<sup>49</sup> However, his efforts on this occasion and the desire on the part of most of the moderate leaders to serve, as we have seen, on the advisory council apparently brought them to the recognition that in order to fight for their policy they must unite in a more compact organizational framework and work as one body. They had learned that in the absence of a political organization of their own they were unable to withstand the AE's pressure, and indeed most of them in the end refused to take part in the advisory council, despite the fact that they had supported the idea of its establishment. In the midst of these attempts to compromise and the doubts and hesitations which they suffered, these moderate groups began to make public their intention to set up a "moderate liberal party" which would embrace all those opposed to the policy of non-cooperation with the Government. In the midst of their preparations the organizers began calling their new organization the "Palestinian Arab National Party",<sup>50</sup> and it seems that it was not by accident that this change in the proposed name was adopted.

The founding congress of the new party was convened in Jerusalem on 10th November 1923. Among those who had ceased to support the AE were 'Ārif Pāshā al-Dajāni and several of his relatives, several members of the Nashāshībi family and their supporters, Sheikh Sulaymān al-Tāji al-Fārūqi, Būlus Shihādah, the Editor of *Mir'āt al-Sharq* and 'Umar Ṣāliḥ al-Barghūthy.<sup>51</sup> The congress chose Sheikh Sulaymān al-Tāji al-Fārūqi as its President and ratified the party's platform. The platform shows that the organizers of the party had learned their lesson from the failure of the "National Muslim Association" and left no doubt as to their opposition to Zionism, to the Balfour Declaration, to the Constitution of the country and to the self-governing bodies which had been determined upon by it. The platform demanded the establishment of a national government and a parliament elected by the people. In this respect there was no difference between the platform of the new party and the stands of the Palestinian AE and

the MCA. True, the party's platform did not reject the very existence of the protection of the British Government, in contrast to the resolutions of the Fifth Congress in August 1922, which had totally rejected British rule and demanded complete independence. But we have seen that these resolutions were adopted following the failure of the long negotiations between the First Delegation and the Colonial Office, in the course of which the heads of the AE had agreed to the existence of mandatory rule and had focussed all their opposition on the Balfour Declaration. The organizers of the party had come to the conclusion that they had no choice but to fight the AE with its own weapons, i.e. to appear no less extreme in their nationalism than their rivals, although they took pains to explain to the Zionist leaders that all this was no more than lip-service.<sup>52</sup> This method was not without immediate negative results. Rāghib al-Nashāshibi, the central figure of the opposition, was unable because of his post as Mayor to support such a platform, and thus from the first was unable to join the party and to work for it openly.<sup>53</sup> Sulaymān Naṣīf, who was consistent in his moderate stand, also refused to lend his support to this "moderate-extremist" organization.<sup>54</sup> 'Ārif Pāshā al-Dajāni withdrew from the founding congress of the party for the same reason, although it is likely that his disappointment over not being elected President of the party was a major factor.<sup>55</sup> As'ad Shuqayri also took no part in founding the party, since at the time he was being courted by the AE, which proposed to him that he should become a member of the organization.<sup>56</sup> Also Mu'in al-Māḍi along with his family and supporters in the Ijzim-Haifa area, who had been in favour of participation in the elections to the legislative council, refrained from joining the party, notwithstanding attempts which were made to convince them to do so.<sup>57</sup> In this way the new party failed from the start in its attempt to unite within it all the groups opposed to the AE. Its extreme anti-Zionist platform did indeed bring Sheikh Sulaymān al-Tāji al-Fārūqi into its ranks, but the price it paid for this was the loss of other important elements.

Since the party's founders did all they could to give their party a truly nationalist character, they took care that their party would not be considered the successor of the "National Muslim Association". The election of Sheikh Sulaymān al-Tāji al-Fārūqi as President of the party was apparently arranged for this purpose, since he had fiercely denounced the Association during its existence.<sup>58</sup> *Mir'āt al-Sharq*, which now became the declared organ of the party, was of the opinion that "the opposition [to the AE] did not begin until the return of the Third Delegation from London [September 1923] shrouded in failure, after all the hopes that the

nation had fixed upon it”;<sup>59</sup> which is to say that the earlier “National Muslim Association” was not to be considered as part of the opposition. And indeed it is true that some of the active members of this Association took no part in setting up the new party, and some of them even wanted to establish a body to compete against it.<sup>60</sup> Nevertheless, it was clear to the Zionist elements and to the Arab community that this whole platform was a pretence and that the members of the party were in favour of cooperating with the Government and the Zionists.<sup>61</sup> The Arab community was able to reach this conclusion from witnessing the important role played by Fakhri Nashāshībi, Rāghib’s nephew and devoted assistant, in organizing the party; whereas the Zionists reached this conclusion by virtue of the fact that during the process of organizing the party Fakhri Nashāshībi had appealed to Kalvarisky for financial support in setting up its clubs, that several of the party’s active members were closely tied to the Zionist Executive, and that Sulaymān Naṣīf had requested financial assistance from it for the paper *Mir’āt al-Sharq*, the organ of the opposition.<sup>62</sup> Financial support was not given by the Zionists to the founders of the party, but the Zionists favoured its establishment, as they regarded the party’s fight against the AE politicians as beneficial to them.<sup>63</sup>

The best proof that the party’s extremist platform was no more than a pretence can be found in the political stands which it took. Before the official establishment of the party and the confirmation of its platform, *Mir’āt al-Sharq*—which became the party organ—called for a policy of cooperation with the British Government, in order to win a re-formulation of the Mandate and changes in the fundamental law of the country (Order-in-Council, 1922), as well as the establishment of a representative council and a national government under British supervision.<sup>64</sup> Ratification of the platform, which completely rejected the Constitution of the country and the self-governing institutions, brought about no change in this position. On the contrary, from early 1924 onwards the paper consistently called for “a positive policy” of cooperation with the Government, which would bring about the establishment of a “Palestinian government under the supervision of the British Government”,<sup>65</sup> or the establishment of a parliament which would be responsible for legislation, leaving executive powers in the hands of the HC.<sup>66</sup> However, even these demands exceeded the party’s true intentions. The criticism uttered against the rejection of the proposal of a legislative council in 1922 shows that the real aim was to make good the damage done in 1922 and to attain what had at that time been rejected, even without radical amendments in the Mandate and the Constitution.<sup>67</sup> Moreover, in order

to give this position force, the paper claimed that even in 1922, alone, in the face of the opposition of the AE and the entire Arab press, it had fought consistently in favour of accepting the legislative council.<sup>68</sup>

With respect to Zionism, however, the setting up of the party led to a noticeable change in the stand taken by those elements centred upon *al-Hizb al-Waṭani*. Up to the time of its establishment, *Mir'āt al-Sharq* and the Nashāshībī faction in Jerusalem had taken a relatively moderate stand on Zionism. They were, it is true, far from agreeing to it, but their opposition was modified by the fact that they tended to cooperate with the Mandatory Government which was itself committed to Zionism. When the proposed Order-in-Council 1922 was first published in February, 1922, *Mir'āt al-Sharq* wrote that it was based on "the Balfour Declaration, that promise to which the Palestinian nation will not agree *so long as the Jews dream of acquiring Palestine and expelling its children*"<sup>69</sup> (author's italics); which is to say, a moderate, limited interpretation of the Balfour Declaration might be acceptable. On another occasion the paper minimized the importance of the Balfour Declaration, arguing that it was given to various interpretations and that the promise supposedly contained in it was no promise at all.<sup>70</sup> However, from the moment that the initiators of the party began taking practical steps towards its establishment, they began to take a different, methodically anti-Zionist line, and announced that from the point of view of their opposition to Zionism there was no difference between them and the men of the AE and the SMC.<sup>71</sup> When in June 1923 the resumé of the Anglo-Hejazi Treaty was published and when the Sixth Palestinian Congress rejected it completely, *Mir'āt al-Sharq* took a more sympathetic view of it.<sup>72</sup>

It seems that it was clear to the circles connected with this paper that if King Ḥusayn's approval for British policy in Palestine were won, this would blunt the opposition to this policy. In that case their stand with regard to the necessity of cooperating with the Government and compromising with it would be accepted.<sup>73</sup> However, not long after the establishment of the party and ratification of its anti-Zionist platform it became apparent that two members of the AE (Amīn al-Tamīmi, 'Abd al-Qādir al-Muzaffar) with a Hāshemite past were leaning towards agreement with the Treaty, or at the least were opposed to taking a stand that would tie Ḥusayn's hands and make it difficult for him to ratify it.<sup>74</sup> The members of *al-Hizb al-Waṭani* understood that they were being presented with a golden opportunity to harm the AE and to represent it as an unreliable factor from a national point of view, a

factor which was sympathetic to Zionism. Therefore from the start of 1924 and throughout that year, the two papers which then supported this party—*al-Karmil* and *Mir'āt al-Sharq*—unceasingly attacked the AE for its supposed tolerance towards Zionism, while they represented their own party as the most consistent element of opposition to Zionism.<sup>75</sup>

It should be noted that along with their denunciations of the Anglo-Hejazi Treaty, these papers were openly anti-Hāshemite, completely rejecting the idea of a Pan-Arab confederation.<sup>76</sup> As we will see, the Palestinian orientation of the opposition groups—a continuation of their anti-unity stand from 1919–20—also influenced this position.

Notwithstanding the adoption of these tactics, the journals of the opposition refrained from competing with the AE, the SMC and their supporters in spreading enmity and hatred for the Jews as such. *Mir'āt al-Sharq* came out against slanderous accusations against the Jewish religion and called for making a distinction between Jews and Zionists.<sup>77</sup> The testing time for this stand came in the summer of 1928, when the circles supporting al-Hājj Amin al-Ḥusayni and their organ *Al-Jāmi'ah al-'Arabiyyah* began creating a furore over the danger to the area of *al-Ḥaram al-Sharīf* from the Jews. *Mir'āt al-Sharq* kept silent throughout this period and did not join this campaign, while Rāghib al-Nashāshibi claimed that he was prepared to help the Jews solve the problem of access to the Western Wall in a satisfactory manner, without, of course, injuring the rights of the Muslims in the *al-Ḥaram* area itself.<sup>78</sup>

The AE fought the new party from the moment of its establishment. Delegations were sent throughout Palestine to make clear the “treacherous” nature of the party, petitions were circulated in which the signatories absolved themselves of any contact with it, and the pulpits of the mosques once again served, with the full assistance of the SMC, as centres of propaganda against the corrupt character of the new party.<sup>79</sup> Despite this campaign and the heavy pressures exerted on anyone linked to the staff of the SMC, the new party managed to progress from an organizational standpoint. It opened a club in its main branch, Jerusalem, and in Jerusalem, Nazareth and Haifa it set up associations of young supporters under the name “Organization of Muslim Youth”.<sup>80</sup> The main branches of the party were set up: in the Galilee district and Acre—a traditional focus of local opposition to the hegemony of Jerusalem—after As'ad Shuqayri had lent his support to the party, in contrast with his aloofness during its establishment;<sup>81</sup> in the Hebron area—where the party based itself on the families of rural sheikhs who opposed urban hegemony and on the al-Khaṭīb al-

Tamīmi family, which had embarked at the time on a lengthy struggle against the SMC over supervision of the religious endowments, the traditional administrators of which were members of this family (the Tamīm endowment, for example);<sup>82</sup> in Ṭul-Karm, where the branch revolved around the Ḥanūn and al-Jayūsi families and their supporters, who were competing with the families of al-Ḥājj Ibrāhīm and Samārah for social primacy;<sup>83</sup> and a small branch in Gaza.<sup>84</sup>

While it is true that during its process of consolidation this party managed to embrace some of the elements which opposed the AE and its methods, including some of those who in November 1923 had not aided in its establishment, it nevertheless was far from becoming the party of all such circles. There were elements, some of them past members of the "National Muslim Association", who stayed aloof, and these began to act in early 1924 towards setting up a political framework of their own. The Zionists were also far from satisfied with *al-Ḥizb al-Waṣāni* because of its anti-Zionist platform and its tactical methods, and in early 1924 they renewed their efforts to establish an Arab organization opposed to the AE and openly in support of Zionism—or at least not hostile to it. In this way the ground was prepared for the appearance of several "agricultural parties" in the Nazareth, Nāblus and Hebron regions.

What marks this phenomenon from its predecessors is the fact that it was based on the families of village sheikhs and attempted to give political expression to the peasant class. In the previous attempts to set up opposition organizations this social factor had played an important role. The bitterness of the village sheikhs' families, which in the second half of the nineteenth century had lost their social grandeur, towards the urban élite which had taken their place was apparently quite deep-rooted. When this urban élite gradually became identified with Palestinian Arab nationalism, the concrete expression of which was opposition to Zionism, its rivals began to lean towards the other side. Not infrequently they were willing to express their opposition to the urban élite by supporting Zionism or at least by demurring from the anti-Zionist movement directed by it. Thus, for example, in March-April 1920 a great number of village sheikhs in the South, the Ramleh-Jaffa area, Judea and Galilee dissociated themselves from the wave of anti-Zionism which was passing through the cities of Palestine at the time and signed petitions supporting Zionist immigration to the country.<sup>85</sup> In organizing this project several rural sheikhs' families were conspicuous—e.g. the Abū Ghaush family of Qaryat al-'Anab and 'Imwās, which enjoyed the support and encourage-

ment of the Zionist Organization<sup>86</sup>—but in the very fact of mass response to this initiative one can see proof of the existence of latent rural bitterness towards the urban leadership. Not by chance did one of the petitions of the village sheikhs from the regions of Judea, the South and Ramleh-Jaffa end by stating that the urban political associations have no connection at all with the community outside the cities and that “in the name of the villages we are opposed to all their corrupt activities which hamper the security of the community. We accept all resolutions that the peace conference may adopt and declare that all the demonstrations which they organized were solely on their own behalf. On the other hand, every petition we present is on behalf of the country’s base, its notables and its leaders.”<sup>87</sup>

The special stand of the families of village sheikhs, which were striving to preserve their superior status, was maintained for years and was of course supported by the Zionists;<sup>88</sup> however, attempts at separate self-organization were not made until the start of 1924, when the anti-Zionist wave had passed its climax and following the emergence of other opposition elements on the political scene. This attempt to organize was not lacking in other motives, including regional and familial ones, but the combination of all these factors lent the organization a certain weight. It is worth adding that this combination of factors did not include the matter of the miserable state of the impoverished *fallāḥs*, who were sunk in heavy debts to urban money-lenders. While the urban leaders of the national movement were in many cases none other than those same money-lenders, the rural self-organization with which we are now dealing based itself on the village notables and not the poor. It was more than merely a protest of impoverished *fallāḥs* against large landowners and money-lenders. It was an attempt on the part of one section of the Palestinian social élite to channel their opposition to their rivals into an organizational framework.<sup>89</sup>

In the first attempt at organization, “the Association for Village Cooperation” (*Jam’iyyat Ta’āwun al-Qurā*) in the Ijzim-Haifa area, the regional and familial elements were especially conspicuous. This region had in the past been the *Itlizām* (tax-farming) territory of the al-Māḍi family of Ijzim, which had managed gradually to turn considerable parts of it into their private property. Even after part of the family moved to Haifa, the villages of the area continued to be under their social, economic and political control.

Mu’in al-Māḍi, as we have seen, maintained a more moderate position than the official line during the time he was a member of the First Delegation to Britain and afterwards supported participation in the elections for the legislative council. He did not join

*al-Ḥizb al-Waṭani* when it was set up, but in 1924 he began giving a political-party expression to his traditional leadership in the area. The al-Mādi family was strong enough to do without Zionist aid in setting up its organization, and therefore the platform it adopted was in the usual anti-Zionist spirit;<sup>90</sup> however, the establishment of the other rural organizations bore a different character.

In early 1924 there began to form in the Nazareth, Nāblus-Jenin and Hebron regions organizations calling themselves *Ḥizb al-Zurrā'* ("Party of the Farmers"). Generally speaking, they were headed by village sheikhs who were influential in their districts, such as Fāris al-Mas'ūd of Burqa and 'Abd al-Laṭīf Abū Hanṭash from Qāqūn (the Jenin-Ṭul-Karm area) and Mūsā Hudayb (Dawā'imah, near Hebron), while contacts were maintained with urban opposition elements, such as the al-Fāhūm family in Nazareth and the Ṭawqān family in Nāblus.<sup>91</sup> These men were aided in organizing their groups by the Zionist Executive and H. M. Kalvarisky, and the Zionists covered the party's expenses, although at first Colonel F. Kisch was opposed to the renewed use of the method of organizing Arab opposition parties through Jewish initiative and assistance.<sup>92</sup>

The platforms of these associations, the composition of which owed much to the efforts of H. M. Kalvarisky, were not uniform; however, they had three main points in common: a desire to cooperate with the Government on the basis of the Constitution; a demand that the Government act to safeguard the rights of Muslims with respect to the *awqāf*, care being taken to preserve equality among urban and rural elements; and an emphasis on various demands relating specifically to the villagers—the annulment of the *'ushr* tax, the establishment of a bank for agricultural credit, improvements in rural education etc. On the other hand, the platforms revealed different attitudes towards Zionism; that of the party in the Hebron region went so far as to openly acknowledge the Mandate, without demurring from its Zionist clauses, whereas the platforms of the associations in other places reiterated the usual nationalist anti-Zionist stand. It should be noted that the representatives of the "Farmers' Party" in Samaria brought their platform to Colonel Kisch for preliminary confirmation, including a part speaking of "ratification of the British Mandate;" however, they shrank from making it public, temporarily, they claimed, because this clause was "detering the *fallāhs* from joining the party". Privately, they continued to support this position.<sup>93</sup>

The Zionists viewed this party as a fairly serious element which had gained a larger measure of support than had *al-Ḥizb al-Waṭani*, the party of the urban opposition elements, although the public

stand taken by the party in the Hebron area in favour of the British Mandate had reduced its influence on the supporters of the Hudayb family of Dawā'imah only.<sup>94</sup> However, this party's complete dependence upon the Zionists led in 1927, when the source of Zionist support dwindled in the wake of the deepening crisis surrounding Zionist activity in Palestine, to its weakening and eventual disintegration.<sup>95</sup> This failure is of great significance when one recalls that it was precisely in that year that the power of the opposition reached a climax unparalleled in the past and indeed never to be repeated.

The rising strength of the opponents of the AE was not expressed only by the setting up of markedly oppositional parties. Of no less importance was the fact that during 1924-5, splits formed in two of the most important Muslim-Christian Associations, in Nāblus and Jaffa.<sup>96</sup> On the surface, the opposition's camp was not united, and in particular there were differences of opinion over the degree of public support to be shown to the Mandate. On occasion the members of *al-Hizb al-Zirā'i* were even denounced by other elements of the opposition for their support of the Mandate and their ties with the Zionist Executive.<sup>97</sup> Nevertheless, a common front of all the members of this camp gradually developed. During the negotiations in late 1924 over the possibility of reaching an agreement between the AE and its rivals, all the factors of the opposition appeared together in united fashion and were represented by a single delegation.<sup>98</sup> This unity took shape in the midst of the struggle which all the opposition elements were carrying on against the SMC; and it was this struggle that brought them the support of circles which had previously supported the AE and gave them a large degree of influence which they were not to have in later years.

#### THE OPPOSITION AT THE PEAK OF ITS POWER

The opposition of Rāghib al-Nashāshibi and his supporters to al-Ḥājj Amīn al-Ḥusayni's appointment as Mufti of Jerusalem and to his election as President of the SMC; the conversion of the SMC into a tool of its President and his allies; the eruption of political differences within the Palestinian community; and the identification of the SMC with one camp, that of the AE—all these factors led inevitably to a serious collision between the SMC and the AE and the various elements of the opposition.

The opposition's attack upon the SMC began with great force in late 1923, following the appearance of its parties, the "National

Party" and the "Farmers' Party". The first appeal made by the new "National Party" to the Government was directed against the SMC.<sup>1</sup>

This attack had several main characteristics. First of all, the parties of the opposition began sending petitions and letters to the Government demanding that it intervene to stop the SMC from accomplishing various acts aimed at strengthening its power against its rivals—the dismissal of Amin al-Ḥusayni's opponents from its service, the turning of orphanages, endowments and the other Islamic institutions in Palestine into an instrument of the President of the SMC, etc.<sup>2</sup> Moreover, the opposition began to argue that al-Ḥājj Amin al-Ḥusayni was not at all fit for the religious office he had assumed, since he had never received an *'ālim's* training and had never served in a religious post up to the time of his appointment as Mufti of Jerusalem.<sup>3</sup>

From arguments directed against the SMC for exceeding the bounds of its jurisdiction, the opposition passed to an attack on the method by which the SMC had been set up and its legal foundation. As will be remembered, the SMC was elected in January 1922 by an electoral committee composed of secondary electors to the last Ottoman Parliament. Now the opposition came forward with the argument that in 1922 these secondary electors were no longer authorized representatives of the people. They had been elected during the last elections to the Ottoman Parliament (1914) and the validity of their election lasted as long as that Parliament was in session; the moment it was dissolved, the validity of their representation ceased. Moreover, even in 1914—so the opposition argued—these secondary electors were not true representatives of the populace, since they owed their election to the manipulations of the Young Turks. As proof of this they pointed to the fact that the Mandatory Government had not regarded them as representatives of the populace, and when it had determined upon setting up a representative body—the legislative council—it had decided to hold new elections according to the very electoral system used for the Ottoman Parliament.<sup>4</sup>

Basic constitutional arguments were raised against the "Order Constituting the Supreme Muslim Council" and the way it operated. The opposition stressed that by putting supervision of the Shar'ī courts in the hands of the SMC and by authorizing it to dismiss *qādis*, the entire Shar'ī legal system had been made dependent upon the will of the President of the SMC. It also came out against putting the *awqāf* under the authority of the SMC, whether directly or indirectly, since in this way the SMC could do whatever it pleased with the *awqāf* without the Shar'ī courts' being able to

prevent it.<sup>5</sup> It was also stressed that the electoral college was not authorized to supervise the SMC's activities, nor could it propose changes in its statutes.<sup>6</sup>

The Government was unable to ignore so large a number of complaints, especially as in many cases they were based on documentary proof, and in late 1923 the Chief Secretary's office asked for the opinion of the district-governors on these complaints.<sup>7</sup>

S. Symes, Governor of the Northern District, answered: "I have little doubt that the allegations made in the enclosure [referring to the letter of 'Abdallah Mukhlis of 21st November 1923; cf. p. 361 note 1] with your letter are substantially true. It is certainly believed by the Moslems as well as by the Christians in this part of the country that the organization of the Supreme Moslem Council is certainly supporting the efforts of the Executive Council of the Palestine Delegation [i.e., the Palestinian AE]. This belief is also held by individuals who have minor appointments under the Supreme Moslem Council and who have personally assured me that their tenure of office would become insecure unless they displayed enthusiasm for the 'National Cause'."<sup>8</sup>

C. H. J. Cox, Governor of the district of Samaria, did not find proofs of all the accusations brought up in the above-mentioned letter but was able to state "that the Supreme Moslem Council does take a very large part in politics and that most of their employees feel that their retention in their posts depends on their participation therein on the lines expected by the Supreme Moslem Council".<sup>9</sup>

It was also clear to A. Abramson, Governor of the Southern District, that the President of the SMC together with the Mufti of Gaza did all they could to injure the opposition, while those who filled religious posts in the district and were dependent upon them also worked in this spirit in order to keep their positions.<sup>10</sup>

Particularly instructive is the opinion of Ronald Storrs, Governor of the Jerusalem-Jaffa district, the most senior of the district governors by virtue of his being Governor of the central district of the country and of his long experience as a District Governor. He stated that several dismissals had been made for political reasons and that pressure was being exerted on the Muslim staff to act according to the policy of the SMC in political matters. In his opinion, "It is generally believed in Jaffa District that the Council is at least as active in political as in religious affairs and surprise is from time to time expressed that the Government should tolerate this almost overt intervention in politics on the part of persons in receipt of official emoluments". He further described the general impression throughout the district "that strong political influence is being brought to bear by the representatives

of the Supreme Moslem Council in favour of the political propaganda of the Moslem-Christian Association”.

Storrs, who was familiar with Islam and Arab society, stressed that the division between Church and State was completely foreign to Islamic theory and practice. He also stated that those who stood at the head of the “Muslim-Christian” movement (i.e., the AE and the MCA), whether they were in the SMC or not, believed that they were struggling against a rival movement in which it was no less difficult to distinguish between the interwoven factors of religion and nationality.<sup>11</sup> He took the complaints of the opposition seriously, arguing that they were worth thorough investigation and that there was likely to be grounds for Government action.<sup>12</sup>

The Government was of the opinion<sup>13</sup> that the setting up of the SMC had pacified the Muslim community and helped it swallow the bitter pills of British Mandatory rule and the pro-Zionist policy. It is no wonder, then, that in the margin of Storrs’ report A. Kirkbride, the Assistant Chief Secretary, wrote: “These reports are interesting and unanimous, but I think that it will be unwise to take now official steps in this respect”. Gilbert Clayton, the Chief Secretary, and Herbert Samuel, the HC, approved this stand.<sup>14</sup>

While the opposition had thus failed to move the Government to act against the SMC, it met with success in other areas. Its concentrated attacks upon the SMC and its methods of action brought about a loss in its prestige in the country, except, of course, among those who benefited from it.<sup>15</sup> However, of greater importance is the fact that this struggle against the SMC brought new elements into the opposition. The family appointments on the part of the President of the SMC and its other members, exploitation of *awqāf* funds for purposes other than those for which they were intended, and the conversion of the SMC as a whole into a tool of one man and his family led men who had previously been members of the AE and supporters of the SMC to join the opposition. Thus, for example, during the process of the Jaffa MCA’s disintegration, which started in late 1923 when the municipality agreed to accept the Rutenberg electric project (a Jewish scheme) on its territory, its President, ‘Umar al-Bayfār, went over to the opposition camp and thus enabled it to penetrate into Jaffa, the former stronghold of the supporters of the AE.<sup>16</sup>

It seems that many members of the Nāblus MCA, the mainstay of the Palestinian national movement, were disgusted with the methods of al-Ḥājj Amin al-Ḥusayni and ‘Abd al-Laṭif Ṣalāḥ, the representative of the Nāblus district in the SMC. In April 1924 they wanted to hold a separate procession during the al-Nebi

Mūsā festivities, understanding as they did that the Jerusalem al-Ḥusayni family was exploiting their participation in the festivities for purposes of strengthening its status and prestige; the following year they started coming out against the AE, refrained from sending their banners to the al-Nebi Mūsā procession and hardly took part in the festivities.<sup>17</sup> 'Abd al-Laṭīf Ṣalāḥ perceived that the support of the nationalist circles of Nāblus was slipping away from him. He therefore set up a new association under the name *Ḥizb al-Ahāli* in competition with the Nāblus MCA; it acted in the main to safeguard its founder's status. This development helped thrust the local MCA with its leaders, al-Ḥājj Tawfiq Ḥamād, Amīn al-Tamīmi and Ḥāfiẓ Ṭawqān into the ranks of the opponents of al-Ḥājj Amīn al-Ḥusayni.<sup>18</sup>

It seems that the passing of the Nāblus MCA into the ranks of the opposition was facilitated by a fairly deep-rooted development. Beginning in late 1922, one senses the growing detachment of its President, al-Ḥājj Tawfiq Ḥamād, from the ranks of leadership. He was not elected to the Second Delegation which departed at that time for Geneva and, probably because of this, took no part in the Sixth Palestinian Congress in June 1923. Some time later he announced his withdrawal from political activity, justifying this by declaring that the nation did not know how to value those who worked and sacrificed on its behalf. In the opinion of *Mir'āt al-Sharq* he secretly lent his support to the new organization, *Ḥizb al-Ahāli*, which was fighting the Nāblus MCA.<sup>19</sup>

In Hebron too the opposition to the SMC began to grow stronger. Behind this lay the anger of the local notables over the SMC's taking over Hebronite endowments and not spending their returns in accordance with the original conditions of endowment.<sup>20</sup>

It should be noted that this struggle was supported by several people who had previously supported the AE and who were later to return to this position, such as 'Izzat Darwaza of Nāblus, Ḥamdi al-Ḥusayni of Gaza, who at the time was beginning a career of political activity as a left-wing nationalist, and the paper *Filaṣṭīn*.<sup>21</sup>

This process embodied a serious threat to the status of the President of the SMC. The Council's term of office was to end in January 1926, at which time new elections were to be held. While the President of the SMC believed that the order constituting the SMC provided for the *Ra'īs al-'Ulamā'*'s serving as President of the SMC for life, and the Government tended to accept this interpretation of the law, the loss of a majority in the Council would still have damaged his position greatly. He therefore looked for ways to ensure that the results of the elections would go in his favour.

In the face of the opposition's petitions, the supporters of the AE and the SMC were organized to present petitions in support of the AE,<sup>22</sup> but it was clearly not in the power of these petitions to solve the problem of the approaching elections. The President of the SMC therefore took care to ensure above all a maximum of control over the Electoral Committee, the only body authorized to approve changes in the "Order Constituting the Supreme Moslem Council".<sup>23</sup> This was accomplished by appointing many members of this body to various posts in the Muslim religious apparatus; in this way, out of the fifty-six members of the Electoral Committee, five were members of the SMC and another seventeen were employed by it; one member died; while the number of whole-hearted supporters of the opposition was also seventeen.

The next step was taken in the summer of 1925. Twenty-one members of the Electoral Committee signed at that time a petition circulated by members of the opposition calling for a convening of the Electoral Committee in order to investigate the actions of several members of the SMC and "several general matters pertinent to the interests of the Muslims of Palestine".<sup>24</sup> The SMC responded by convening the Electoral Committee in August 1925 but brought before it another matter for discussion—a proposal to amend Article 3 of the "Order Constituting the SMC" of December 1921. This Article enjoined that the elections for the SMC be held in accordance with the electoral law for the Ottoman Parliament, and it stressed that the Muslim members of the municipalities would act as supervisory bodies during the preparations for the elections and during the elections themselves.<sup>25</sup> The change proposed by the SMC would transfer the power of supervision over the elections in each sub-district to the four secondary electors from each sub-district who had participated in January 1922 in the elections for the SMC, and would authorize each of these "quartets" to add six members at their own discretion. The meaning of this proposal was clear. Since the opposition had great influence among the members of the city councils and several of the more important mayors were among its leaders (Rāghib al-Nashāshibi in Jerusalem, Sulaymān 'Abd al-Razzāq Ṭawqān in Nāblus and others), the proposed change aimed at depriving the opposition of the possibility of supervising and influencing the course of the elections and at transferring this task to individuals, many of whom were dependent upon the SMC and obedient to its influence. The SMC's argument in favour of the proposed change was that in contrast with what the Ottoman legislators had intended, the members of the city councils were no longer elected but rather appointed by the Government and were therefore unable to serve as representatives of

the populace for purposes of supervising the elections. The members of the opposition replied, naturally, that the situation had been no different in December 1921 when the Order was approved, and that no-one at that time had raised the question of whether the members of the municipalities were appointed or elected. There can be no doubt that it was perfectly clear to all parties that this matter, however important in itself, was not the real issue.

When discussion opened on the question of amending the electoral procedures, the leaders of the opposition camp, eleven in all, walked out of the assembly in response to the proposed amendment; it received thirty-six votes, a little less than the legally required two-thirds' majority. In order to make the amendment into law it was necessary to present the proposed amendment to the Government for approval. The opposition tried to prevent the Government from approving the proposal, arguing that if the votes of the twenty-two members of the Electoral Committee who were members of the SMC or dependent upon it were discounted, a majority of the Committee would then be on its side. However, the Government paid no heed to this argument and approved the proposed amendment after making a few minor changes. Now that this approval was secured, the SMC began its preparations for the elections, which were held in late 1925.<sup>26</sup>

The results of the elections show how much the opposition had gained. It won victories in a majority of the districts: Acre, Safed, the Ijzim-Haifa area, Nāblus and Beersheba; the supporters of the SMC were victorious in Jerusalem and in the South. In several districts the elections were not completed, since as soon as the results of the primaries became known both sides took the matter to court, demanding that the elections be disqualified in those areas in which they had lost. The victory of the opposition was made possible by the formation of a wide front which included past supporters of the AE and the SMC, such as the members of the Nāblus MCA, and in which for the first time the members of the opposition of all shades of opinion were united.<sup>27</sup>

These results should have secured for the opposition two representatives in the SMC, one from the Ottoman *sanjaq* of Nāblus and one from the *sanjaq* of Acre. Two supporters of al-Ḥājj Amin al-Ḥusayni should have been elected as representatives of the *sanjaq* of Jerusalem and would, together with him, have maintained their majority in the SMC. However, the many lawsuits that took place in connection with the elections led to their being declared invalid.<sup>28</sup> The High Court of Justice was asked by the members of the opposition to invalidate the elections in Jerusalem, and by 'Abd al-Laṭif Ṣalāḥ to invalidate the elections in the Nāblus area.

And in fact, the elections were declared invalid in all the districts for legal reasons, with no attempt being made to clarify the actual course of the elections.<sup>29</sup>

At this stage both sides remained dissatisfied, although the opposition was certainly able to regard the entire affair and its results with some satisfaction. Immediately after the invalidation of the elections, the Government began trying to bring the two sides to an agreement, but the attempt was a failure and both sides immediately went back to attacking each other.<sup>30</sup> Each side organized its supporters in nation-wide conferences and crystallized its stands in preparation for a continuation of the struggle. The opposition took the stand that the SMC's present term of office should not be extended and that new elections should be held according to the original version of Article 5 of the Order Constituting the SMC, i.e. under the supervision of the municipalities.<sup>31</sup> The stand taken by the supporters of the SMC was in the main a rejection of all Government interference in the affairs of the SMC and a strengthening of its independence, while calling for the election of a new SMC by the Electoral Committee which had chosen the first SMC in January 1922.<sup>32</sup>

In fact, the two sides had come to a secret agreement, with the aid of the Government, to accept the appointment of a temporary SMC composed of two representatives for each side, with the majority secured for the President of the SMC by the continuation of his term. The Government received this agreement happily, since it saved it from having to decide on a delicate internal Muslim question. The secrecy surrounding the agreement was a result of the fact that the leaders of the two sides had abandoned some of their principles and supporters. The opposition waived its demand that new elections be held and agreed to the continued representation of the Northern District, its most important stronghold, by a former member of the SMC and a supporter of its President, Sheikh Muḥammad Murād, Mufti of Haifa; while the supporters of the SMC agreed to forego the membership in the Council of Sheikh 'Abdāllah Dajāni of Jaffa and 'Abd al-Laṭīf Ṣalāḥ of Nāblus and resigned themselves to Government interference in appointing the SMC, after having fought so stubbornly in the past to consolidate its independence of the Government. Outwardly the heads of both sides created the impression that the solution had been forced upon them by the Government.<sup>33</sup>

This agreement was a great triumph for the opposition. In the new composition of the SMC, it gave substance to what they had achieved in the elections and to their growing influence in the country, and it enabled them to put two of their own men on the

SMC. In this way the SMC ceased to be a completely obedient tool in the hands of its President. Moreover, the agreement on the part of al-Ḥājj Amīn al-Ḥusayni and two of his men to serve on the SMC on the basis of a Government appointment gave their rivals a superb weapon. The opposition could now represent them as being no more than ambitious men who were not ashamed to betray their own principles in order to maintain their majority in the SMC. Although *Mir'āt al-Sharq*, the journal of the Nashāshībīs in Jerusalem, kept silent, since this faction was a party to the same agreement, *al-Karmil*, the opposition journal in the Northern District, did not see itself as bound by an agreement (of which it possibly knew nothing anyway) injurious to its followers, and exploited to the limit the acceptance of the appointment by Amīn al-Ḥusayni and his supporters as a weapon against them.<sup>34</sup>

This victory of the opposition was an excellent preface to the important test of strength between it and the supporters of the SMC, notably the municipal elections which were to be held in March-June 1927. These elections brought the inter-party intra-Arab struggle out into the country-wide arena, since residents from all the communities took part in them. From the point of view of the supporters of the SMC, their importance lay in the fact that they presented an opportunity to prove that the opposition's achievements in early 1926 were only accidental, while they themselves were still the true representatives of the Palestinian population. Moreover, it seems they believed they would be able to defeat their main rival, Rāghīb al-Nashāshībī, in the elections to the Jerusalem municipality, since in the elections to the SMC they had won in this city.

The supporters of the SMC did their utmost to achieve this aim. First of all they tried to claim that their list represented the Palestinian AE, but Mūsā Kāzīm al-Ḥusayni, who in 1926 too had maintained a large degree of neutrality towards Amīn al-Ḥusayni and his rivals, hastened to take a similar stand this time and denied this announcement.<sup>35</sup> Secondly, they succeeded in splitting the opposition's camp in Jerusalem by reaching agreement with 'Ārif Pāshā al-Dajāni, formerly an ally of Rāghīb al-Nashāshībī's, that he would announce his candidacy for Mayor on their behalf.<sup>36</sup> They also demanded of the Government that the elections be held according to separate lists of electors for each community, in such a way that the members of each community would choose its representatives for the municipality in a predetermined number proportionate to the size of each community. The Government decided, however, that although the number of representatives from each community would indeed be predetermined, all the residents

of the city would elect the representatives of all the communities. This demand was made in order to forestall the possibility that Jewish votes would go to their rivals' candidates. The circles of the opposition also understood this and therefore opposed the demand raised by the supporters of the SMC.<sup>37</sup>

After this demand had been rejected by the Government,<sup>38</sup> the supporters of the SMC decided to prevent the election of Rāghib al-Nashāshībi even at the cost of coming to an arrangement with the Jews over their voting in the Jerusalem municipality. It should be noted that in early 1927 the whole Zionist project was going through a crisis more serious than any other it had encountered during the whole period of British Mandate; it was thus much easier for the avowed opponents of Zionism to regard it with some degree of tolerance since in the eyes of the Arab community it appeared anyway to be on the decline.<sup>39</sup> Jamāl al-Ḥusayni and Jamil al-Ḥusayni turned to Colonel F. H. Kisch with the request that the Jews refrain from voting for the Nashāshībi candidates, while they themselves would refrain from voting for the Jewish, ultra-orthodox anti-Zionist "Agudath Israel" candidates.<sup>40</sup> Al-Ḥājj Amīn al-Ḥusayni appealed to Gad Frumkin, the Jewish Supreme Court Justice, in the same manner and proposed political concessions to Zionism in order to achieve the same end.<sup>41</sup> The Ḥusaynis did not attain their goal, as the Jews wisely presented a united front and nominated as many candidates as the number of seats which they had been allocated, and thus the election of their representatives was not dependent on the voting of members of the other communities. Thus the Jews, were able to vote according to their own interests in favour of Rāghib al-Nashāshībi's wretched administration and not for their national enemies.<sup>42</sup> In this manner, not only did the Ḥusaynis fail to attain their goal, but they even supplied their rivals with an excellent weapon against them, since the Ḥusaynis' attempt to reach agreement with the Jews became known in the community.<sup>43</sup>

In the end the Ḥusaynis also failed in the elections; out of the eight representatives of the Arabs in the Jerusalem municipality (five Muslims and three Christians) and four Jews, six supporters of the Nashāshībis were elected (three Muslims and three Christians).<sup>44</sup> The Jewish votes helped bring about the victory of the Nashāshībi faction, since if the Arab votes only had been taken into account, only four Nashāshībi men would have been elected (two Muslims and two Christians), as opposed to four supporters of the SMC (three Muslims and one Christian). Nevertheless, even if account had been taken only of the Arab votes, the results would still have been a victory for the Nashāshībi faction—Rāghib al-

Nashāshībi received the highest number of votes among the Arab voters; second to him came his Christian supporter, Ya'qūb Farrāj, and third his Muslim supporter, Zaki Nusaybah.<sup>46</sup> Even if the results of the election had been thus, the Government would still certainly have appointed Rāghib al-Nashāshībi as Mayor.

The opposition's triumph embraced the entire country and its candidates won in most of the municipalities, with the exception of Gaza and Majdal.<sup>46</sup> In this way its members gained positions of power and influence and seemed to be destined to replace the AE circles (which had lost much of their prestige) as spokesmen for the Palestinian-Arab community, or at least as an element equal to the AE in power and importance. And in fact one of the most important consequences of the opposition's triumph was that the SMC and the AE were no longer able to ignore its strength; they were forced to recognize the necessity of coming to agreement with it regarding the renewed momentum of the Palestinian national movement.

## Chapter Six

### THE TURNING POINT, 1924-9

#### THE WEAKENING OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE AND THE CHANGE IN ITS POLITICAL POSITION

During the second half of 1923 and throughout 1924, the weakness of the Palestinian national movement was apparent to all. The efforts to avert ratification of the Mandate with its Zionist provisions intact had failed. The attempt to look to King Ḥusayn for assistance had not only not aided the Palestinians in their struggle but had even contributed to some degree to his fall and to the collapse of the idea of Arab unity with which he had been connected. The internal bitterness against the AE's leadership which had previously existed had now taken on the form of organized factional opposition and had already met with some success. All this could hardly fail to make its mark on the active members of the AE, on its public prestige and on the morale of its supporters. The divisions within the Zionist camp, and in particular within American Zionism, aroused the impression that Zionism was on the wane, and the struggle against it therefore no longer appeared to be so vital.<sup>1</sup>

In January 1924 the Labour Party came to power in Britain; it continued the policy of its predecessors with regard to the Palestine question. The Palestinians thus learned that all British governments, regardless of party, took the same political line. This fact undoubtedly disheartened the Palestinian nationalists, who until then had placed great hopes on each change of government in Britain. The deliverance they so desired came neither from the pro-Arab camp within the Conservative Party nor from the Labour Party.<sup>2</sup>

The results of these developments were to be seen in the growing political apathy, the internecine disputes among families and communities, the disintegration of the branches of the MCA and the political calm which came to prevail—phenomena which lasted for some time. It is thus not surprising that in the summer of 1925 the new HC concluded that it was no longer necessary to submit monthly political reports, since nothing worth reporting was going on.<sup>3</sup>

The AE was not unaware of how critical this situation was. In early 1924 it began discussing the possibility of convening the

Seventh Palestinian Congress in order to give the national movement new impetus. After hesitations and consultations with delegations from the various cities, it decided to convene it in June 1924. It was decided to do everything possible to turn the Congress into a demonstration representative of all sections of the Palestinian community; thus general elections according to the areas of the country were to be held and the liberal professions were to be given special representation.<sup>4</sup>

There was a wide gap between the adoption of the resolution to hold general elections and its execution. The AE lacked the most elementary instruments required (a voting register, supervisory staff etc.) to execute such a resolution. The members of the opposition understood this and were quick to announce their non-participation in the Congress, which they believed would therefore be a narrow party congress.<sup>5</sup>

The unwillingness of members of the opposition to take part in the Congress revealed their attitude towards the AE. In their opinion, the AE had become, from the moment their party had been set up, a factional organization which was no longer authorized to convene a general Palestinian congress. From then onwards their stand was that the Palestinian Congress had to be convened by a *joint* committee of the AE and the opposition parties or some other neutral body. In any case, the AE no longer constituted the only representative framework of the Palestine Arabs.<sup>6</sup> The members of the opposition were at the time preoccupied in energetically condemning the leaders of the AE for tending to agree to the British-Hejazi Treaty and thus implicitly accepting the Balfour Declaration.<sup>7</sup> Participation in the Congress was likely to have put an end to this fierce propaganda campaign, and it is probable that for this reason too the members of the opposition refused to take part in it.

This opposition was sufficient to nullify the idea of convening the Congress. Various elements among the supporters of the AE which were later to join the opposition, such as the heads of the MCA in Jaffa and Nāblus, appealed to the AE to postpone the Congress.<sup>8</sup> The AE apparently realized that holding the Congress would only demonstrate the weakness of its supporters' camp and therefore decided to postpone it. The reason given for the postponement was the desire to know what the final form of the Anglo-Hejazi Treaty would be,<sup>9</sup> but there is no doubt that it was the internal split which was the cause.

This development led to a further decline in nationalist activity. Not only did the Congress, intended to inject new life into the movement, not take place, but the dimensions of the internal split and the power of the opposition had now been revealed to all. This

phenomenon was even more conspicuous in the following year as the elections to the SMC drew near. During the second half of 1925 this struggle became the central political issue which pre-occupied everyone. Although this was a period of extensive Jewish immigration, almost no-one paid any attention to it; the eyes of all were directed to taking over the SMC. The relations between the two camps also deteriorated during this period and, generally speaking, prevented the formation of a united Palestinian front.<sup>10</sup>

What remained of the AE and the MCA during the years 1924-8 was no more than an office run by Jamāl al-Ḥusayni. This office would occasionally send off memoranda to the Government or to the League of Nations on the situation in Palestine, or letters of protest on various matters.<sup>11</sup> Were it not for the demonstrations which were organized when Lord Balfour came to Palestine in April 1925 and a few acts of solidarity with the Syrian rebels in the latter half of that year, it would have seemed that even the Palestinians' resistance to Zionism had totally disappeared. Even the traditional strikes on Balfour Declaration Day were forgotten.

The decline in activity meant that the financial resources of the AE diminished to a point where in 1926 there was not enough money left to cover its current expenses or to pay the Secretary his much reduced salary.<sup>12</sup> As a result, the office of the AE was closed in the course of 1927; Jamāl al-Ḥusayni, its Secretary and motive force, accepted the post of Secretary of the SMC in 1928, and only at the Seventh Congress was a way found to revitalize that body.<sup>13</sup> The small measure of attention which was devoted during this year of crisis to political affairs was centred entirely on the municipal elections and on the internal controversy which accompanied them.

To understand the causes of this crisis, several other factors must be examined. In the wake of the flood of Jewish immigration to Palestine in 1925, a serious crisis began to take shape in Jewish settlement and the Zionist movement in 1926. The prosperity that had accompanied this wave of immigration at the start gave way to a serious economic crisis. The number of emigrants from Palestine grew, while the number of immigrants diminished to the point where in 1927 emigration was larger than immigration. This trend was accompanied by a serious financial and moral crisis in the Zionist movement. The dimensions of unemployment in the *yishūv* were quite considerable, and there were frequent demonstrations of unemployed and hungry workers. This bitter reality led to a withdrawal from extreme slogans and demands, and on the fringes of the Jewish camp much more moderate stands on the question of Palestine's political future began to appear.

The Palestinian community was aware of these developments. It was clear to them that the Zionist demands had become more moderate, and the danger that had seemed so threatening a few years earlier was now regarded in a completely different light. The larger the number of emigrants grew, the happier the Palestinian community felt; the sense that the Zionist scheme had reached a point of stagnation or even failure grew stronger.<sup>14</sup> In the light of the demonstrations of Jewish unemployed in Tel-Aviv and Jerusalem and a few cases of suicide, *Filasfin* wrote: "There is no need to repeat that Zionism has gone completely bankrupt, and there is no longer need to bring proofs to substantiate this statement. Proof is necessary only with regard to doubtful matters, but here there is no longer the slightest doubt of the bankruptcy of the Zionist scheme, which once soared so high in the skies of the Jewish world, a beacon in the eyes of some of the dreamers among the Jews."<sup>15</sup> In the opinion of *Sawt al-Sha'b*, "the failure of the Zionist movement is a natural result of the crisis, since Zionism is an artificial idea nourished by emotional fervour coinciding with fantastic imagination".<sup>16</sup>

Clearly, if such was the situation and if Zionism was viewed in this manner, the urge to organize anti-Zionist activity was bound to disappear. Moreover, a situation such as this strengthened the hand of those who were in favour of co-operating with the Government, notwithstanding the Balfour Declaration, and led to a re-appraisal on the part of those who had in the past opposed such co-operation. The crisis in the Zionist movement thus helped weaken the political activity of the rival Palestinian element, though on the other hand it encouraged—as we will see—the trend towards conciliation between the two rival camps within the Palestinian community and facilitated the triumph of the more moderate strategy.

The same factors which extinguished the spirit of the AE led many of its members to think that the Palestinian national cause would be furthered if a way could be found to set up the self-governing institutions that had previously been rejected. Such renewed thinking opened the way to contacts with the Government in 1925-7 over the establishment of a legislative council.

In the summer of 1923 Jamāl al-Ḥusayni had been prepared to agree to some sort of compromise over the legislative council,<sup>17</sup> although he brought up this possibility only in internal correspondence. In late 1924, on the other hand, he took the trouble to present his compromise idea to a Jewish personality (H. M. Kalvarisky), even introducing a certain change into it. Now he agreed that the upper chamber should be constituted according to

the proposed composition of the legislative council (i.e. a combined majority of Government and Jewish representatives), while he also agreed to an enlargement of its jurisdiction. In his first proposal he had stated that the supreme arbiter in cases of disagreement between the HC and the elected legislative council would be the League of Nations; he now proposed that no resolution passed by the legislative council ("the lower chamber") be binding unless ratified by the upper chamber. As proof of his goodwill he also suggested that the Immigration Committee be composed of two Jews, one Muslim and one Christian, with an Englishman presiding.<sup>18</sup>

This proposal served as the basis for talks between its proponent and Kalvarisky and was later brought by Jamāl al-Ḥusayni before the HC. The HC estimated that most of the Palestinian community leaned towards accepting this idea or one similar to it; but he was fearful that this body might turn into an instrument which would hinder the Government, not necessarily out of opposition to Zionism but by virtue of opposition to modern government and the need to pay taxes.<sup>19</sup> Herbert Samuel was also dubious about the seriousness of the advocates of this proposal and was at most ready to agree to the setting up of an advisory council. He stressed that whatever the proposal, the initiative this time had to come from the Arab side, after all the previous Governmental proposals had been rejected by the Arabs.<sup>20</sup> The AE did not agree to Herbert Samuel's proposal, while the opposition didn't dare to come out openly in favour of it even though it was inclined to accept it;<sup>21</sup> thus it was that this initiative petered out, although its influence was to be felt for many years to come.

In June 1926 the attempt was renewed to reach agreement over participation by the Arab community in the Government. Each side which took part in this new attempt claimed that the initiative had come from the other side.<sup>22</sup> It appears that both sides were right, since in 1926 both the Palestinian leadership and certain Government circles became aware that it was now possible to create a new basis for relations between the Government and the Palestinian community.

In contrast to the previous initiative of Jamāl al-Ḥusayni, this time the talks were carried on by a number of personalities. Among them were supporters of the AE (Rashīd al-Ḥājj Ibrāhīm), members of the opposition and individuals who were sympathetic to it (Būlus Shihādah, Mu'in al-Mādi and 'Umar Ṣāliḥ al-Barghūthy), and some who generally supported the AE but were not always identified with its Ḥusayni leadership ('Izzat Darwaza and Rafiq al-Tamīmi). The other side in the negotiations was represented by

Eric Mills, the Assistant Chief Secretary. The main demand of the Arab participants was the creation of a constitution which would make Palestine's status equivalent to that of Iraq, with the institutional expression of this status being the establishment of a bicameral parliament, in exact accordance with Jamāl al-Ḥusayni's proposal two years previously. In exchange for this they were prepared to admit "that His Majesty's Government is bound by international obligations regarding Palestine. We demand the above-mentioned Government to define its obligations and the restrictions applied to them in such a way that no room will be left in Palestine for any interpretation opposed to or in violation of these obligations and restrictions." Eric Mills leaned towards the interpretation that the Arabs were demanding the inclusion of the main points of the policy declaration of June 1922 (Cmd. 1700) in the country's constitution; however, it seems that the intention of the Arabs was more far-reaching, since in their last memorandum they stated: "They [the Arab representatives in the talks] know that the Mandate imposes on the Mandatory state international obligations which it has taken upon itself, but they want these obligations not to clash with the civil, *national*, *political* and religious rights of the *Arabs* and they desire that the inhabitants take an active part in making the laws and in governing the country"—i.e. here was an attempt to impose further restrictions on the Balfour Declaration (the italicized words) which were likely to make it a dead letter in fact if not in theory.

The second limitation which the Arab side was prepared to accept and which largely derived from the first was the exclusion of matters connected with the Government, by virtue of its status as trustee in charge of carrying out the Mandate, from the jurisdiction of the proposed parliament.

The Government's response was outwardly sympathetic. It did, it is true, point out that the Arab proposals contained some matters which the Government was not inclined to accept. But in general—so they said—they comprised a reasonable basis and were worthy of being brought to the attention of the Colonial Secretary. This would be done on the single condition that the HC could be persuaded that the proposals presented expressed the opinion of an "effective body" (*hay'ah 'āmilah*) of the inhabitants of the country.<sup>28</sup>

This seemingly innocent condition was intended to put an end to the negotiations, since it was obvious that the Arab participants in the talks represented no-one but themselves, while the Palestinian AE was out of action at the time.

This approach originated from the opinion of the HC, Lord Plumer, that, first, elected municipalities should be established as

testing grounds for self-government, and only afterwards should they pass to the higher stage of establishing central self-governing institutions.<sup>24</sup>

Notwithstanding its failure, this attempt at agreement is important for three reasons. First of all, it showed how much the controversies within the Palestinian camp with regard to paths of political action had diminished. The dispute among advocates of cooperation with the Government and opponents of this idea had, practically speaking, ended. This conclusion holds not only for the AE and the opposition but also for al-Ḥājj Amin al-Ḥusayni. He also expressed himself at this time (1925) in favour of setting up a legislative or advisory council.<sup>25</sup> Two years later, when the crisis in Zionism was at its peak, he too was prepared to guarantee that when this council came into being, matters relating to the question of the Jewish National Home (immigration and land acquisitions) would be removed from its jurisdiction.<sup>26</sup> Secondly, the Palestinians learned that the Government was prepared to re-open the matter of establishing self-governing institutions. And thirdly, the Government's hint that it was necessary first of all to set up a representative body which would be able to speak in the name of the entire community largely helped to accelerate the process which led to the convening of the Seventh Congress two years later.

#### THE AGREEMENT WITH THE OPPOSITION

The gradual weakening of the AE destroyed the basis for its claim to be the only authorized representative of the entire Palestinian population. The growing strength of the opposition and its partial victories in the elections to the SMC and overwhelming success in the elections to the municipalities were to force the SMC and the heads of the AE to change their stand towards it.

The change which had occurred in the stand taken by the leaders of the AE and its active members regarding cooperation with the Government largely demolished the political basis of the internecine controversy. What remained in existence were the personal, familial and regional differences noted in the previous chapter. In order to create a united front it was necessary to find a way to bridge these differences, and four years of negotiations were needed to establish this bridge.

Immediately after the establishment of *al-Ḥizb al-Waṭani*, 'Umar Shākir, the Editor of the paper *al-Falāḥ* of Mecca and King Ḥusayn's emissary, proposed in December 1923 to resolve the

difficulties between the AE and its opponents.<sup>1</sup> His proposal never took shape and in the course of 1924 the relations between the two camps greatly deteriorated. A delegation from *al-Ḥizb al-Waṭani* and *Ḥizb al-Zurrā'* which departed in January 1924 to meet with King Ḥusayn in Mecca was attacked by hooligans hired by the AE.<sup>2</sup> The opposition was not silent; at the time it was carrying on a fierce campaign against the AE because of its alleged agreement to the inclusion of Palestine in the Arab confederation in exchange for recognizing the Balfour Declaration (see Chapter Five). Each camp accused the other of treachery, selling out to the Zionists, selling land to Jews etc. Again an Arab personality from outside Palestine attempted to arbitrate between the two camps ('Abd al-'Aziz al-Tha'ālibi, a Muslim scholar from Tunis), but he too failed. What caused the failure and was later to cause the failure of similar attempts was the AE's refusal to regard *al-Ḥizb al-Waṭani* as having equal status with the AE. Its stand was "that the AE is not a party, since it represents the nation or a decisive majority of it".<sup>3</sup> At most they were prepared to negotiate with Seikh Sulaymān al-Tāji al-Fārūqi personally, since they exempted him from the charge of treason.<sup>4</sup>

An additional, more serious attempt to reach an agreement was made in the autumn of 1924. This attempt marked a turning-point in the AE's attitude towards the opposition, since this time it agreed to negotiate with a delegation from the opposition parties and not only with al-Fārūqi personally. Apparently the AE's failure to convene the Seventh Congress in the summer of 1924 because of the opposition's refusal to take part in it had influenced its leaders. After an interchange of letters between the parties it was decided to open negotiations between the delegations of the two sides.<sup>5</sup>

The members of the opposition strove in the course of the contacts to win recognition for the equality of status between their parties and the AE by having their parties and the AE convene the all-Palestine Congress together; in this way the existence of the opposition parties would be legitimized. An alternative proposal put forward by the opposition was a preliminary dissolution of both the parties and the AE.<sup>6</sup> Among the members of the AE and its branch associations, however, opposite views held sway. They believed that the basis for an arrangement with the opposition had to be the dissolution of the opposition's parties *before* the Palestinian congress was convened, along with the re-attachment to the AE of several of its leaders who had been members of it previously (al-Fārūqi etc.).<sup>7</sup>

The negotiators from both sides in the end reached a compromise solution. They decided that the Palestinian Congress would be

convened by a committee called "the central committee" composed of four representatives of the AE and four representatives of the opposition parties. The Congress itself would be convened on the basis of general regional elections. The agreement left undetermined the question of whether the opposition parties were to be dissolved after this committee was set up or after the Congress convened.<sup>8</sup>

This compromise was a complete victory for the opposition. Its demand for equality between its organizations and the AE was recognized, while the AE's demand that the opposition dissolve its separate organizations was not mentioned at all. It seems that for many of the AE's members this was too much to swallow, and the AE therefore decided to bring the agreement before a national convention of its supporters for approval and refrained from approving it alone.<sup>9</sup> At the convention the tables were turned; most of the participants refused to agree to the compromise agreement and insisted that the pre-condition for any settlement with the opposition was the dissolution of its parties. In fact the participants in the convention rejected the proposed settlement and resolved that the opposition must dissolve its parties, in exchange for which five of its men would be joined to the AE and Sheikh al-Fārūqī would be appointed its Vice-President. The enlarged AE would then convene the Seventh Palestinian Congress (the opposition opposed calling the Congress "seventh", since it demanded that its own congresses be included in the number of all-Palestinian Congresses).<sup>10</sup> The members of the opposition refused to accept this solution and the negotiations ended in failure, each side putting the responsibility for this on the other.<sup>11</sup> An important factor in the shaping of the opposition's negative stand on the AE's proposal was the position of the members of *Ḥizb al-Zurrā'*. These men, with the encouragement of the Zionist Organization, worked against any settlement with the AE, and at the same time informed the Government of their complete rejection of the AE's memorandum to the League of Nations. The men of *al-Ḥizb al-Waṭani* apparently refused to weaken their position by reaching agreement only with the AE, so that in the end they followed their partners' lead.<sup>12</sup> The fact that the opposition was not unanimous was later to put renewed obstacles in the way of a settlement between the rival camps.

In March 1925 Lord Balfour paid a visit to Palestine. Before his arrival the AE made extraordinary efforts to organize strikes and demonstrations throughout the country and to put on a front of general unity. For this purpose it instructed its supporters to refrain from all attacks on members of the opposition in order to deny them an excuse not to participate, and it seems that an agreement

was reached with the members of the opposition to work together on the day of the strike.<sup>13</sup> This arrangement worked, and on the day of Balfour's arrival, 25th March 1925, the Palestinian populace showed complete unity—the strike embraced all the cities of the country and attained mass proportions.<sup>14</sup>

This joint activity helped create a new spirit of cooperation between the two camps. On the basis of this spirit, efforts to reach a settlement were renewed; this time too, however, the attempt failed because the opposition began to harden its stands in view of the struggle expected over the elections to the SMC. As a precondition to participation in the Congress the opposition demanded a change in the order constituting the SMC and determination in advance of the number of its delegates to the Congress. The stand taken by Fāris al-Mas'ūd, head of *Ḥizb al-Zurrā'* in Samaria, also contributed to the hardening of the opposition's stand. The members of the AE rejected these demands, and the attempt failed.<sup>15</sup> No further attempt was made to bring about by compromise a closing of the ranks within the Palestinian camp until after the matter of the composition of the SMC was finalized in the spring of 1926, even though in 1925 Jewish immigration to Palestine reached an unprecedented scale.

Following the settlement of the question of the SMC's composition, the two sides again turned to the question of unity and the convening of the Seventh Congress. For this purpose they turned for assistance to Aḥmad Zaki Pāshā from Egypt, who acted as mediator and initiator of the compromise.<sup>17</sup> As a result of this initiative, various notables from both camps met together, and it was finally decided that a committee composed of an equal number of representatives from both sides would determine the composition of the Congress and would convene it. This committee adopted the principle of equal representation for both sides (fifty men for each side) at the Congress itself.<sup>18</sup> It seemed that this time the Congress would actually assemble, since both sides were interested in setting up a representative body able to negotiate with the Government in the name of the Palestinians, and the talks with Eric Mills (see the previous chapter) were being carried on at that time. The establishment of a representative council in Syria in early 1926 also helped strengthen this trend towards reaching agreement with the Government.<sup>19</sup> Nevertheless, this time too the attempt failed, although it seems that the main reason for this lay in the conflicting interests prevailing within the opposition camp itself.

From the very start it was apparent that not all the sectors of the opposition were happy with these talks, and not all of them took part in them. A clear dividing line split the opposition camp:

those who were satisfied with the settlement reached over the SMC participated in the talks and agreed to join forces again around the AE, while those who had opposed this arrangement stood apart. The members of the opposition from the Nāblus and Jerusalem-Jaffa districts were thus on the former side, whereas their colleagues from the Northern District and Gaza—areas whose previous representatives in the SMC had not changed—were on the other side. This regional difference was reinforced by personal interests. Among the opposition's members from the North was the opposition's most important candidate for a high religious post—Sheikh As'ad al-Shuqayri. Despite the victory of his camp in the elections for the SMC in the Northern District, he was left out of the SMC appointed following the invalidation of the elections. It is obvious, then, why his supporters and their organ, *al-Karmil*, opposed the compromise settlement regarding the SMC and also the matter of convening the Seventh Congress. A similar consideration led Sheikh Sulaymān al-Tāji al-Fārūqi, President of *al-Hizb al-Waṭani*, not to take part in the attempt to reach a settlement between the two camps and to oppose it after it had been reached. He also must have seen himself as a natural candidate for high office in the Muslim religious establishment; his non-election to the SMC undoubtedly led him to this position. It should be noted also that a personal interest caused Mu'in al-Māḍi and his supporters, from the Haifa sub-district, to withdraw their support for As'ad al-Shuqayri and his men, although until then they had been working as a single bloc forming the opposition of the Northern District.<sup>20</sup>

This split in the ranks of the opposition caused the failure of the realization of the settlement. Without the support of the Northern members, the members of the opposition from the centre and south of the country would have become a minority in the Congress and the AE, and it is unlikely that they were prepared to accept this. As a result the agreement was never realized and one more attempt to reach a settlement failed. In late 1926 the internecine struggle began to flare up anew in view of the approaching municipal elections, and in the heat of the struggle it was obviously impossible to consider settlements or compromises. But when the elections were over, voices were raised again in favour of unity and settlement. It is not an accident that it was *Mir'āt al-Sharq*, the Nashāshībīs' organ in Jerusalem, that first called for this.<sup>21</sup> In the wake of their electoral triumph their self-confidence had increased, and their ability to ensure themselves an important status within the nation-wide frameworks was now far greater than it had ever been.

This initiative led once again to a renewed attempt to convene

the Seventh Congress. While contacts between the parties were indeed carried on during the second half of 1927, they went on in a casual fashion until early 1928, when it seemed that there was a real desire on the part of the leaders of the two camps to reach an agreement.<sup>22</sup> And in fact the heads of the SMC and the AE on the one hand and the members of the opposition in Jerusalem on the other quickly reached a settlement,<sup>23</sup> which was to ensure the pre-eminence of both sections of the Jerusalem élite within the Palestinian community. However, just as two years previously the members of the opposition in the North of the country had refused to support a settlement, having been cheated with respect to the SMC, so this time, too they made their participation in the Congress conditional on several things. They demanded that the Congress assemble elsewhere other than in Jerusalem; that the number of delegates from Jerusalem be determined proportionately to the percentage of Jerusalemites in the total population; and that inhabitants of regions outside Jerusalem be forbidden to appoint Jerusalemites as their representatives in the Congress, which would strengthen the weight carried by the Jerusalem delegates at the Congress.<sup>24</sup> "Let the organizers of this Congress know", wrote *Mir'at al-Sharq*, "that the country is not the private property of a few Jerusalemite families".<sup>25</sup>

This stand taken by the members of the opposition from the North brought the preparations for convening the Congress to a standstill.<sup>26</sup> Their power resulted from support this time from an additional factor, namely a uniform front of the Christian communities. In the course of the negotiations on convening the Congress the representatives of the Christian communities had lent their support to the forceful members of the opposition from the North who objected to the hegemony of the SMC's supporters, demanding that a pre-determined number of places at the Congress be reserved for them.<sup>27</sup>

In light of this front of Northern opposition and the Christian communities, the organizers of the Congress had to give way on several important issues. It was determined that representation at the Congress would be proportionate to the size of the cities and sub-districts, and that Jerusalemites would be prohibited from representing regions outside Jerusalem at the Congress. The Christians secured a certain number of places at the Congress. The only concession made by the other side was that it agreed to the Congress's being convened in Jerusalem and not elsewhere, as it had originally demanded.<sup>28</sup> In actual fact, out of 227 delegates there were no more than 28 from Jerusalem and the surrounding villages, in complete contrast to the picture at previous Congresses.<sup>29</sup> What

this arrangement meant was that the al-Ḥusayni family and the faction of the SMC were denied hegemony in the Congress and the AE which was to be elected by it.

Another matter which stood out during the preparations for convening the Congress was the almost universal consensus that the Congress had to request the Government to set up a representative legislative body having a wider jurisdiction than the proposed legislative council of 1922. This stand prevailed among both supporters and opponents of the AE and the SMC,<sup>30</sup> and was the result of the developments in Palestine during the previous few years. The crystallization of this moderate line meant that when, despite the difficulties, the Congress did finally assemble, various circles and elements which in the past had stood aloof from the national struggle and refrained from taking part in the organizational apparatus of the national movement, now participated.<sup>31</sup>

When the Congress convened on 20th June 1928 in the auditorium of the *Rawḍat al-Ma'ārif* school in Jerusalem, these new moods were easily detectable. Most of the discussions revolved around the question of establishing a representative legislative body similar to that which had been set up in the other mandated countries, and the demand to establish such a body was the primary resolution adopted by the Congress.<sup>32</sup> The Congress refrained from adopting any explicit resolution favouring independence, against the Mandate or the Balfour Declaration. It seems that this was a result of the strong desire then prevalent among the Palestinian leadership to further the possibility of establishing a representative legislative body in the country. The hostility in the Jewish community to this idea was well known to them, and it is probable that they feared that if the Jewish community kept up its opposition to this plan the British Government would probably not propose it. The Zionist movement and the *yishūv* were at the time in the midst of a great crisis, and thus the decision not to express opposition to the Balfour Declaration and thus to mollify Jewish opinion did not seem too far-reaching.<sup>33</sup>

Another matter accomplished at the Congress was the revitalization of the AE. It was decided that each sub-district would be represented in the new AE by two Muslim delegates, one from the camp of the SMC and one from amongst its opponents; in addition there would be twelve Christian representatives—forty-eight members in all.<sup>34</sup> Immediately after its establishment the new AE elected a committee to direct its affairs. At the head of this committee Mūsā Kāẓim al-Ḥusayni was placed, who was again elected President of the AE. Its other members were the two Vice-Presidents: Ya'qūb Farrāj (Greek-Orthodox) and Tawfīq Ḥaqqi

al-'Abdāllah, both from the opposition, and the three Secretaries of the AE: 'Awni 'Abd al-Hādi (a neutral, close to the Ḥusayni camp), Jamāl al-Ḥusayni (one of the leaders of the SMC camp) and Mughannam Ilyās Mughannam (Protestant, of the opposition).<sup>35</sup>

The nature of the resolutions and the new composition of the AE were clear signs of the victory of the opposition and the moderate spirit. Nevertheless, several other phenomena heralding the rise of new, younger and more radical elements were already present. A group of young delegates, whose chief spokesman at the Congress was Ḥamdi al-Ḥusayni of Gaza, was active at the Congress against this spirit of moderation. They opposed the restriction of debate to the question of representative rule only and demanded that complete independence for the country be called for. Moreover, they came out against the indubitably Palestinian orientation prevalent at the Congress—the spirit of “Palestine for the Palestinians”—and stressed various Pan-Arab questions. In their opinion, the solution to the Palestine question was independence within the framework of Arab unity. They were not strong enough to change completely the nature of the Congress, but they did succeed in passing a resolution stating that “the demand to establish representative rule does not mean deviation from the National Pact [which had been adopted at the Fifth Congress and bore an extremist character] or from the resolutions of previous Congresses. This demand is but a means to hasten the realization of the supreme goals of the nation.”<sup>36</sup> This resolution did not change the character of the Congress in the eyes of these young radicals, who saw it as the weakest of all the Palestinian Congresses “with regard to fervour, strength of the resolutions, their scope and the nature of the struggle”.<sup>37</sup> But there is no doubt that their success in having it passed, much to the regret of the leadership, bore witness to the appearance of new and powerful forces within the Palestinian national movement.

After the Congress the new AE began to take the first steps towards executing its resolutions. The committee of the AE (comprising the President, Vice-Presidents and Secretaries) met with the HC and informed him of the Congress's demand “to establish a representative government in Palestine”. During the conversation the members of the committee stressed that there was no contradiction between Britain's international obligations and the granting to the inhabitants of Palestine of rights such as Iraq and Syria enjoyed. They also argued that just as in the past the Jews had enjoyed complete equality with the Arabs, so the Arabs still “do not desire to change this policy of theirs towards the Jews, so long as the Jews do not desire to prejudice the political, economic and

social rights of the Arabs". "We do not believe", they said, "that Britain, with the League of Nations behind her, can promise any people something opposed to the principle of equality among peoples".<sup>38</sup> The meaning of these new tactics was made explicit by Mūsā Kāzīm al-Ḥusayni in an interview published in the press. It meant making peace with the idea of British mandatory rule in Palestine if only self-governing bodies would be set up in the country. The pro-Zionist policy and the Balfour Declaration were of course an integral part of the Mandate, but one should not conclude from this that they were being accepted. At most, Mūsā Kāzīm al-Ḥusayni was prepared to see in the developments of the crisis period 1927-8 the true image of Zionism, as he agreed to Jewish immigration on the scale of 200-500 immigrants a year or even 1,000 immigrants. With respect to the status of Hebrew too, he refused to budge from his fundamentally negative stand, even though he defined this negative stand in a less candid fashion.<sup>39</sup>

However, this appeal to the British came at an inconvenient moment, since at that time Lord Plumer had just resigned his post, and the new HC, Sir John Chancellor, did not arrive in Palestine until late 1928. In any case, in January 1929 the AE renewed its efforts after a silence of several months;<sup>40</sup> again its committee met with the HC, brought up its proposal to establish a representative body in the country, and expressed its willingness to enter into negotiations with the Government over the realization of this demand "by being reasonable and meeting it half-way". Furthermore, "they believed there was now no dispute on principle" between the Government's stand and the Palestinian position. The Palestinian representatives had no doubt that "the international obligations imposed on His Majesty's Government need not be the real bar to giving some sort of self-representation".<sup>41</sup>

In his reply the HC did not commit himself to anything of substance other than a promise to consider their request thoroughly, but in his despatches to the Colonial Office in London he began to express the opinion that it would "be difficult to resist much longer the demand for the conversion of the present Advisory Council [composed of the Heads of the Departments in the Government] into some form or other of Legislative Assembly, more particularly in view of the forthcoming establishment of representative government in the politically less advanced territory of Trans-Jordan".<sup>42</sup> Whether or not the HC had arrived in Palestine believing that something must be done to further the rights of the Arabs, clearly the moderate approach of the AE's delegation made an impression upon him.

The Conservative Colonial Secretary, L. Amery, was far from

enthusiastic over this approach of John Chancellor and informed him that he was of the opinion that there was a need for extraordinary caution in everything connected with the advancement of constitutional developments in Palestine;<sup>43</sup> however, the resignation of the Conservative Government and the rise to power of a Labour Government headed by Ramsay MacDonald in early June 1929 cleared the way for the HC to make good his position.

In June 1929 the HC expressed to the new Colonial Secretary (Sydney Webb, the well-known socialist thinker, who became Lord Passfield) his opinion that it was now possible to cooperate with the Arabs in the government. They were no longer demanding the abrogation of the Balfour Declaration and the Mandate, and their fear of Zionism had largely abated. His concrete proposal was to set up a legislative council with similar jurisdiction to that of the proposed council of 1922. In contrast, however, to the one which the council now proposed it would be composed of Government officials and representatives of the populace *who would be appointed by the Government* in proportion to the size of the communities. There would be one more appointed representative than there would be government officials: fifteen appointed representatives of the populace (ten Muslims, three Jews and two Christians) and fourteen officials, including the HC.<sup>44</sup>

From the point of view of its representational and democratic significance this proposal was weaker than that of 1922, and it seems that this was intended to soften the hostility of the Jewish side to the possibility of establishing a legislative council in the country. However, what is far more important and interesting is that the leaders of the two rival camps, which had now joined together in the revitalized AE, Mūsā Kāzīm al-Ḥusayni and Rāghīb al-Nashāshībi, gave their consent to this proposal. For several months Chief Secretary Harold Luke carried on consultations and negotiations with these two personalities, in the course of which the plan was outlined, and they even agreed to serve on this body when it was set up.<sup>45</sup>

At first sight it seemed that the path had been cleared for the establishment of representative institutions in the country—a path which had been blocked in 1923 by the boycott of the elections to the legislative council. However, Mūsā Kāzīm al-Ḥusayni was not so sure that he would be able to persuade the camp of supporters of the AE and the SMC to agree to this plan, since they had rejected it in 1922. In any case, he insisted that all the talks be kept secret, and if anything were to become known of them inopportunistically, and the radicals showed any opposition to the proposal, however slight, he would, he declared, be forced to withdraw

his consent.<sup>46</sup> Therefore, the AE was not informed at all about these talks and the agreement. The AE's memorandum to the HC, signed by Mūsā Kāzīm al-Ḥusayni and presented on 17th June 1929—near the date on which the secret negotiations were concluded—made no mention whatsoever of the talks or the agreement. Instead, it continued to demand a representative government by means of which the inhabitants of Palestine would be able to take part in legislation and taxation and to diminish the seriousness of the present general crisis threatening the country.<sup>47</sup>

An obvious indication of Mūsā Kāzīm al-Ḥusayni's apprehension can be detected in the composition sketched out during the talks for the future legislative council. With the exception of Mūsā Kāzīm al-Ḥusayni himself, almost all the proposed appointees to the council came from the ranks of the opposition, although not all of them had consistently supported it, and in general they had leaned previously towards a policy of cooperation with the Government.<sup>48</sup> This composition undoubtedly bears witness to the fact that Mūsā Kāzīm knew very well that even if the supporters of the SMC were to agree to the plan, they would still certainly refuse to admit in so clear and public a manner to the change that had occurred in their position.

However, these doubts and fears remained purely theoretical, since the outbreak of the August 1929 riots, connected to the question of the Jews' rights of worship at the Western Wall, barred for some while any further discussion of the constitutional question of establishing a legislative council. Nevertheless, this agreement, though never realized, has an intra-Arab political importance. It seems to point to the beginning of a new arrangement of forces within the Palestinian community, with the erstwhile enemies Mūsā Kāzīm al-Ḥusayni and Rāghib al-Nashāshībi on one side, and on the other al-Ḥājj Amīn al-Ḥusayni, Mufti of Jerusalem and President of the SMC. The two veteran leaders of status now based themselves on the AE and the social forces which up till then had directed the Palestinian struggle, while the camp of al-Ḥājj Amīn's supporters identified itself increasingly with the new generation of young radicals, who had come to the fore for the first time at the Seventh Congress.

Just as the August 1929 disturbances with one blow put an end to the June agreement without its ever having become known in the community, so they also accelerated the process behind the appearance of al-Ḥājj Amīn and his camp as an alternative force—and at times, a force opposed to the traditional camp lined up behind the AE.

## Chapter Seven

### THE CONFLICT OVER THE WAILING WALL AND ITS REPERCUSSIONS

Apprehension over the danger threatening the Muslim Holy Places in Palestine and the need to defend them accompanied the emergence of the Palestinian-Arab National movement from the start. The Palestinian Muslims were aware that *al-Ḥaram al-Sharīf* stood on the site of the Jewish temple. Moreover, they regarded Zionism from the beginning as a movement striving to change the national *status quo* in the country and to restore the glory of the ancient Israelite kingdom. Naturally, then, they began to develop fears lest the mosques of al-Aqṣā and the Dome of the Rock also became objects for Jewish restorationism.

These fears were not the product of intellectual speculation alone. The growth in numbers and status of the Jewish community of Jerusalem from the early nineteenth century onwards was accompanied by efforts to attain recognition of the right of worship beside the Wailing Wall, which was, of course, outside the bounds of *al-Ḥaram al-Sharīf*. It had been customary for ages past for Jews to worship at this site, but it seems that during the nineteenth century various attempts were made to make explicit the rights of the Jews to bring chairs, benches and a dividing screen between the sexes during prayer and also to repair the square in front of the Wall—measures inevitably interpreted as an expression of rights of possession over the spot. It seems that the leaders of the Muslim community of Jerusalem noticed this fact and appealed to the authorities. Indeed, in 1840 and 1911 the proper authorities determined that the Jews had no rights over the site other than permission to visit the site for purposes of worship, but without bringing benches, dividing screens or scrolls of the Law.<sup>1</sup> The fact that the area before the Wall was part of the Abū Madyan *Waqf*, which had been established for *Maghribi* pilgrims who had settled there, was a solid basis for rejecting the Jewish claims to possession of the site.

This legal obstacle—the Wall area being part of a *waqf*—led certain Jewish figures (Nissim Bechar and Baron Edmond de Rothschild) before the First World War to make various attempts to acquire this piece of land, or the entire area settled by the

*Maghribis*, by the methods of exchange customary in transactions involving *waqf* lands. It is worth noting that the first attempt, in 1887, failed because of the fear the Jews felt that such a transaction might have a negative effect on the Arabs, even though the Governor of the district, Ra'ūf Pāshā, and the Mufti of Jerusalem, Muḥammad Ṭāhir al-Ḥusayni (al-Ḥājj Amīn's father) agreed without hesitation to this proposal.<sup>2</sup> During the period of the First World War, a renewed attempt was made to purchase the paved area before the Wall. The Turkish Governor leaned at first towards agreeing to this but afterwards withdrew his consent, since because of the death sentences issued at the time in the military court at 'Aley against many Arab notables "much discontent existed among the Arab population".<sup>3</sup>

In 1919, following the British conquest, Jewish elements renewed their attempts to acquire the area adjacent to the Wailing Wall. This time too the attempt failed, since the price demanded by the property-holders was exorbitant. Ronald Storrs, the Governor of the district, to whom the Jews had turned for help in carrying out the transaction, refused to deal with the matter after it had become known to the community and had aroused opposition.<sup>4</sup>

Against the background of the basic fear of Zionism, and various pronouncements of Jewish spokesmen which could be interpreted as expressing hopes of rebuilding the Temple,<sup>5</sup> these attempts at acquisition began to be interpreted in the Muslim community as a first step towards a Jewish take-over of the entire *al-Ḥaram al-Sharīf* area.<sup>6</sup> Nevertheless, during the first years following the British conquest this affair was still not a standard subject in Arab protests and propaganda, although occasionally certain fears were expressed.<sup>7</sup> Only in 1922 did this topic become an important community affair and a central issue in Arab propaganda. In order to understand why this development occurred we must direct our attention to the attitudes of the three sides involved in the matter: the Jews, the Arabs, and the British.

Throughout the nineteenth century and especially after the decision of the *Majlis al-Idārah* of the Jerusalem district in late 1911, the Jews had not resigned themselves to the prohibition against bringing chairs and scrolls of the Law and against setting up a dividing screen in the wall area. In 1912 Jewish representatives raised this question before the supreme authorities in Istanbul, but they claimed that the Empire's involvement in the Balkan Wars kept the Ottoman Government from deciding on the matter.<sup>8</sup> However, the principal method which they used to attain unlimited rights of worship was intercession with the District Governor and the administrator (*mutawalli*) of the Abū Madyan *Waqf*—inter-

cession accompanied not infrequently by financial incentives. In this way the Jews were able to win consent to their worshipping in their own manner without disturbance, so that the restrictions which had been made in 1840 and 1911 were in reality not always observed. This was also made possible by virtue of the fact that the area involved—the pavement in front of the Wall—was not considered a holy place for the Muslims, and the residents of the *Maghribi* quarter even used to throw their garbage there.<sup>9</sup>

With the British conquest and the hopes it aroused among Jews in Palestine and outside it, various Jewish elements tried to change this situation—where rights of worship at the most sanctified spot in Judaism were dependent upon the mercies of the administrators of the Abū Madyan *Waqf* and the heads of the Muslim community in Jerusalem.<sup>10</sup> In May 1920 it became necessary to repair the structure adjacent to the Wailing Wall within *al-Ḥaram al-Sharīf*. This work required that repairs be made in the upper part of the Wailing Wall itself. The Jewish community of Jerusalem saw this as desecration, and its leader, Rabbi Kook, demanded that the Government transfer the Wailing Wall “into the care and control of the Representatives of Jewry” and to entrust them with whatever repairs would become necessary. A letter from the Zionist Commission on the same subject could have been interpreted as a demand for ownership of the Wall.<sup>11</sup> The Government rejected these demands, and the Jews continued their age-old custom of bringing benches and ritual articles to the Wall area on Sabbaths and holidays.

It is highly doubtful whether this situation could have continued for long without trouble. The British had obligated themselves in their first proclamation following the taking of Jerusalem to preserve the *status quo* with respect to religious affairs and the Holy Places. This obligation was given added force in the Mandate (Article 13). Any protest on the part of either side against the existing arrangements beside the Wall would have forced the Government to intervene and determine what the *status quo* was, especially inasmuch as a special article in the Mandate (Article 14) obliged it to set up a commission of inquiry to determine the rights of the various communities at the Holy Places. The enthusiasm which had gripped the Jews after the British conquest began to abate, and Rabbi Kook's demand was not repeated. However, in 1922 a new factor entered the picture, namely the SMC, which had been set up at the beginning of that year.

The cultivation and repair of Jerusalem's two great mosques and the furthering of Jerusalem's importance in the Muslim world were basic features of the SMC's policy from the start. Moreover,

the Muslims were now encountering Jewish efforts to win legal possession of the Wailing Wall and the small paved area in front of it and pronouncements which could be understood as still more far-reaching in their intentions with regard to the area of *al-Haram al-Sharif* itself.

It should be noted that the attempts to bring chairs and benches for the worshippers were undoubtedly a product of their needs, particularly on the Day of Atonement, which is a day of fasting. However, it must be remembered that such actions over the course of years and without opposition would certainly have created certain rights of tenure over the spot, and assuredly would have been seen in this light by the Jews. Long experience with the struggle among the various Christian communities over their rights at the Holy Sepulchre and the Church of the Nativity had taught the Muslims that any deviation from the customary habits created a new rule, and any change in the *status quo* inevitably became a new *status quo*.

If Zionism was seen as an attempt to change the demographic and national *status quo* in the country, it is no wonder that the above-mentioned Jewish attempts were regarded as a first step towards taking over the area of *al-Haram al-Sharif*. From this it was an almost inevitable step to the SMC's policy of opposing any attempt to reinforce the Jewish rights in the Wall area, and especially any attempt to purchase this area. Such a development was not only in harmony with the efforts to enhance the status of the mosques in Muslim eyes, but even supplied excellent proof of the necessity of Pan-Muslim solidarity in their defence. The vociferousness and extremism which for years characterized the SMC's efforts to prevent the transfer of the Wall area to Jewish hands were undoubtedly a product of this combination of circumstances, but the sincere and real fear which was likely to have developed in the midst of the Palestinian Muslims as to the future of *al-Haram al-Sharif*, within the context of their more extensive fears as to Zionism's true aims, must not be treated lightly.

And in fact, a mere three months after the establishment of the SMC, during Passover 1922, the Muslims prevented the Jews from bringing chairs to their prayer site beside the Wailing Wall, though they had done so undisturbed since the British conquest.<sup>12</sup> Similar situations recurred in 1923 and 1925 at the time of the Jewish holidays, and the SMC presented protests to the Government. The British authorities were forced to intervene. Since first and foremost they aimed at keeping order and preventing riots, Ronald Storrs decided in 1922 that chairs and benches were not to be brought to the Wall area. However, it was clear from the start that

this decision would not lead to a final resolution of the issue, since there were substantial differences of opinion between the parties as to the meaning of the *status quo*: did it mean the situation in *actual practice* in the last days of Ottoman rule, or the *legal* situation as finally determined in the decision of the Jerusalem *Majlis al-Idārah* in November 1911? The Jews of course clung to the former interpretation and the Arabs to the latter; of more importance is the fact that the policy of the authorities from 1922 on seems to show that they accepted the Arab interpretation.<sup>13</sup> The decision of an authorized body, even if not carried out in practice, seemed to them more important and more authoritative than an arrangement reached privately with the administrator of the Abū Madyan *Waqf* and the heads of the Muslim community in Jerusalem. Leonard Stein, the Secretary of the Executive of the World Zionist Organization, wrote in 1925: "Harsh and inconsiderate as has been the attitude adopted by the Moslem community, it would seem to have had the letter of the law on its side in insisting that no concessions should be made to the Jews at the Wailing Wall—arguing, as it doubtless would, that such concessions might prove to be the first stage in a process of a peaceful penetration [to the Wailing Wall pavement]".<sup>14</sup>

In this way the SMC won an important gain. Its policy of safeguarding Muslim rights at the Holy Places and enhancing the status of these places was represented as a defence against Jewish intrigues. Its argument was that "the Jews' tears and kisses at the Wall were not a product of their love for the Wall itself but of their fond desire to take over *al-Haram al-Sharīf*, as everyone knows".<sup>15</sup> The fact that the Government adopted the Muslim interpretation of the *status quo* from the start enabled the SMC, a quasi-Governmental body, to maintain undisturbedly a hard-line policy with respect to the question of the Wailing Wall even outside the boundaries of Palestine, in areas under British rule.

The SMC and the AE were not content merely to thwart all Jewish attempts to gain any sort of position in the area before the Wall; they began directing a systematic campaign in Palestine and the entire Muslim world against the supposed danger of a Jewish take-over of the Muslim Holy Places in Palestine. With this in mind, the SMC and AE fell with delight upon a painting of the late nineteenth century by the "Torat-Hayyim" *Yeshiva* (a religious high school of the traditional sort) showing the Dome of the Rock crowned by a Star of David.<sup>16</sup> The Jewish explanation—that this picture had been used for years for decorative purposes (*Mizrah*—"East"—as it was called) or for purposes of fund-raising abroad by the Jerusalem *yeshivahs* was disregarded. This Jewish picture

was copied and circulated by the SMC throughout the Muslim world as proof of Jewish intentions. When Sheikh 'Abd al-Qādir al-Muẓaffar tried in late 1922 to enlist the support of the Kemalist Turks and the representatives of Persia and Afghanistan in the Arab struggle in Palestine, he stressed the danger to the al-Aqṣā mosque and the need for Pan-Muslim defence of it.<sup>17</sup> When Kāmīl al-Budayri was at work with the same aim among the tribes of Transjordan and the Arab desert, he too used these same photos.<sup>18</sup> This propaganda reached its climax when in the summer of 1922 a Palestinian delegation left on a propaganda and fund-raising campaign in the Hejaz during the pilgrimage (*ḥajj*) season.

The idea of sending a delegation to eastern lands in order to carry on propaganda for the Arabs of Palestine and to collect funds for their struggle had been brought up at the Fourth Palestinian Congress. However, most of the attention at that Congress had been devoted to sending a delegation to Britain, so that this idea, although adopted in principle, was not realized.<sup>19</sup> The decision to carry out the idea was made a year later, in June 1922, and involved a controversy over the composition of the Delegation (see Chapter Three), not long after the outbreak of the first dispute over the Jewish rights of worship at the Wailing Wall. Notwithstanding the opposition of 'Arif Pāshā al-Dajāni, President of the AE during Mūsā Kāẓim al-Ḥusayni's absence (in Britain), it was decided to send Sheikh 'Abd al-Qādir al-Muẓaffar (Jerusalem), Rafīq al-Tamīmī (Nāblus), Abū al-Khayr al-Muwaqqā' and Amin Nūrallah (Haifa). Adīb Abū Ḍabbah from Jaffa was appointed Secretary of the Delegation.<sup>20</sup> This composition was decided upon through consultation with the various MCA associations, with the aim of giving representation to the various districts of the country.<sup>21</sup>

Before the Delegation departed, in late June 1922, it published an appeal to the Arabs of Palestine. The Delegation explained that it was departing for Mecca in order "to call the Islamic peoples in the East and the West to the aid of the Palestinian people in defending its land. There can be no doubt that every Muslim man and woman regards safeguarding the honour of *al-Masjid al-Aqṣā*, the first *Qiblah* and the third most holy site in Islam, as his religious duty."<sup>22</sup>

On its way to Mecca the Delegation spent a few days in Egypt. They were received by members of the "Party of Syrian Unity" and met with various Egyptian personalities. The Delegation's aim was to alert Muslim opinion in Egypt to the dangers threatening al-Aqṣā.<sup>23</sup> With this in mind they issued a manifesto headed by a picture of the Dome of the Rock topped by a Star of David. The manifesto produced proofs of the actual danger threatening al-

Aqṣā and stated that only a common defence by all Muslims could forestall a Jewish take-over of the mosque.<sup>24</sup> The members of the Delegation met with the leaders of Islam in Egypt, the Mufti and Sheikh al-Azhar, and with Muḥammad Rashīd Riḍā's assistance they issued a *Fatwā* calling for the defence of *al-Masjid al-Aqṣā*.<sup>25</sup>

In Cairo the Delegation drafted appeals to Muslim leaders throughout the world calling upon them to aid the Arabs of Palestine in defending the Holy Places of Islam. In the appeal to the Iraqi Muslims, it was stressed that the Zionists were desirous of establishing a Jewish kingdom in Palestine, rebuilding Solomon's Temple and taking over *al-Masjid al-Aqṣā* for this purpose, which had been built on its ruins. These appeals were accompanied by the famous picture showing Zionist flags and a Star of David on the walls of *al-Ḥaram al-Sharīf* and on the Dome of the Rock.<sup>26</sup>

This activity was more or less a preliminary to the main mission in Mecca. The stay in the important Muslim centre of Egypt was utilized to enlist the support of the Islamic world for the Arab struggle in Palestine, with the matter being represented as a general Muslim religious duty. Mecca, during the *ḥajj* season, was of course an extremely convenient place to carry on this activity. Immediately after the Delegation's arrival there, on 11th July 1922, it began working. After meeting with King Ḥusayn, the Delegation began campaigning among the heads of the local Muslim community and the pilgrims. The picture of the Dome of the Rock capped by a Star of David was the major, most effective propaganda tool.

Since these were the days when the ratification of the Palestine Mandate was being discussed at the League of Nations, the Delegation saw to it that the leaders of the Muslim community and the heads of the pilgrimage delegations wired to the League and to Britain their opposition to the Mandate and the pro-Zionist policy. Much effort was also devoted to propaganda among the pilgrims, for which purpose the Delegation held meetings, parades and parties. It should be noted that this propaganda met with certain difficulties from the Indian pilgrims, who still held a grudge against the Arabs because of the Arab revolt against the Turks. The Delegation also met with King 'Abd al-'Azīz ibn Sa'ūd and explained the Palestine problem to him.<sup>27</sup>

The crowning achievement of all this activity was the convening of the leaders of the Arab pilgrims in a congress known as the "al-Jazīrah Congress". The original intention of the Palestinian Delegation had been to convene a Pan-Islamic Congress to discuss ways and means of defending the "Holy Land",<sup>28</sup> but it was probably the lack of enthusiasm on the part of the Indian Muslims for this activity that led to the convening of a merely Pan-Arab

Congress. In any case, on 9th August 1922 the heads of the Palestinian and Syrian Delegations and notables from among the pilgrims from Iraq, Najd, Haḍramaut, Yemen, Hejaz, Deir al-Zor and Egypt assembled and listened to 'Abd al-Qādir al-Muẓaffar, exchanged views and resolved to set up an "Association for Muslim Solidarity" (*Jam'iyyat al-Taḍāmun al-Islāmi*) to act in defence of *al-Masjid al-Aqṣā*.<sup>29</sup> The resolutions of the Congress called for establishing Arab unity, complete independence for the Arab lands and a boycott of oppressors.<sup>30</sup> This new organization never took shape. Nevertheless, the Delegation to the Hejaz was not without value. It is very likely that the propaganda it carried on furthered in later years the fund-raising directed by the SMC in Islamic countries for the purpose of restoring *al-Ḥaram al-Sharīf*. One may well conclude today that this Muslim propaganda regarding the Jerusalem mosques symbolized the first step in achieving Pan-Arab solidarity over the Palestine question. During this period the SMC and AE hardly dared to carry on a similar propaganda campaign within Palestine itself. The tone of the leaflets distributed within the country was far more moderate, and the conflicts which broke out on occasion beside the Wailing Wall until 1925 were not blown up into highly significant occurrences. The years 1924-8 were not conducive, as we have seen, to significant activity, especially since the SMC was busy at this time in consolidating its power and in struggling against the "Opposition".

During these quiet years, 1926-7, various Jewish elements renewed the efforts to acquire the paved area before the Wall and the approaches to it, but this attempt too failed, owing to their inability to meet the high prices they were asked to pay.<sup>31</sup>

What, then, were the reasons for the magnification of the incident which occurred on the eve of the Day of Atonement 1928, thus beginning the process that ended in the August 1929 riots?<sup>32</sup>

First of all, it seems that what the Muslims saw as a deviation from the *status quo* was this time more serious than previously; the Jewish worshippers had set up a partition between men and women and had not contented themselves with bringing benches and appurtenances of prayer as in the past. No less important is the fact that the internal crisis of the Palestinian Arabs had abated. In June 1928, the Seventh Palestinian Congress had convened after five years of inactivity, and the SMC too had weathered the crisis over the invalidation of the January 1926 elections. The temporary SMC appointed at the time was still acting without opposition, and the Muslim Committee for drafting new statutes for the SMC was about to complete its task.

Some have claimed that the entire conflict over the Wailing

Wall came about only because al-Ḥājj Amīn al-Ḥusayni wanted to rouse the Palestinian national movement from its sleep. Rather it would seem that in so far as the Palestinian community had managed to overcome its internal divisions to a considerable extent and there had been a reawakening of its national movement, the SMC and its President were able to exploit what seemed to them a Jewish provocation, in order to intensify the struggle against the Jews.<sup>33</sup> The Wall affair enabled them to give the struggle against the Jews a religious dimension and to enlist the support of the urban and rural masses, who until then had not been attracted by the secular nationalist slogans. Immediately after the Day of Atonement (24th September 1928), during which the police removed the dividing curtain from the pavement in front of the Wailing Wall during the Jewish prayers—thus arousing a very sharp reaction on the part of the Jews—the SMC and the President began a systematic and extremely energetic propaganda campaign in defence of *al-Masjid al-Aqṣā* and the safeguarding of Muslim rights at *al-Burāq al-Sharīf* (the Wailing Wall in Arabic), holy to the Muslims by virtue of its being part of the al-Aqṣā walls. The SMC met with the Officer administering the Government (Acting High Commissioner) and stressed that the intention of the Jews was to gradually take over *al-Masjid al-Aqṣā*.<sup>34</sup> In a similar spirit, protest meetings by worshippers were held in the al-Aqṣā mosque, and protests signed by many hundreds of worshippers were sent to the British Government and printed in papers and pamphlets.<sup>35</sup> In these protest notes and pamphlets it was stated that the Jews aimed at taking over *al-Burāq*, which is holy to the Muslims as an inseparable part of *al-Masjid al-Aqṣā*. The Muslims would never agree to any change in the *status quo* from Ottoman times, as defined explicitly in the decision of the *Majlis al-Idārah* of the Jerusalem district in 1911. For purposes of organizing this Muslim protest movement a “Committee for the Defence of *al-Burāq al-Sharīf* and the Islamic Holy Places” was set up with branches in the various cities of the country. The Committee was elected at a mass convention which took place on 1st November 1928 under the leadership of al-Ḥājj Amīn al-Ḥusayni. The Committee began issuing manifestos, appeals and protest notes calling for the defence of *al-Masjid al-Aqṣā*. The paper *al-Jāmi‘ah al-‘Arabiyyah*, al-Ḥājj Amīn al-Ḥusayni’s organ, devoted much space to the publications of this Committee, and the Wall affair was one of its main topics at the time. In one of its issues it wrote: “The Muslims of Palestine are determined to sacrifice body and soul in order to safeguard their religious rights. It is enough that their national rights have been stolen from them.”<sup>36</sup>

This Muslim pressure began to bear fruit. On 19th November the Colonial Secretary made an official declaration in Parliament in which he accepted, for all practical purposes, the basic elements of the Arab stand. He stated that the Government "are bound to maintain the *status quo*, which they have regarded as being, in general terms, that the Jewish community has a right of access to the pavement for the purposes of their devotions, but may bring to the Wall only those appurtenances of worship which were permitted under the Turkish regime". The announcement stressed that on the Day of Atonement in 1928 innovations had been made beside the Wailing Wall (the setting up of partitions) which were not included in the *status quo*.<sup>37</sup>

This document has great importance for understanding the exacerbation of the Muslim struggle over the Wall. The Jews were bitter at this declaration, seeing it as an attempt to perpetuate the humiliating arrangements made by the Turks for Jewish worship at the Wall. On the other hand, the leaders of the SMC received the declaration with satisfaction and expected the Government from that moment on to act in accordance with the spirit of this declaration and to carry out the formal *status quo* from Turkish days.<sup>38</sup>

The intentionally provocative policy of the SMC from May to August 1929 in the Wall area should be understood within the context of this expectation that the declaration of the Colonial Secretary from November 1928 would be carried out. Since the Government had not taken any steps towards stating explicitly that bringing benches to the Wall and setting up a partition beside it were forbidden to the Jews, the SMC embarked on a series of steps aimed at staging a confrontation which would force the Government to act. Even before this the announcer (*Mu'adhdhin*) in the mosque beside the Wall had, with the prompting of the SMC, begun to call to prayer during the hours of Jewish worship. Now vociferous Şūfi ceremonies (*Dhikr*) were begun in the new Şūfi praying-spot (*al-Zāwiyah*) near the Wall. At the same time an entrance was opened up in one of the walls perpendicular to the Wailing Wall and connected to the path leading to the Maghribi gate of *al-Ḥaram al-Sharīf* wall, so that the pavement before the Wall could become a passage-way from the Maghribi quarter to the Maghribi gate.<sup>39</sup>

The stand taken by the HC also greatly encouraged the President of the SMC to continue his aggressive policy. If up till now the President of the SMC had been able only to sense that the Government's sympathies were on the Muslim side in this conflict, in a conversation between him and the HC on 6th May 1929 the HC

told the Mufti: "Your Eminence, I know, was quite satisfied with the White Paper [the Colonial Secretary's declaration of November 1928] and I think you know also that my predecessors, especially Mr. Luke, did their best to support your claims as far as was proper and you may have guessed that the terms of the White Paper were largely based on the representations made by this Government before I came. (His Eminence assented)". The Mufti therefore asked that action be taken to assuage the Arabs' fears. Of no less importance is the fact that the HC troubled to inform the Mufti that he (the HC) had three months previously requested the Jews to bring him evidence of their rights at the Wall, but that they had still not done so. "And I feel that if they had such evidence, they would have let me see it at once. I therefore consider that it is likely that they have no evidence. Accordingly it seems also likely to me that the contention of the Moslems as regards the bringing of benches and appurtenances to the Wall will be established." The HC also assured the Mufti that he was awaiting instructions from the Colonial Secretary to issue an order with respect to the Jews' rights beside the Wall. The Mufti responded by saying that he was relying upon the Government.<sup>40</sup>

The HC began acting in the spirit of his conversation with the Mufti and on 14th June 1929 proposed to the Colonial Secretary a draft of instructions concerning Jewish rights of worship beside the Wall, based on the narrow interpretation of the *status quo*, i.e. that the Jews were forbidden to bring benches or to set up a partition beside the Wall, although they could bring basic appurtenances of worship (an Ark, Scrolls of the Law etc.), since the Ottoman authorities had been more tolerant of this.<sup>41</sup>

However, this stand of the HC's was not entirely acceptable to the new Colonial Secretary, Sydney Webb (later Lord Passfield). In his opinion Jewish rights were not limited to items officially approved but also included rights acquired through custom.<sup>42</sup> Also significant is that fact that the Colonial Secretary's reply was extremely tardy (about three months), since in the meanwhile a new Government had been set up in Britain (the minority Labour Government under Ramsay MacDonald), and the new Colonial Secretary apparently wanted to study the problem closely before coming to a decision.

Whatever the reason for the slowness of the decision, al-Ḥājj Amin al-Ḥusayni certainly understood it in this manner: the HC had told him explicitly that the Muslim stand in the controversy was correct. The issuing of official instructions which would give legal force to this Muslim stand could be expected any moment, the only delaying factor being the approval of the Colonial Secre-

tary. The Colonial Secretary's tardiness was no doubt a product of Zionist pressure in London.<sup>43</sup> Therefore, the Zionist pressure had to be compensated for by increased Arab pressure in Palestine. This pressure took the form of heightening the demand that the Government carry out the instructions of the White Paper of November 1928 and exacerbating the agitation throughout the country.

Such, it seems, was the background to the outbreak of the August 1929 disturbances, and it is no accident that the worst pogroms in which about 100 orthodox Jews of the "old community" were murdered were those carried out by the most traditional Muslim communities—Hebron and Safed (there were no Jews in Nāblus). The controversy over whether the pogroms were organized by the SMC or not seems somewhat superfluous. While it is true that the demonstration by *Betar* (the youth movement of the Revisionist party) at the Wailing Wall on Tishea Be-Av (15th August 1929) prompted the Muslim demonstration there the next day, a demonstration carried out with the prior knowledge of both the SMC and the Government,<sup>44</sup> the bloody outbreaks occurred a week later and not necessarily in response to the Jewish demonstration.

It seems, then, that the disturbances were a direct result of developments which occurred from September 1928 onwards, and of the clear-sighted understanding of the President of the SMC that he had here an issue which could on the one hand, by virtue of its religious sensitivity, unite the Muslim community throughout Palestine, and which on the other hand did not involve a worsening of his relations with the HC, who was in agreement with his stand on this issue. 'Izzat Darwaza, who served for years as a member of the AE and was in the 'thirties employed by the SMC as General Administrator of the *Waqfs*, stated that the national movement was overcome by weakness but it "renewed its activity for some time after the *al-Burāq* uprising, and it was this [re-activation of the movement] that *those who caused the uprising from behind the scenes* had hoped for".<sup>45</sup> Al-Hājj Amīn and the leaders and members of the AE did indeed stay for the most part behind the scenes. Many of the members of the AE took no part at all in the propaganda campaign directed at the Wailing Wall issue from September 1928 onwards. Most conspicuous in this campaign were, generally speaking, the leaders of the SMC and the Muslim religious functionaries. Among the leaders of the nationalist associations in the various cities, only two were sentenced in court for their part in inciting and organizing attacks on Jews in August 1929 (Sheikh Ṭālib Maraḡah of Hebron and Farīd Fakhr al-Dīn of Beisan). 'Abd al-Laṭīf Ṣalāḥ of Nāblus, a former member of the SMC, was

also accused of systematic agitation in the North in August 1929.<sup>46</sup> It was the SMC, not the Palestinian AE, that was the Arab element involved in this case.

The spirit prevailing in the report of the Shaw Commission (except for the opposing stance of Harold Snell, later Lord Snell) was that the rioting was a product of the cumulative effect of Zionist activity in the country and had not been premeditated. Even the systematic agitation from September 1928 onwards was not considered particularly important by most members of the Commission.<sup>47</sup> This stand hardly seems reasonable, in view of al-Ḥājj Amīn al-Ḥusaynī's systematic policy on the question of the status of *al-Ḥaram al-Sharīf* from 1922 onwards and in view of 'Izzat Darwaza's explicit admission quoted above.

Immediately after the outbursts the various vehicles of Palestinian public affairs (the AE, President of the SMC, the press etc.) not only hastened to disclaim all responsibility for them and to claim that they were unwelcome to the Arabs, but even announced that what had really taken place was a Jewish attack upon the Arabs.<sup>48</sup> This was also the line taken by the Arab spokesmen before the Shaw Commission of Inquiry. However, a year or two later Palestinian spokesmen were beginning to regard these outbreaks in a different light. On the fortieth day after the hanging of three of the murderers who had taken part in the slaughter in Hebron and Safed, the Palestinian AE issued a manifesto in their memory which stated that these men were "innocent saints . . . pioneers of freedom and independence".<sup>49</sup> Later much praise was showered on the outbreaks, since in their wake "momentum was restored, will-power grew stronger, and those souls whose owners had been overcome by slumber awoke to life".<sup>50</sup> On the fourth anniversary of the outbreaks, Amīl al-Ghūrī (who became in the 1940s the secretary of the Arab Higher Committee) wrote even more explicitly: "Today is the anniversary of the August uprising (*Thawrah*), the flames of which were borne high on this day in 1929. That day was a day of brilliance and glory in the annals of Palestinian-Arab history. This is a day of honour, splendour and sacrifice. We attacked Western conquest and the Mandate and the Zionists upon our land. The Jews had coveted our endowments and yearned to take over our holy places. In our silence they had seen a sign of weakness, therefore there was no more room in our hearts for patience or peace; no sooner had the Jews begun marching along this shameful road than the Arabs stood up, checked the oppression, and sacrificed their pure and noble souls on the sacred altar of nationalism."<sup>51</sup>

The honour ascribed to the August 1929 riots in bringing about

the arousal of the Arab community and the renewed drive in the activity of the AE and the associations was undoubtedly justified by the facts.

The AE saw in these disturbances a good opportunity to renew the political efforts to change Britain's policy on Palestine, and one of the first steps it took was a decision to send a new delegation to London to discuss with the British Government possible changes in its Palestine policy.

More important is another product of the conflict over the Wailing Wall. Al-Ḥājj Amīn al-Ḥusayni's decisive role in this affair led to his being regarded as the most important Arab-Palestinian leader. The conflict itself emphasized the religious significance of the anti-Zionist struggle, while the course of its development demonstrated that al-Ḥājj Amīn's strength and influence were incomparably greater than those of the other leaders.

It was not by chance that after August 1929, conflicts over primacy began to develop between Amīn al-Ḥusayni and Mūsā Kāẓim al-Ḥusayni. The first such conflict broke out in autumn of 1929 with the establishment of the fund for the assistance of Arab victims of the riots. This fund succeeded in raising £15,000 in the Arab countries, a large sum by any standard; the question of who was to supervise the distribution of these funds became a matter of controversy between al-Ḥājj Amīn and the Committee for the Assistance of Victims he had set up on the one hand and Mūsā Kāẓim al-Ḥusayni and the AE on the other.<sup>52</sup>

In early 1930 the AE elected the delegation which was to depart for London. For the first time, an attempt was made to deprive Mūsā Kāẓim al-Ḥusayni of the Presidency of the Delegation. The supporters of al-Ḥājj Amīn al-Ḥusayni were not content solely with his inclusion in the Delegation but demanded that he be elected its President. Only the joint front created by the members of the Nashāshībi opposition and the supporters of Mūsā Kāẓim al-Ḥusayni succeeded in overcoming the pressure of Amīn al-Ḥusayni's supporters and secured for Mūsā Kāẓim al-Ḥusayni the Presidency of this Delegation too.<sup>53</sup>

Since it was now apparent to al-Ḥājj Amīn and his supporters within the AE that the chances of his replacing Mūsā Kāẓim al-Ḥusayni as its President and as official and universally accepted leader were slight, the organ of these people began in the summer of 1930 a policy of opposition to the AE. The policy strengthened as time passed, sometimes assuming the form of absolute opposition to this body. This line of action was one of the factors which slowly led to a loss in the AE's prestige and to the demoralization which set in in late 1933. The death of Mūsā Kāẓim al-Ḥusayni

in March 1934 accelerated the process of disintegration and helped clear the path for al-Ḥājj Amīn al-Ḥusaynī's leadership.<sup>54</sup>

In many ways the Wall affair was the crowning achievement of al-Ḥājj Amīn's policy, conspicuous throughout the 'twenties of enhancing the status of *al-Ḥaram al-Sharīf*. After the first stage of the major repair work of the mosques of *al-Ḥaram al-Sharīf* was completed in 1928, they became within a year a symbol of the struggle against Zionism in Palestine. This was the best way to bring home the danger threatening the Palestinian Arabs from Zionism. Instead of abstract nationalist slogans about self-determination, majority rights etc., they now had a concrete symbol which was clearly understood by the Muslim masses.

The importance of this development exceeded the bounds of Palestine. The Wall affair marked the beginning of the development of the Palestine question from a local question into a Muslim, Pan-Arab one. Thanks to the propaganda carried out by the SMC during the 'twenties, Muslim public opinion in general began directing its attention to Palestine and its Holy Places. It now faced concrete demands by the Muslims of Palestine to come to their aid in defending the Islamic Holy Places in Palestine, which were entrusted to the care of the Palestinian Muslims by the Muslims of the entire world (this was the common Palestinian interpretation). This help did indeed come. Large sums were collected in the Arab and Islamic countries for the victims of the riots which served the purpose of al-Ḥājj Amīn and the Palestinian national movement. Of no less significance is the fact that when in 1930 the League of Nations' Commission of Inquiry into the rights of Jews and Muslims at the Wailing Wall was set up, the Palestinian spokesmen skilfully represented this issue as affecting the Muslims of the entire world. Muslim witnesses from various Muslim countries appeared before the Commission, thus strengthening Muslim ties with the struggle of the Palestine Arabs. The outstanding expression of this development occurred in December 1931, when a world-wide Muslim Congress in defence of the Islamic Holy Places in Palestine assembled in Jerusalem, under the Presidency of al-Ḥājj Amīn al-Ḥusaynī. The more successful this policy in attaining its end, the more Amīn al-Ḥusaynī, its chief exponent, became an internationally known Muslim personality.

Some have argued that one of the most important results of the August 1929 riots, if not the most important,<sup>55</sup> was the publication of the Passfield White Paper of October 1930 in the wake of the Shaw and Hope-Simpson Reports. The importance of this lies in the fact that the October 1930 White Paper promised the Arabs, under the influence of the Shaw Report, two important things:

the establishment of a legislative council, and heavy restrictions on Jewish immigration, land acquisitions and settlement. However, this appraisal would seem to be exaggerated. The idea of establishing a legislative council was renewed under the administration of Sir John Chancellor and Harry Luke (Chief Secretary) *before* the 1929 outburst and certainly before the publication of the Shaw Report. In January 1930 Sir John Chancellor renewed his efforts towards establishing a legislative council and bringing about a radical change in British policy in Palestine—in this way not only anticipating the Shaw Report but even, it seems, influencing it.<sup>60</sup> On the contrary, a study of the whole matter of the British Government's quandary in 1930-4 over the question of setting up a legislative council shows that the Arab riots of the summer of 1929 supplied the opponents of this idea in the Colonial Office, the British Government, Parliament and pro-Zionist opinion in Britain with an excellent argument. There is thus no doubt that the riots of the summer of 1929 did not revive the idea of a legislative council, but rather delayed the adoption of this programme by the British Government until such time as the ever-growing Jewish element in Palestine was able to counter it (early 1936).

If the October 1930 White Paper had indeed been applied in the realm of Jewish immigration and land acquisition, then the above argument would be at least partially correct. However, the actual developments from 1931 onwards prove that MacDonald's letter of February 1931 meant the complete abrogation of the October 1930 policy declaration, and the Palestinian Arabs thus got no practical benefit from this declaration. The importance of the Wall affair therefore remains limited to the realm of Arab and Muslim affairs—the Pan-Muslim feeling which was beginning to develop with respect to the Palestine question, and the rise of al-Ḥājj Amin al-Ḥusayni to a prime position of leadership.

## Chapter Eight

### ORGANIZATIONAL AND SOCIAL ASPECTS OF THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE MOVEMENT

#### THE CRYSTALLIZATION OF THE ORGANIZATIONAL FRAMEWORK THROUGHOUT THE COUNTRY

The triumph of the Palestinian orientation in the summer of 1920 over the Pan-Syrian orientation led, as we have seen, to a considerable strengthening of the status of the MCA at the expense of *al-Nādi al-'Arabi*, *al-Muntadā al-Adabi* and smaller associations in the unity movement. At the Third Palestinian Congress in December 1920, the Muslim-Christian associations became the main organizational framework of the Palestinian-Arab national movement, although in a few places there existed other associations which took part in the various national congresses.

In late 1918 there were in existence, as we have noted, two "Muslim-Christian associations": in Jaffa and Jerusalem. The first country-wide congress of the MCA took place in late January 1919; while a superficial glance would reveal that the delegates who participated in it represented MCA branches throughout the country, it seems that the actual situation was different. It was apparently the Jerusalem and Jaffa MCA's which organized the congress and invited representatives from the various cities of the country in order to forge an instrument for a general stand on the question of the country's future. The source material from this period does not confirm the first impression, that what we are dealing with is a congress of delegates from existing MCA branches.<sup>1</sup>

In any case, the members of the MCA intended from the start to establish their organization as a body representing the Palestinian Arab population; the statutes they adopted in late 1918 bear witness to this fact.<sup>2</sup> Nevertheless, we have seen that there were at this time other organizations in existence such as *al-Nādi al-'Arabi* and *al-Muntadā al-Adabi* which survived until 1922-3.

Another phenomenon which from the first deprived the MCA of its monopoly over representation of the political-national element was the part taken in the general activity by other associations—familial, cultural, economic, philanthropic and communal. Thus,

for example, there existed in Jerusalem in 1918-19 *al-Muntadā al-Dajāni*, an organization of Catholic Youth, *al-Jam'iyyah al-Khayriyyah* and others.<sup>3</sup> Similar organizations continued to exist throughout the 'twenties and still saw themselves as fit to represent their members on a political level as well.

Nevertheless, the MCA gradually developed into a nation-wide body with branches in various places in Palestine. The centre of the organization, the Jerusalem MCA, included until the summer of 1922 a majority of the public circles in Jerusalem. 'Arif Pāshā al-Dajāni's dismissal from the post of President of the AE led to his estrangement from the Jerusalem association, and it was the Secretary of the AE, Jamāl al-Ḥusayni, who actually managed the association. The hegemony of the Jerusalem MCA is illustrated by the fact that its leaders became the leaders of the nation-wide organization; the AE was located in Jerusalem, and the everyday management of the Secretariat was also entrusted to Jerusalemites. The first Secretary was Ishāq Darwish; the second, Jamāl al-Ḥusayni, with his brother Ishāq al-Ḥusayni serving as his assistant. When Jamāl al-Ḥusayni left for India in the autumn of 1923 as part of the SMC Delegation, he was replaced by another Jerusalemite, Khalil al-Sakākīni. When Jamāl al-Ḥusayni rose to a higher position, becoming one of the leaders of the AE, the position was given to another Jerusalemite Ḥusayni Ṣafwat Yūnis al-Ḥusayni.

Another expression of the hegemony of Jerusalem was the frequent representation at the country-wide congresses by Jerusalemites of geographically or politically distant areas, although residents of other cities also participated in these spoils. It is impossible to know whether the residents of Tiberias, Safed and other places actually initiated their representation by Ishāq Darwish, Jamāl al-Ḥusayni, Ḥasan Abū Sa'ūd and others, or whether the latter simply exploited the fact that no delegates came from these places. Whatever the reason, the phenomenon of Jerusalem's thus having more influence in the country-wide congresses is an important one.

The second important centre of the MCA, Jaffa, was prominent in the period 1918-23 because it was less affected in the early 'twenties by the internal split between supporters and opponents of the AE. During this period the Jaffa MCA managed to unite within itself most of the community leaders of Jaffa, and its power and influence were almost unchallenged. However, in late 1923 this united front began to crumble. At that time the Jaffa municipality agreed to receive its electricity from the P. Rutenberg project, thus arousing the anger of various extremist elements.

The Mayor, 'Āṣim Bey al-Sa'īd, was a close ally of 'Umar al-Bayṭār, the President of the Jaffa MCA, and the wrath against the municipality was also directed against 'Umar al-Bayṭār. The influential Dajāni family exploited this situation to attack him and undermine his position. As a result of this conflict the Jaffa MCA slowly disintegrated into two rival camps, and its former status disappeared.<sup>4</sup> This development was accelerated from 1926 onwards, when 'Umar al-Bayṭār and 'Āṣim Bey al-Sa'īd joined the ranks of the opposition. The Jaffa paper *Filasṭīn* also transferred its political loyalties from the AE to its opponents. The small extent of the power of the AE's supporters was demonstrated in the elections to the Jaffa municipality in June 1927, in which 'Āṣim Bey al-Sa'īd and his men were victorious and he won re-appointment to the post of Mayor.<sup>5</sup>

The closing of the ranks in 1928 and the August 1929 disturbances brought about a revival of the Jaffa MCA. From the second half of 1929 onwards this association was conspicuous in its energetic activity, its extremist stands and the pressure it brought to bear on the AE to act more decisively. During this time—and not by coincidence—'Abd al-Qādir al-Muẓaffar was serving as the Association's Secretary; this new spirit of activity was an expression of the beginning of a new impetus within the Palestinian national movement which was to be still more obvious several years later.<sup>6</sup>

Haifa was also an important centre of nationalist activity, but no united Muslim-Christian Association was set up there. During the last period of Ottoman rule, relations between Christians and Muslims had greatly deteriorated there. The economic progress made by the former left the Muslims far behind and aroused considerable jealousy among them.<sup>7</sup> Apparently because of this development the nationalist activists of Haifa were unwilling to set up an inter-community organization; instead they set up in the year 1337 A.H. (the Hijrite year 1337 began on 7th October 1918) a "Muslim Association" which was active on the level of nationalist struggle and not simply as an organization concerned with religious and communal affairs.<sup>8</sup> About a year later the Christians set up a "Christian Association" which worked along similar lines as the Muslim Association,<sup>9</sup> although at the First Congress in January 1919 there was already one Christian delegate from Haifa. Generally speaking, the two associations worked jointly, sending protest telegrams to the Government, bringing the petitions of the population before the local governor and organizing joint demonstrations, although the representation of the population at the Congresses was organized separately. Their separate existence lasted throughout the life-span of the MCA and the AE,<sup>10</sup> and it was only in

the second half of the 'thirties that supra-community structures were set up in Haifa.

Another Muslim-Christian Association which was already in existence in 1919 was that of Nāblus. This Association, under the Presidency of al-Ḥājj Tawfiq Ḥamād and the management of Ḥāfiẓ Aghā Ṭawqān (who was *Mu'tamad al-Jam'iyyah*, Manager of the Association's Affairs), was extremely active in Nāblus itself, in its environs, and on a country-wide scale.<sup>11</sup> Its strength was conspicuous at the First Congress. There it constituted a clear alternative to Jerusalem as the organization's centre, in the wake of the refusal of the Jerusalem leadership to acquiesce to the trend of unity with Syria. It succeeded during the first half of the 'twenties in uniting most of the notables of Nāblus within it and was, as we have seen, a most important factor behind the blocking of the elections to the legislative council. The Nāblus MCA perhaps reached the height of its power and achievements when in 1926 it joined the opposition in its struggle against the Ḥusayni monopoly in the SMC. It seems that it was this development which led in the late 'twenties to an alternative nationalist organization in Nāblus—the Committee of the Arab Congress (*Lajnat al-Mu'tamar al-'Arabi*)—even though the MCA survived until 1931.<sup>12</sup>

In July of 1931 the Nāblus MCA decided to change its name to the "Patriotic Arab Association" (*al-Jam'iyyah al-'Arabiyyah al-Waṭaniyyah*);<sup>13</sup> this change of name was extremely significant. Even earlier, at the Fifth Congress, 'Izzat Darwaza, the outstanding spokesman for the young, militant trend, had expressed his dissatisfaction with the name MCA. In his view, this name did not express the new nationalist spirit and was too much anchored in the community structure.<sup>14</sup> The change in name of the Nāblus MCA was thus intended to emphasize the more militant trend which began spreading in 1931, in the wake of the great disappointment over the "MacDonald Letter" (or the "Black Paper", as the Arabs called it) of February of that year. It was not by chance that two weeks after the change, on 31st July 1931, there convened in Nāblus, against the wishes of the AE, a country-wide convention: the participants challenged the methods of the existing leadership and demanded, some subtly and some forthrightly, that practical preparations be made for an armed struggle to realize the national goals.<sup>15</sup> The Secretary of the Nāblus MCA in this period of change, and the moving spirit behind the convention was Muḥammad 'Izzat Darwaza.

Alongside the Nāblus MCA, *al-Nādi al-'Arabi* continued to exist, although it was largely silent and was apparently absorbed by the MCA.<sup>16</sup> What is interesting is that this structure produced in late

1927 an important initiative, which was to influence the further development of the national movement in the 1930s. In December 1927 the *Nāblus al-Nādi al-'Arabi* turned to the various associations of Muslim youth in Palestine with a proposal to establish a country-wide organization of the associations of Muslim youth. While this body did not at first intend to deal in political affairs, its growing strength and political activity a few years later were among the important characteristics of the period. It is important to state that the initiator of this activity was also Muḥammad 'Izzat Darwaza.<sup>17</sup>

The first piece of evidence we have of the existence of an MCA in Gaza comes from December 1920, although Gaza sent representatives to the First Congress. From that time onwards there is more evidence of the active existence of the association.<sup>18</sup> As we have noted, the Gaza MCA was completely successful in blocking the elections to the legislative council, and the opposition hardly penetrated there. In the municipal elections of 1927 the supporters of the SMC and the AE won their only great victory there.

Jerusalem, Jaffa, Haifa, Nāblus and Gaza—this was the extent of the MCA (although in Haifa there existed separate community structures) in the first stage of organization, up to the Third Palestinian Congress in December 1920. Throughout 1921 and the first half of 1922 there appeared to be a halt in the spread of these associations across the country, and only in the summer of 1922 was it possible to detect renewed organizational efforts. In June 1922 an attempt was made to set up an MCA in al-Birah,<sup>19</sup> but it never got off the ground. Slightly more successful was the attempt made at the same time in Nazareth. This town had not taken an active part in the national movement in its initial stages. A delegation from Nazareth had indeed taken part in the First Congress, but the town was unrepresented at the Third and Fourth Congresses. Moreover, Nazareth did not satisfy the financial demands made upon it by the AE for the purposes of financing the activity of the AE and its delegations.<sup>20</sup> Later in the 'twenties Nazareth was the location of several influential elements (above all the al-Fāhūm family) which worked hand-in-hand with the rivals of the AE. Nevertheless, an MCA was set up there, basing itself mainly on the rivals of the al-Fāhūm family—the al-Zu'bi family—and the association even sent delegates to the Sixth Congress in June 1923.<sup>21</sup>

The first evidence of the existence of a nationalist association in Tiberias dates from the same time, July 1922, although there existed only a Muslim association, without a parallel Christian one such as was set up in Haifa. Tiberias was rather poorly represented at the nation-wide Congresses. A delegation was indeed sent to the

First Congress, but in the later Congresses the local residents forfeited their right of representation (except for the instance of sending one delegate to the Fourth Congress) and permitted residents of other areas to claim that they were acting as representatives of Tiberias.

The Tiberias association, like the one in Nazareth, was not conspicuously active in a district which, generally speaking, stood on the sidelines of the national movement and hardly fulfilled its financial obligations; indeed after 1923—the year marking the climax of the first wave of nationalist activity—it was no longer heard of.<sup>22</sup>

Another region which was still further removed from the national movement and its Jerusalemite leaders was the city and villages of Hebron. Representatives of this region took no part in the first three Congresses (the First, Third and Fourth) and contributed little to covering the expenses of the AE, so that one could actually say they took no part in the national movement in its early years.<sup>23</sup> In the summer of 1922 a delegation from Hebron participated for the first time in a nation-wide Congress (the Fifth), and, though it was not overly active and left no impression on the city, the first evidence of the existence of an MCA dates from that period.<sup>24</sup>

Throughout the 'twenties and early 'thirties Hebron and its environs were an important centre of opposition. Conflicts between the administrators of the local endowments and the SMC over use of the resources of the *awqāf* were, as we have seen, among the important causes of this situation. In the late 'twenties this situation changed somewhat. The President of the SMC appointed as local Mufti one of the opposition's leaders in Hebron, Sheikh 'Abd al-Ḥayy al-Khaṭīb al-Tamīmī; in this way his family became supporters of the SMC and the AE. However, this appointment did not entirely do away with the elements opposed to the SMC and the AE.

In 1922 (the Fifth Congress), several sheikhs from the tribes of the Beersheba area joined the framework of the country-wide Congresses and the AE; but from the start the Bedouin character of the population in this region excluded any possibility of organized activity in a nationalist, country-wide spirit or of the bearing of the financial burden of such activity.

The situation was different in Safed. At the end of the first organizational stage of the national movement in the autumn of 1920 and winter of 1921, *al-Nādi al-'Arabi* was active in this town.<sup>25</sup> But it seems that this body was not widely supported or particularly active. Actually, nationalist activity in Safed (participation in the country-wide Congresses, in demonstrations, sending of

protests, the boycott of the elections to the legislative council) up until March 1923 was carried on through the social and religious leadership, headed by Sheikh As'ad Muḥammad al-Ḥājj Yūsuf Qaddūrah, Mufti of Safed. A framework as weak as this put difficulties in the way of collecting funds, and Safed too had only a tiny share in the AE's budget, which was far smaller than the quota demanded of it. In the winter of 1923 the Safed MCA was established, and it survived until the late 'twenties, although during the low period of 1925-8 its existence was completely unnoticed, as was the case in the other parts of the country.<sup>26</sup>

The developments in Beisan were to a certain extent similar to those of Safed. In the early 'twenties no nationalist organization worthy of the name existed there, and until the Fifth Congress Beisan was not represented at the country-wide Congresses. Nevertheless, Beisan was not devoid of nationalist activity. A number of individuals headed by Jubrān Iskandar Kazmā (a Greek-Orthodox who had studied agronomy at Montpellier in France, son of one of the pupils of the Russian schools which had aided the Orthodox community in its struggle against Greek rule of their patriarchate) bore the burden of the activity without setting up an organized association. They succeeded in uniting most of the sheikhs of the region in a struggle for their rights to *jiftlik* lands in their area and in large measure became their representatives. However, their power was not unlimited, and there were sheikhs who preferred to be linked to the other active elements (the opposition's "National Muslim Association" and the emissaries of the Zionist Executive). There is evidence from late 1924 of the establishment there of an MCA which, without being very active, was also to survive until the end of the 'twenties.<sup>27</sup>

The resurgence of nationalist feeling throughout the country in the wake of the 1929 riots led to the awakening of the various associations previously dormant. Several attempts were also made at that time to widen the organizational framework. In both Ramallah and Ramleh—two towns in which the leaders of the opposition (Būlus Shihādah and Sheikh Sulaymān al-Tāji al-Fārūqi) had considerable influence—Muslim-Christian Associations were set up, and the one in Ramleh even began to show signs of activity. An attempt was also made to set up a Muslim-Christian Association in Lydda.<sup>28</sup> With the exception of the Fourth Congress, Ramleh was represented at all the country-wide Congresses, but Ramallah's representatives were absent from the First and Fifth Congresses, while those of Lydda took no part in the Third, Fifth and Sixth.

In three towns no Muslim-Christian Associations were set up: Ṭul-Karm, Jenin and Acre; but with respect to the former two

towns, this did not reflect alienation from the national movement. In Ṭul-Karm a local organization called *al-Nādi al-Waṭani* (the Patriotic Club) was set up in late 1918, and throughout the period of "Southern Syria" it was active together with the branches of *al-Nādi al-'Arabi* and *al-Muntadā al-Adabi*.<sup>29</sup> Afterwards this organization continued to be the one nationalist framework in Ṭul-Karm and called itself *al-Nādi al-'Arabi al-Waṭani*. It was this organization which maintained connections with the AE and which organized local activity. In the second half of 1921 nationalist spirit in Ṭul-Karm died down in the wake of the collective fine imposed on the town, but in 1922 nationalist activity was revived with *al-Nādi al-'Arabi al-Waṭani* serving as its framework.<sup>30</sup> Ṭul-Karm was represented at all the country-wide Congresses from the First onwards.

An attempt was made in May-June 1922 to set up a Muslim-Christian Association in Ṭul-Karm to work as a branch of the Nāblus MCA. However, this attempt should not be seen as an effort to strengthen the ties of the nationalist circles of Ṭul-Karm within the country-wide framework. It was rather an attempt on the part of Muḥammad Kamāl al-Jayūsi to come out against the leadership of *al-Nādi al-'Arabi al-Waṭani*, in the hands of members of two other families: Salīm 'Abd al-Raḥmān al-Ḥājj Ibrāhīm, the Mayor's son, and 'Abdāllah Samārah, the son of a large land-owner.<sup>31</sup> The attempt failed, and it was the above-mentioned organization which continued to act as the branch of the national movement in Ṭul-Karm. It seems that in the latter part of 1923 the organization began to disintegrate and gradually disappeared.<sup>32</sup> It should be noted that at the end of the 'twenties and the beginning of the 'thirties, when the impetus of the Palestinian national movement was renewed, this organization was not re-established there. The two young leaders mentioned were prominent in the efforts of their circle in Nāblus and other places to bring about the radicalization of the national movement, and Salīm 'Abd al-Raḥmān stood out as one of the important leaders of the militant movement. It seems that the reservations shown by the men of this movement towards the old associations deterred them from reviving their local organization.

In Jenin too no MCA was set up; no attempt was even made to establish one. Nevertheless, nationalist activity was not unknown in this region. Its notables participated in the various local and country-wide activities, and it seems that the lack of an organizational framework was not always a hindrance.<sup>33</sup> Nevertheless, it was probably the lack of such a framework that caused Jenin's lack of representation at the Fourth and Sixth Congresses.<sup>34</sup>

It is very likely that the reason no MCA was set up was the strong position of the opposition in Jenin and the surrounding villages, a result of the al-Jarrār family's having joined its ranks. The establishment of an MCA would have revealed the al-Jarrār family's aloofness from the nationalist circles, a possibility which the Jenin activists probably wanted to avert.

Acre, which also had no MCA, was throughout the period under discussion (and later too) the most important centre of opposition to the AE in the north of the country. The reservations felt towards the country-wide nationalist framework could be seen in the minimal amount of participation in the country-wide Congresses. Acre had no representatives at the First and Fourth Congresses; at the Third Congress there was one denizen of Acre who participated on a personal basis, it being stressed that no structure in Acre had authorized him to represent it at the Congress; at the Fifth and Sixth Congresses only one delegate participated; and only at the Seventh Congress, which was held by virtue of agreement with the opposition, did a large and representative delegation take part.

A study of the spread of the Palestinian national movement shows clearly just how central the MCA framework was to that movement. In places where branches of the MCA were set up, political-nationalist activity was more systematic and organized. In those places it was easier to gather funds to finance the country-wide activities, and the participation of those places in the development of the country-wide political framework was less problematical.

These Muslim-Christian Associations were never set up as organizations based on personal membership by the Arab inhabitants. Where they existed, they in fact consisted of representatives of the various elements comprising the local élites. In general, in each of them there were to be found representatives of the important families, the religious functionaries and the sheikhs of the villages in the vicinity of the town, whenever the latter were prepared to take part in nationalist activity. Special representation was always reserved for the Christian communities in the local committees—representation which was usually greater than their proportionate number in the population. The MCA thus constituted a basic framework of leaders and activists, who were able whenever necessary to motivate the masses under their influence.

This organizational character suited the traditional social structure and the accepted status of the local élite. This élite drew its authority from traditional prestige factors such as religious status (filling religious posts, belonging to the *Ashrāf*), possession of landed property and long-standing family claims to positions in the

Ottoman administration, along with a consciousness of noble origin (the village and *nawāḥi* sheikhs). It thus needed no popular-democratic confirmation of its status.

Moreover, the conversion of the MCA into the main nationalist organization strengthened still further this organizational trend, at the expense of more personal conceptions of membership such as were prevalent in the militant associations of the "Southern Syria" period—*al-Nādi al-'Arabi*, *al-Muntadā al-Adabi*, *al-Ikhā' wa-al-'Afāf* and *al-Fidā'iyah*.

A summing-up of the many Jewish reports concerning the extent of membership in the various associations in 1919 puts their membership at approximately 3,000. A British police report of December 1920 gives a similar number,<sup>35</sup> although it includes all the Arab associations, as well as the philanthropic, cultural and community organizations. Nevertheless, the estimate of this report can be accepted, as we have seen that these organizations also took part in political activity and acted as representatives of their members on a political plane. It is not impossible that there was some overlapping in membership in the various associations, and thus the number given should be regarded as the upper limit of active membership in the various nationalist associations. In the course of the 'twenties the stratum which carried the burden of nationalist activity grew somewhat and came to include a number of intellectuals, who were not always from the traditionally important families. But there was no essential change in the character of membership in the MCA. This statement is illustrated below by the discussion of the election and composition of the country-wide Congresses.

As an example of the composition of the MCA the following event can be cited: in February 1919, at the height of the quandary prevailing in the Jerusalem MCA with regard to the orientation towards Damascus (see Chapter Two), the Association convened for a meeting. Seven of the heads of the Muslim families, five of the Latin notables, five Orthodox notables, and nine village sheikhs from the Jerusalem area were present. While it is unlikely that all those connected with the Association were at the meeting, and the proportions of representatives of the various sectors should not be seen as constant, it is still instructive to note that this meeting saw itself as authorized to speak "on behalf of all the inhabitants".<sup>36</sup>

During the abortive attempt to set up an MCA in Ṭul-Karm in June 1922 (see above) about a hundred of the town notables took part; while in the Haifa Muslim Association 114 men participated in electing the board, out of 160 notables of the Muslim community in Haifa who had been invited to participate.<sup>37</sup>

It should be noted that the participation of village sheikhs in the MCA framework was limited to the areas of Judea and Samaria, where rural structures with historical roots (*nawāḥi*) and their own traditional leadership existed.

The boards directing these associations were elected at meetings of the active members. These elections were not held on fixed occasions, and at times groups competing for leadership would try to convene the notables who supported them in order to elect a different leadership. There was certainly some degree of turnover in the composition of the boards.<sup>38</sup>

The organizational apparatus of these associations was very restricted. Generally speaking there existed a board of members which met from time to time to adopt resolutions, while the everyday activity was carried on by the Secretary. These bodies were voluntary and without a paid staff. Thus only individuals with a strong financial position had the spare time for constant activity, and the membership of these institutions indeed came from land-owners, large-scale merchants and professional people (lawyers and journalists as a rule). Only in Jerusalem did the MCA have a small permanent staff. The Secretary of the AE also acted as Secretary of the Jerusalem MCA from the time when 'Arif Pāshā al-Dajāni, the first President of the Jerusalem MCA, was removed from the Presidency of the AE in June 1922.

With all the shortcomings of the MCA structure, it nevertheless constituted the local and national organizational framework, of the Palestinian national movement. The local associations were the medium of communication between the Jerusalem AE and the regions of the country. From it the associations received reports of its activities by way of circulars and instructions to carry out various activities (to demonstrate, cable protests, present petitions etc.), and the associations sent off reports of their own activities.<sup>39</sup> Nevertheless, it is difficult to see the various Muslim-Christian Associations as one uniform, country-wide framework. The nationalists were themselves aware of this, and at the Fourth and Fifth Congresses brought up various proposals to consolidate the associations into a hierarchical country-wide framework, in which the associations in the large cities would organize the establishment of branches in the villages and towns near by.<sup>40</sup> The only place where such an attempt was made was Nāblus. The Nāblus MCA and its leaders saw themselves as the leaders of the entire district and tried to further nationalist activity in Jenin, Ṭul-Karm and the villages of the district. But it is just the Nāblus MCA which illustrates the lack of uniformity of a country-wide framework. Not infrequently this association took its own initiatives, sent emissaries

to Muslim elements outside Palestine without consulting the AE and exerted constant pressure on the Jerusalem AE in the direction of extremist action.<sup>41</sup>

Despite all these shortcomings the MCA saw itself as the body representing the entire Arab population.<sup>42</sup> In 1918–20 the MCA was not the only body representative of the population. Other elements, more extremist than the MCA, were also active. Later, after these extremist organizations had disappeared, the MCA did not have the field to itself for long; opposition began to develop and organize itself. Nevertheless, the extent of the support which the AE and the MCA enjoyed was clearly incomparably greater than that of the opposition, as can be shown by the success in blocking the elections to the legislative council. It must, however, be borne in mind that we are dealing here with that part of the urban population which was politically conscious and gave thought to the question of the political and national future of the country. This part was limited above all to the urban educated élite, although its influence penetrated to other strata and it was capable of mobilizing still greater support. By virtue of this phenomenon the MCA was able to claim that it represented the entire population.

It should also be recalled that the growing strength of the opposition in the late 'twenties deprived the MCA of its title to complete representation of the population. The Seventh Congress of June 1928 was convened by agreement between the heads of the AE and the heads of the opposition, and the AE elected at it ceased to be identical with the MCA. However, until then the AE had been the pinnacle of a pyramid, the base of which comprised the Muslim-Christian Associations, and the centre layers, the country-wide Congresses. These institutions were the MCA's country-wide instruments of representation and the organizational basis for its attempt to appear as an organization representing the whole country.

Before the convening of the Congresses, the executive members of the local MCA or of any other association which was active in the area in nationalist activity would assemble to elect a number of the local active members as delegates. There were never general elections. Moreover, not all the members were always connected to the local association convened for the elections.<sup>43</sup> In Jerusalem an attempt was made to convene the local notables to elect delegates to the Sixth Congress in June 1923, since the local MCA had been paralysed when its President, 'Ārif Pāshā al-Dajāni, had joined the ranks of the opposition. Around 150 notables were invited, but only about 60 turned up and chose 30 delegates to the Congress. The fact stands out that this election campaign was organized by Jamāl

al-Ḥusayni, the Secretary of the AE, while the local MCA was completely ignored.<sup>44</sup> This electoral method was also used before the Seventh Congress, which was in many respects the most representative of all the Congresses. However, this time, in the wake of the preliminary agreement between the supporters of the AE and the SMC and the opposition, it was necessary to maintain numerical equality between the two sides, and the delegates were therefore decided upon in preliminary negotiations among the notables of both camps in each place.<sup>45</sup>

It is no wonder, then, that from the first the British authorities had doubts about the representative character of this framework. We have seen that after the convening of the Third Congress the Government had doubts as to whether the Congress deserved to be considered as truly representative of the Palestinian population. In response to this, Mūsā Kāzīm al-Ḥusayni remarked: "the delegates of the Congress convening in Haifa [the Third, December 1920] were chosen in part by the Muslim-Christian Associations and the other associations and clubs which were established in orderly fashion and which represented all the inhabitants before the American Commission [King-Crane Commission] and the Government in all matters; the rest were chosen by the notables and dignitaries of the country (*A'yān wa-Wujahā' al-Bilād*), the sheikhs of the towns and villages and the representatives of the various communities . . . on this basis it should be clear to His Excellency the High Commissioner that the Congress was elected by the people, that it represents an absolute majority of the Palestinian people, Muslims and Christians, and that it unites within it the notables and dignitaries of the country, who have always represented it."<sup>46</sup>

In these words Mūsā Kāzīm al-Ḥusayni revealed with complete frankness the social conception of the Palestinian aristocracy. The source of this aristocracy's authority was traditional and not democratic, and it did not see itself in need of confirmation of its status by other classes. Notwithstanding this fact it saw itself simultaneously as the representative of the entire population, since according to its conception no other form of representation could possibly exist. It should be noted that even if the masses had been asked at the time to give their opinion as to who should represent them they would undoubtedly have authorized completely the representatives of the social élite, whose leadership they accepted without question. What is more, from 1876 onwards, when elections to the Ottoman Parliament began to be held, the electoral method employed had been no different in any significant sense from that described by Mūsā Kāzīm al-Ḥusayni. The reasons for this lay

in the property qualifications for franchise required by the Ottoman electoral law and in the holding of the elections in two stages.

This social conception was of course reflected in the composition of the delegates at the various Congresses. The delegates came, generally speaking, from that same social élite which saw itself as the true representative of the people: the prestigious urban families which produced religious functionaries, officials in the administration, merchants and landowners, and the families of the village sheikhs. In the Seventh Congress there were slightly more professional people (mainly lawyers), but most of them also came from these same aristocratic families.

As to the families of village sheikhs, it should be stressed that this element did not come from all parts of the country. The only rural areas represented at the Congresses and in the other political structures were Judea and Samaria and the Carmel. The villages of the coastal plain and Galilee were completely passive and took no part in political activity.

The reason for this difference lay in the social variance between these regions. In the Judean mountains and Samaria there was a continuity of settlement from previous ages. The villages were organized in sub-districts, at the head of which were the local sheikhs. While these structures increasingly disintegrated as the Ottoman administration began to succeed in abolishing the *iltizām*, they nevertheless survived until the early days of British rule as structures having social significance and their own leadership.

On the other hand, the villages in the coastal plain and in the valleys had been set up in later periods, after the terror of the Bedouins had largely passed and after the latter had themselves begun to settle down in the empty regions of the country. In these villages no social-administrative units had yet crystallized, nor did they have their own leadership.

Moreover, in the coastal plain and the valleys large-scale land-ownership was more widespread, since in the absence of peasants with rights of possession the urban notables had been able to register the land in their own names without difficulty (prime examples of this are the Jezreel Valley, the Haifa bay area, Emek Hefer, and the Judean lowlands). This enhanced the dependence of these villages on the urban notables and prevented the development of self-leadership.

The religious functionaries carried no great weight at the various Congresses, although some of them (Sheikh Muḥammad Murād, the Mufti of Haifa, Sheikh Sa'īd al-Khaṭīb, the main preacher in al-Aqṣā) took part in most of the Congresses. However, this phenomenon does not prove that there was little participation on

their part in nationalist activity. On the contrary, religious functionaries appeared as representatives of the population when petitions and protests were presented to the authorities, during demonstrations and at various popular assemblies. The fact that such assemblies were frequently held in mosques and churches and that demonstrations often began or ended in them made the active participation of the religious functionaries inevitable.

The various Congresses used to elect an executive to direct activity and carry out the resolutions until the convening of the next Congress. This body included the highest echelon of the country-wide leadership. A fundamental feature of the election of these bodies at the various Congresses was the desire to give representation to the various regions of the country and to that part of the Christian community which continued to take part in nationalist activity after 1920—in the main the Orthodox community (see next section). In the Executive elected at the Sixth and Seventh Congresses special representation was given to the Christians on a country-wide community basis; at the Sixth Congress the Christian delegates in the Executive were elected by their community in addition to those Christians who were chosen to represent their towns, while at the Seventh Congress the Christian representatives in the Executive were elected on a community basis only. At most of the Congresses (until the Fifth and afterwards) the members of the AE were elected as representatives of their cities, but it was the plenary session of the Congress which did the electing. However, at the Sixth Congress the regional character of the AE's composition alongside its community character stood out, as the representatives of each region were responsible for electing the representative of their region in the AE.<sup>47</sup> This system was clumsy and made the AE's activities more difficult. It was hard to assemble its members from all over the country for sessions in Jerusalem, and not infrequently sessions were cancelled or held in the most cursory fashion because members were unable to attend. It must be recalled that the activity of members of the AE was in addition to their normal occupations, so that even though most of them were rich and independent, they were still not always able to give time to meetings.<sup>48</sup>

With the return of the First Delegation in August 1922 an attempt was made to redress this situation; it was decided that the Delegation, or a majority of it, along with any number of the other members of the AE would constitute a quorum for the sessions of the AE.<sup>49</sup> While this arrangement solved the problem of sessions being cancelled because of the absence of members from outside Jerusalem, it entrusted the management of affairs to a limited

number of Jerusalemite and Nāblusite members. It was probably this development which led to the stressing of the regional character of membership in the AE at the Sixth Congress.

A step forward was taken after the Seventh Congress. The AE elected at that time was large and clumsy (48 members), and from the start it was clear that it would be unable to deal with the current, everyday management of the movement. Therefore two Vice-Presidents, Ya'qūb Farrāj (a Greek-Orthodox from Jerusalem) and Tawfiq Ḥaqqi al-'Abdāllah (of Acre)—both of them members of the opposition—were elected alongside the President of the AE (Mūsā Kāzim al-Ḥusayni), as was an office of three members comprising: Jamāl al-Ḥusayni, the lawyer Mughannam Ilyās Mughannam (a Jerusalemite Protestant and member of the opposition), and the lawyer 'Awni 'Abd al-Hādi (who was not really identified with either of the two rival camps).<sup>50</sup> This meant a considerable increase in organizational power, since until then the entire organizational burden had been borne by Jamāl al-Ḥusayni, the only Secretary.

This structure did indeed revitalize nationalist-political activity, particularly after August 1929,<sup>51</sup> but other developments beginning in 1931–2 once again weakened the AE.

Several factors were at work at this time. The "MacDonald Letter" of February 1931 was the first.<sup>52</sup> Until it was published, it had seemed as if the AE's policy was bearing fruit—that as a result of its pressure on the Government the Palestine problem had been reappraised and the Government had drawn several conclusions in favour of the Arab side in the spheres of Jewish immigration and land acquisitions. The MacDonald Letter in one blow destroyed the main promises of the October 1930 White Paper. This turning-point rocked the Palestinian community and very much diminished hopes of reaching a satisfactory settlement with the British Government.

Along with this development there had arisen a more militant stratum of activists and leaders. Even before the 1929 riots, community frameworks of Muslim youths had begun to organize themselves (see next section), gradually taking on more radical nationalist positions. Beginning in the summer of 1931 these youths began to talk of an armed struggle to realize the Arab national goals in Palestine. They began demanding a policy of civil disobedience, non-payment of taxes, etc. The head of the Association of Muslim Youth in Haifa, Sheikh 'Izz al-Dīn al-Qassām, organized at the time an armed group which began carrying out acts of terror and murders against Jews.

The 1929 riots gave a considerable impetus to this development.

Al-Ḥājj Amīn al-Ḥusayni was shown to be the central figure among the Palestinians. While he had still not gone over to the side of those who wanted to exacerbate the methods of struggle against the Government, his very rise to leadership strengthened the young radicals, who were all Muslims.

In the 'thirties the bankruptcy of the AE became apparent to all. Zionism was advancing at an ever-increasing rate. The number of Jewish immigrants grew following the rise of the Nazis to power, and the rate of land acquisitions accelerated. Not only did the AE fail in preventing land sales, but accusations were even made that some of its members dealt in such sales themselves. The SMC, on the other hand, tried to fill the gap and carried on a religious propaganda campaign against the sales; and in numbers of cases it did succeed in preventing villagers from selling their land to the Jews.

The impotence of the AE was becoming more and more obvious. The circles of Amīn al-Ḥusayni's supporters did not hesitate to attack this body and indirectly its President. Their attacks greatly injured the prestige of the AE. By 1933-4 it had lost its self-confidence and its faith in its ability to act. The October 1933 demonstrations was the last attempt to salvage its prestige and achieve something. When it failed in this it lost its political effectiveness completely and its members succumbed to the notion of handing the job over to other, younger and perhaps more talented individuals.

Mūsā Kāẓim al-Ḥusayni's death in March 1934 removed the last element which had supplied some sort of rationale for the further existence of this body. In the months after his death the AE also went through its death agonies and towards the end of the year finally disappeared.

With all its weaknesses, there is still no doubt that by its very existence the AE served as a framework for coordinating the various nationalist associations throughout the country into one movement. Not long after the Fourth Congress in July 1921 the Secretary of the AE began publishing a weekly circular containing details of current activities. Of much importance is the fact that this weekly circular contained detailed news from the various regions of the country (on the basis of information received from the various associations), in this way strengthening the consciousness of community among these regions.<sup>63</sup> However, the AE lacked the power to continue this project, and after about a year publication ceased. The short-lived vigour which the AE took on after the 1929 riots led to renewed publication of the weekly circular, but this time too the activity lasted only about a year.<sup>64</sup>

In 1921, and particularly after the Fourth Congress, the idea of publishing a newspaper which would serve as the organ of the AE and the movement began to develop. The editing was entrusted to Kāmil al-Budayri and Yūsuf Yāsīn, both of them members of *al-Nādi al-'Arabi* in Jerusalem; in September 1921<sup>55</sup> they began publication of *al-Ṣabāḥ*. From the start the paper met with financial difficulties, since the AE was unable to fulfil its commitment to pay for 600 subscriptions. The various associations throughout the country were to distribute the paper and organize the collection of the subscriptions.<sup>56</sup>

The paper served as a forum for AE positions, petitions and activities and made an important contribution to the strengthening of ties among the various associations, which were now able to bring to the attention of the entire community all that went on in their areas. The paper managed to survive until 1923, when it was forced to cease publication because of financial problems.<sup>57</sup>

In the period before the rise of the opposition's strength, the power and status of the AE was expressed in its ability to motivate most of the Palestinian urban community to political action. It was the AE which planned the presentation of protests in the various cities, the sending of protest cables, the holding of demonstrations and the boycott of the elections to the legislative council.<sup>58</sup> Although it was not always successful in this and could not always prevent the appearance of exceptions to its rule, there is no doubt that its successes in this area were greater than its failures. The rise of the opposition changed this situation. The impressive protest organized in March 1925 on the occasion of Lord Balfour's visit to the country was not planned by the AE alone but through agreement and coordination with the opposition, and the Seventh Congress could not have been convened without some such preliminary arrangement.

One of the methods employed to maintain this status was occasionally to invite delegations from the various cities of the country to Jerusalem to confer upon current affairs. In this way the tie between the centre and the districts was maintained from congress to congress in a fairly effective manner. It sometimes happened that the AE's stand was not adopted at these conventions; situations such as this undoubtedly reinforced the sense of participation of the community at large.<sup>59</sup>

One of the most difficult problems the AE faced was how to find financial resources to pay for its activities. In general the local associations managed to finance their activities without too much difficulty, both because of the relatively small expenditure involved and because it was easy to gather funds to finance a local

organization. This was not always the case with respect to the AE and the country-wide activities—nor, above all, with respect to the delegations sent abroad.

The method employed in raising funds was to distribute the estimated expenses over the various districts of the country, with the members of the AE and the associations in the various districts in charge of collection. In this way, for example, the first AE (i.e. the body elected at the Third Congress in December 1920) tried to collect during its brief existence (until June 1921) a total of £12,000. Out of this estimated sum, a mere £5,223 was actually collected. The interesting point is that most of this money (over £4,000) was intended to finance the First Delegation to Britain; while what remained was supposed to be sufficient to cover the current expenditure of the AE, including the travelling expenses of the Delegation to Egypt in March 1921 (to meet with Churchill during his stay in Cairo).<sup>60</sup>

This sum was not easily come by, and the AE had to appeal again to the districts to raise it. The convening of the Fourth Congress was made conditional on the delegates from the districts bringing with them the sums required of them.<sup>61</sup> The Delegation's departure was also delayed for approximately a month because of lack of money.<sup>62</sup> Nevertheless, the AE managed to raise a significant sum which made it possible for the six-member Delegation to depart, and afterwards too the AE continued its fund-raising campaign. The Delegation was thus able to stay an entire year in London, carrying on extensive activity and staying in an expensive hotel, though from time to time it sent urgent appeals for more money to the AE in Palestine.<sup>63</sup>

This situation, however unglamorous, was still incomparably better than in later years. During the lifetime of the first AE the internal fissures had as yet not been revealed, and there were great hopes at the time of the departure of the First Delegation. The next AE, which served between the Fourth and Fifth Congresses, managed to raise only £2,200, and from time to time it was threatened with paralysis.<sup>64</sup> In 1923 the situation reached a point where the AE was unable to issue a manifesto containing the resolutions of the country-wide convention it had just held. The Secretary, Jamāl al-Ḥusayni, was not paid his salary for four months, while creditors were pressing him hard.<sup>65</sup>

This desperate financial situation put great difficulties in the way of sending the Third Delegation. Out of the £1,000 it had been decided to raise to finance the Delegation, only £450 was raised before its departure, and the Delegation was forced during its stay in London to plead repeatedly for additional funds.<sup>66</sup> Afterwards,

as the internal split and the paralysis of the AE's camp worsened, the financial difficulties became greater. In 1925-6 the AE was faced with bankruptcy. It lacked the money to finance its small everyday expenses, and Jamāl al-Ḥusayni was forced several times to threaten to resign after his salary had not been paid for many months.<sup>87</sup> In 1922-3 the AE attempted to make its fund-raising more effective by having special fund-raising projects, such as selling stamps which it had issued and requiring all the association's members to pay a small but regular monthly sum. However, these ideas were never carried out.

The AE tried to get out of this situation by raising funds outside Palestine, in the Palestinian-Arab communities on the American continent, but it had little success in this. From time to time small sums of money were collected (a few hundred pounds altogether), but systematic and continual contributions were not forthcoming.<sup>88</sup>

It should be noted that after August 1929, when the Palestinian nationalist movement came back to life, it succeeded in raising in the period August 1929-March 1930 approximately £4,200, not counting contributions made in order to finance the trip of the delegation which left for London. However, this sum included £1,770 "lent" to the AE by the "Committee for the Assistance of Victims of the Riots", although there is no evidence that this loan was ever repaid.<sup>89</sup>

The failure in gathering funds was one of the important factors behind the failure of the AE to realize a large part of its plans and decisions. Moreover, it reflected the low degree of national consciousness and consolidation in the Palestinian community. Aid from the Arabs outside Palestine was non-existent at that time and could not have been expected. On the other hand, this situation shows that the stories current in Palestine in those years among the circles of the opposition, the Jewish press and the Zionist Executive to the effect that the SMC had financed the Palestinian delegations with *awqāf* funds were apparently somewhat exaggerated.

#### THE CHRISTIAN COMMUNITIES AND THE NATIONAL MOVEMENT

One of the important phenomena which stood out from the beginning of the Palestinian-Arab national awakening was the formation of a joint Muslim-Christian front. This was something completely new and opposed to the long tradition of Christian isolation from public life. In the course of the process of reform in the Ottoman Empire in the nineteenth century the Ottoman government had

attempted to improve the status of its Christian subjects and to give them equality with the Muslims. This process had been a source of increasing bitterness to the Muslim community and aroused fierce hatred for the local Christians and even violent riots.<sup>1</sup> In 1913 the Ottoman authorities amended the "Law of the *Vilāyets*". Until then half of the seats in the "general councils" (*Majālis 'Umūmiyyah*) in the provinces had been reserved for the non-Muslim communities. Now this allocation of seats was done away with, and the election of the members of the councils was to be free from community quotas. As a result, in the elections held in Jaffa not one Christian was elected. The interesting fact is that this was a phenomenon which occurred in other places too; in the *vilāyets* of Aleppo (which had a large number of Christians) and Tripoli the same thing happened, much to the bitterness of the Editor of the Christian paper *Filasfīn*, who saw this as discriminatory.<sup>2</sup> It is no wonder, then, that in those very years Jewish observers noted the gap—indeed, the enmity—that existed between Muslims and Christians. This development was, it seems, a direct result of the anti-Christian feeling which swept through the Ottoman Empire in the wake of the war against the Italians in Libya and the Balkan Wars. During 1911–12 these wars against Christian states were represented throughout the Empire as a religious war of Muslims against Christians, while the military defeats which the Ottomans suffered enhanced the Muslims' hate for the local Christians whom they identified with the enemies of the Ottoman Empire.<sup>3</sup> During the First World War this phenomenon became still more serious, and the Christians suffered abuse from government officials—extremist Muslims<sup>4</sup>—a fact which could hardly have increased the friendship between the two communities.

The formation of a Muslim-Christian anti-Zionist front did not weaken community loyalties. The integrative structures—nationalist (MCA), economic (chambers of commerce)<sup>5</sup> and philanthropic—were composed on a representative community basis or were associated with one community. Nevertheless, the very formation of a common front and the adoption of common political positions was a real innovation.

What, then, happened in the second decade of the twentieth century to change the bitter reality of the past? The development of Arab national consciousness in the last days of the Ottoman Empire, and the weakening of loyalties to the Empire on the part of some sections of the Muslim élite may well have helped to bridge the old emotional gap. However, it should not be assumed that Arab national consciousness by itself could have brought about this change, since that consciousness was of extremely limited

extent and without strong roots. Other factors, then, were also involved.

The apprehension felt by the local Christians towards Zionism and the Jews arriving in the country was apparently serious. Aside from the age-old religious hostility, there was now fear of Jewish intellectual and economic competition. The local Christians were for the most part urban traders, craftsmen, shopkeepers and public officials. By virtue of their greater education they had an easier time in gaining posts in the government which was set up in the wake of the British conquest, and before long they had attained a most eminent position within it. The craftsmen and traders were also alarmed at the appearance of a Jewish element which was, they feared, likely to deprive them of their position.<sup>6</sup>

These fears moved the Christian community to identify itself completely with the anti-Zionist stand of the Muslim leaders. The fact that the heads of the British military administration also regarded Zionism with hostility and encouraged the setting up of the MCA strengthened the anti-Zionist feeling of the Christian leaders.

The heads of the Muslim community rejoiced at this Christian position. It was most important for them to be able to represent the anti-Zionist stand as a factor uniting the entire Arab population. They were thus able to claim that they represented the entire population, and they were certainly not unaware of the effect that a stand taken by Palestinian Christians against Zionism would have on Christian opinion in Britain and throughout the West. And in truth, the Christians carried considerable weight in the MCA in its early days. About 20% of the delegates to the First Congress in January 1919 and half of the delegates from Jerusalem (the centre of activity) were Christians.<sup>7</sup>

With this it must be noted that Christian involvement in the national struggle in its early days was not uniform in character or motives. While opposition to Zionism was universal, the orientation towards unity with Syria was backed up primarily by the pro-French Catholic communities. The Association of Catholic Youth in Jerusalem cooperated actively in 1919 with *al-Muntadā al-Adabi*, and both associations were supported by the French; Barlassina, the Latin Patriarch of Jerusalem, and Ḥajjār, the Greek-Catholic Bishop of Galilee, were conspicuous by their systematic anti-Zionist activity.<sup>8</sup>

The stand taken by the largest Christian community, the Greek-Orthodox, was more complex. The Patriarch of this community and its bishops were certainly more fearful of the trend to arabicize the Patriarchate than of Zionism. The Greek-Orthodox Patriarchate

and the traditional leadership of the community (Ya'qūb Farrāj of Jerusalem and others) therefore tended to cooperate with the British government from the start and opposed the trend towards unification with Hāshemite Syria. In contrast to them were young, educated figures within the community, such as Khalīl al-Sakākīni, Yūsuf al-'Īsā and his brother 'Īsā al-'Īsā, leaders of *al-Nahḍah al-Urthūdūxiyyah* (the Orthodox Revival), who were conspicuous by their Arab nationalist pro-unity stand.<sup>9</sup>

Nevertheless, the traditional leadership was more powerful, and the leaders of the community in Jerusalem expressed a preference for British mandate and opposition to unification with Damascus before the King-Crane Commission.<sup>10</sup> The Russian Revolution and Russia's disappearance as an active element giving support and protection to the Greek-Orthodox in the Middle East undoubtedly brought about this moderate stand towards the British.<sup>11</sup> The members of *al-Nahḍah al-Urthūdūxiyyah* saw themselves as Arab in all respects and identified themselves with the Arab nationalist movement; some of them (the al-'Īsā brothers of Jaffa, for example) even joined the extremist association *al-Fidā'iyyah*.<sup>12</sup> However, most of the community had still not undergone this transformation, so that when their previous protection disappeared, they looked for new foreign protection in the guise of British rule.

Muslim-Christian solidarity during the years 1918–20 was not, then, as solid as might appear at first glance. The uniting factor was enmity towards Zionism, but as far as the political future of the country was concerned there were great differences of opinion. The Christians were unceasingly torn between their communal loyalties and identity and the need to take part in the anti-Zionist struggle; while the Muslims for their part tried to restrain their anti-Christian sentiments with the passing of Ottoman rule and did much to prevent the creation of a Christian question and a Christian front against them. In the final analysis this was no more than a clever tactic which was not always successful in attaining its goal.<sup>13</sup>

The changes in the political conditions which had brought about the formation of the Muslim-Christian front were accompanied by the first fissures in that front. Fayṣal's coronation as King of "Greater Syria" in March 1920 met with the opposition of the Palestinian Christians.<sup>14</sup> The Orthodox had been opposed even before this to the unity trend, whereas the Catholics had hoped for unity under French protection and not under Muslim-Arab rule. The decisions of the San Remo Conference to separate Palestine from Syria and to establish separate mandates in these two lands made the Catholics' estrangement from the Palestinian

national movement still greater. The hope that Palestine would be placed under French protection by way of unification with Syria had been dispelled, and with it the primary motive for their participation in the movement. It is no coincidence that two to three years later Herbert Samuel was able to state that the Latin Patriarch of Jerusalem and the Greek-Catholic Bishop of Galilee (the two highest dignitaries in the Catholic communities in Palestine) had cut down their anti-Zionist propaganda to a considerable extent, and the latter had even forsaken all activity in the national movement, having been extremely active previously.<sup>15</sup> This is not to say that the Catholic communities abandoned the MCA and ceased to take any part in political activity. Some individuals (such as Wadi' al-Bustāni, a Maronite from Haifa) stood out by virtue of their systematic, and even extremist, activity. Nevertheless, it can be stated that there was a decline in the degree of active participation by the Catholic element in the national movement.

Among the Greek-Orthodox, on the other hand, the trend towards greater involvement in the Palestinian national movement grew stronger. The trend towards unity, which had aroused their apprehensions, had passed away completely. On the other hand, the internal struggle within the Greek-Orthodox community between the Patriarchate and its supporters on the one hand and the majority of the community on the other grew worse. The Patriarchate, in an attempt to solve its considerable financial difficulties that had occurred during the First World War, sold extensive areas of land in Jerusalem to Jews. In this way the Patriarchate created for itself an additional cause for attack by circles within the community.

The young circles, inheritors of *al-Nahḍah al-Urthūdūxiyyah*, convened in July 1923 in Haifa a country-wide Congress of representatives of the community from all areas subject to the jurisdiction of the Jerusalem Patriarchate (Palestine and Transjordan). The very convening of this Congress and the status of the participants bears witness to the fact that the opponents of the Patriarchate had attained absolute influence over the Arab rank and file.<sup>16</sup> The appointment by the Patriarch in 1922 of a metropolitan for Nazareth who was ignorant of Arabic, in opposition to the wishes of a majority of the community there, was the primary reason for convening the Congress and for the support it enjoyed.<sup>17</sup>

The resolutions of the Congress revolved primarily around demands to enhance the authority of the Arab rank and file in directing community affairs: a two-thirds majority for the local rank and file in the body directing the affairs of the community ("the mixed council");<sup>18</sup> the advancement of local community

members to high church positions; dismissal of priests ignorant of Arabic, especially the metropolitan of Nazareth [the latter had not only been appointed by the Patriarch completely against the wishes of most of the Nazareth community, but had also aroused the anger of the Arab community by working for participation by the members of his community in the elections to the legislative council as described below]; the appointment of Arab metropolitans and bishops; and writing the history of *al-Nahḍah al-Urthūdūxiyyah*. The Congress elected an executive which included those Orthodox personalities active in the Palestinian national movement ('Īsā al-'Īsā, Ya'qūb Farrāj, Ibrāhīm Shammās, Ya'qūb al-Ṭawīl and others).<sup>19</sup> Eight years later, when the Second Orthodox Arab Congress was convened, the participants went still further and demanded the appointment of an Arab Patriarch to the Jerusalem Patriarchate in place of the Greek Patriarch who had died that year.<sup>20</sup> The Greek-Orthodox often claimed that they were subject to triple oppression—British, Jewish and Greek—and that their situation was thus still more serious than that of the other sections of the Arab population.<sup>21</sup>

The Sixth Palestinian Congress adopted the demands of the Greek-Orthodox community, regarding them as part of the more general nationalist demands.<sup>22</sup> In this way the link between the Orthodox community and the general Palestinian nationalist framework was undoubtedly reinforced.

However, strong as the Muslim-Christian connection was, it was not strong enough to do away with the sensitivity of the Christian minority and the suspicions which the Muslim majority felt towards it.

It is instructive to note that among the Christian leaders there was a tendency to a more moderate attitude towards the Government,<sup>23</sup> while restricting their opposition to the question of Zionism alone. In the elections to the legislative council the ratio of Christian candidates nominated to the number of secondary electors allotted them was higher than among the Muslims (19 candidates for 59 secondary electors among the Christians, as opposed to 107 candidates for 663 Muslim secondary electors).<sup>24</sup> The Greek-Orthodox Patriarch and the metropolitan of Nazareth and their supporters in the community were active in favour of participation in the elections, and in general there was less enthusiasm among the Christians for the boycott of the elections.<sup>25</sup>

And, indeed, in early 1923, the first signs of a split in the Muslim-Christian front could be detected. Christian participation in anti-Government propaganda diminished, their enthusiasm over the possibility that the country might win independence under Muslim-

Arab rule lessened, and their support for mandatory rule became greater.<sup>26</sup>

No less instructive was the fact that eventually all the Arab papers under Christian ownership (*Mir'āt al-Sharq*, *al-Nafir*, *Lisān al-'Arab*, *al-Karmil* and *Filasṭīn*) joined the ranks of the AE's opponents.

Another phenomenon which bore witness to the strengthening of communal feeling was the Christian demand for special representation in the AE elected at the Sixth Congress. While until then the Christians had been elected to this body as representatives of their areas of residence (though attention was given even then to the proportionate weight of their representation), now two members were attached to the AE as special representatives of the Christians, aside from the usual regional delegates.<sup>27</sup>

This phenomenon recurred at the Seventh Congress with greater force. During the wearisome negotiations which preceded the Congress the Christians appeared as one bloc and saw to it that they had reserved representation in it; they did this through co-operation with the opposition.<sup>28</sup> Even after agreement had been reached, the representative of the Latin community in Jerusalem did not take part in the Congress, although he had been elected as a delegate;<sup>29</sup> nor did the Christian representatives of Nazareth.<sup>30</sup> The link between the Christians and the opposition was conspicuous in the municipal elections in Jerusalem. In both 1927 and 1934 the opposition candidates won all the seats allotted to the Christians, while in 1927 the supporters of the SMC won half the Muslim places, and in 1934, all of them.<sup>31</sup>

There were several basic reasons for these developments. In the years 1918–22, which marked the height of Muslim-Christian cooperation, Zionism had been seen as a real danger. After the British policy declaration of June 1922 (Cmd. 1700) this fear abated somewhat among the Christians, who had from the first shown more affection for Christian Britain than had the Muslims, and the main motive for Muslim-Christian solidarity was somewhat weakened.<sup>32</sup>

Another, much more influential, phenomenon was the upsurge of feelings of Muslim solidarity with the Kemalist Turks in their victorious war against the Greeks. The fervour of the Palestinian Muslims aroused serious apprehensions in the minds of the Christians about a renewal of Muslim sentiments of identity and superiority. Moreover, the Christians' sympathies were on the side of their Greek counterparts and not with the Muslim Turks, their former oppressors; when the Palestinian Muslims organized a fund-raising campaign for the Turkish war victims, Christian elements

organized a parallel campaign for the Greek victims. Matters came to a head when the Christian members in the First Palestinian Delegation had to be encouraged by the Palestine Government to continue their participation in the Palestinian Executive.<sup>33</sup> Even the idea of establishing a Muslim university in Jerusalem aroused the opposition of Christian spokesmen, who feared anything with Pan-Muslim connotations.<sup>34</sup>

Another development originating outside Palestine was the Syrian revolt of 1925. In the course of the revolt Christian villages in the Ḥawrān were attacked by Druzes, and incidents such as these occurred in Damascus as well. These incidents set up echoes in Palestine, such as the following statement made by a Christian in a Christian paper: "If patriotism (*waṭaniyyah*) is not to be established without pillage and robbery, and independence not to be attained without slaughtering Christians and burning their houses, then I prefer the French flag or any other foreign flag."<sup>35</sup>

The internal division in the Palestinian-Arab community also helped weaken Christian-Muslim unity. One of the manifestations of this division was the gradual identification of the camp of the SMC and its supporters with the AE. This apparently aroused Christian apprehensions about the essentially Muslim character of the Palestinian national movement; they thus moved, along with their newspapers, more and more towards the opposition camp. This stand aroused bitterness in turn in the camp of the Muslim supporters of the SMC, so that still greater estrangement took place between the two communities.<sup>36</sup>

In the spring of 1928 a world congress of Christian missionaries convened in Jerusalem. The Muslim community feared this congress might become a launching pad for intensive missionary activity in their midst. They therefore raised an outcry against the congress, and some of them failed to distinguish between the foreign missionary element and the local, indigenous and Arabic-speaking Christians.<sup>37</sup>

In the same period, early 1928, the country-wide structure of Young Men's Muslim Associations was established.<sup>38</sup> These associations were set up in the course of 1927 throughout the country, and their organization into a united country-wide framework lent them added importance. It seems that the very setting-up of this body pointed to a strengthening of the sense of communal identity. It occurred at a time of crisis in Zionism, when apparently the urge to demonstrate Muslim-Christian unity had greatly diminished. It is almost certain that a desire to compete with the parallel Christian structures and with the missionary activity was also at work. However, this organization gradually took on an anti-Christian character,

as it was combined with another question which then preoccupied the Muslim community to a considerable degree.

From the start of British rule the Christians had enjoyed an important place in the administration. By virtue of their greater education and knowledge of foreign languages, Christians found far more places in Government service than their proportionate share of the population warranted.<sup>39</sup> From the start this caused latent bitterness among the Muslims, although during the first years of British rule it was hard for the Muslims to express this. In those years everything was done to demonstrate Muslim-Christian solidarity; even to have brought the matter up would have been interpreted as an admission of the importance of community identities and of the existence of a conflict of interests between the two communities. In the mid-'twenties, with the weakening of this solidarity, many Muslims began to allow themselves to express their feelings on this point. It is safe to assume that as a result of the work of the Government's educational network the number of educated Muslim youths grew larger, so that there was more pressure on Government offices. Complaints began to appear in the press about discrimination against Muslims with respect to Government offices and the preference shown to Christians.<sup>40</sup> This topic gradually became a public issue of primary importance, arousing anger and affecting relations between the two communities.<sup>41</sup> Various elements began to organize themselves, to present petitions and to send delegations to the Government with a demand to do justice to the Muslims in this area, while the AE was requested to organize country-wide activity.<sup>42</sup>

The organization of the Young Men's Muslim Associations adopted this issue as its own and began to be one of the most important elements active in campaigning to enlarge the proportion of Muslims in Government service. At its Fourth Congress, in the summer of 1932, much attention was given to this question, and it occupied an important place in the resolutions.<sup>43</sup> In less public meetings, the heads of the organization did not hesitate to state explicitly that "the Christians are robbing the Muslims of their rights to [Government] offices".<sup>44</sup> *Al-Jāmi'ah al-Islāmiyyah*, the paper of Sheikh Sulaymān al-Tāji al-Fārūqi, which held a radical Pan-Islamic position, dealt with this issue with a ferocity bordering on open incitement against the Christians.

Several young Muslims organized themselves in a special body, "the Preparatory Committee of Young Educated Muslims", to fight for their rights. In November 1932 these men convened a country-wide congress in Jaffa and established the "Committee of Young Educated Muslims". At their Congress they came out

fiercely against the Christians, although 'Abd al-Qādir al-Ḥusayni, the son of Mūsā Kāzīm, tried—apparently under his father's influence—to calm the agitation.<sup>45</sup>

In the wake of these developments the Christians began to organize themselves in opposition, and there were fears that there would be a public and violent split between the two communities.<sup>46</sup> Still earlier, on 9th September 1932, the AE had discussed on its own initiative the bitter controversy between the two communities; it decided to ask the Government not to employ foreigners, in order to leave room for local residents, "and to maintain a proportionate balance in distributing offices".<sup>47</sup> It should be noted that this resolution was proposed by 'Isā al-'Isā, a Christian from Jaffa, and it should be seen as a temporary measure taken in the light of heavy Muslim pressure. However, this resolution apparently did nothing to cool tempers. On 28th September 1932 the AE again discussed the factional spirit prevailing in the country and met with 'Abd al-Qādir al-Ḥusayni, the representative of "the Preparatory Committee of Young Educated Muslims". During the discussion the need to put an immediate end to the danger of factionalism and to refrain from attacking the Christians was stressed. However, while the Christian members demanded that the topic be dealt with, that anything which could affect "the good atmosphere which exists among the children of the single homeland" (the words of 'Isā Bandak, a Greek-Orthodox from Bethlehem) be condemned, and that the YMMA of Jaffa, the "root of the evil" (in the words of Alfred Roq, a Greek-Catholic of Jaffa) be restrained, the Muslim members expressed support for the Preparatory Committee and argued that it was acting not against the Christians but simply in favour of Muslim rights (in the words of Hāshim al-Jayūsi and 'Izzat Darwaza).<sup>48</sup>

In the light of these differences of opinion the AE was unable to reach any conclusion and had to leave it to its office to issue a manifesto on this matter.<sup>49</sup> However, by this time the activity of the AE and its office was declining. The AE did not convene again until a year had passed, and the office too convened only once (19th May 1933)<sup>50</sup> before October 1933. As a result this institution, which was considered the leading organization of the Palestinian national movement, was unable to deal with this serious question.

It should be noted that on a lower, mundane level, things were no less wearisome. We have seen that fairly successful anti-Christian propaganda accompanied the establishment of the "National Muslim Associations" in 1921. In various places in Palestine an anti-Christian spirit continued to exist and from time to time received

forceful expression.<sup>51</sup> Personal conflicts over land deals or acts of kidnapping or murder, in which members of different communities were involved, sometimes took on factional significance and were seen by the Christians as indicative of the true attitude of the Muslims towards them.<sup>52</sup> In 1924, when the Mayor of Nazareth died, the struggle over the appointment of his successor turned into a conflict between Muslims and Christians in that city.<sup>53</sup>

The Christians took no part in the August 1929 riots, the whole character of which was Muslim, and thus the Christians were naturally not involved in the later cases of fines and punishment. It seems that this too contributed to the exacerbation of inter-community relations, or at the least to Christian fears as to the Muslims' intentions towards them.<sup>54</sup>

In the summer of 1930 a Christian journalist, Jamil al-Baḥri, head of the YMCA in Haifa, was murdered. This murder was directly linked to a conflict between the Christians and Muslims of Haifa over ownership of the old cemetery area.<sup>55</sup> The murder caused great agitation and affected relations between the communities. The AE decided to act and did all it could to keep the murder case a personal affair. A high-ranking delegation was sent to Haifa,<sup>56</sup> but the Christians remained very bitter; some of them presented the British Government with petitions in which they disavowed any connection with the national movement and the Muslims.<sup>57</sup>

As a result of all this, tension between the different communities grew more intense in the early 'thirties.<sup>58</sup> The HC was able to write: "Christian Arab leaders, moreover, have admitted to me that in establishing close political relations with the Moslems the Christians have not been uninfluenced by fear of the treatment they might suffer at the hands of the Moslem Majority in certain eventualities."<sup>59</sup>

With this it must be stated that the leaders of the communities did all they could in times of tension to calm tempers and bring about reconciliation.<sup>60</sup> Even al-Ḥājj Amin al-Ḥusayni, who more than anyone symbolized the trend towards Muslim militancy which characterized the Palestinian national movement from the early 'thirties onwards, worked assiduously to prevent dissension and enmity between Muslims and Christians and to preserve the united front.<sup>61</sup>

In the end, notwithstanding all the difficulties, the leaders succeeded in toning down the conflicts existing between the two communities. In this they were aided by two basic facts: Christian opposition to Zionism, and Christian self-identification, alongside their community identity, as Palestinian Arabs.<sup>62</sup>

## Conclusion

The sanctity of Jerusalem in Islam and in Christianity, the setting up of the administrative unit of *Filasfīn* by the Arab conquerors, the survival of this unit in various forms during the course of Muslim rule and the rise in the status of the district of Jerusalem after the first half of the nineteenth century—all these factors contributed at the start of the twentieth century to the development of *Filasfīn* as a concept having geographical and religious significance. This non-political concept began to take on political significance as a result of pressure from an external, foreign element, namely Zionism.

Even before the First World War, but in the main after it, Zionism was seen by the Arabs of Palestine as a phenomenon which set out to change the national and religious *status quo* of the country. They responded at first with suspicion which was in many ways a product of the difference in life-styles and social habits but which gradually turned to enmity. It was the desire to prevent Zionism from being realized that motivated the Arabs of Palestine to organize themselves politically and to formulate the main points of their stand, which negated Zionism and claimed the country for its indigenous inhabitants.

The general Arab awakening penetrated into Palestine at the end of the First World War with the officers and propagandists of the army of the "Revolt in the Desert", which in late 1918 had established a semi-independent Arab government in Damascus.

It seemed then to the Arabs of Palestine that if that government were to rule Palestine too, the Balfour Declaration would not be realized. For this reason in early 1919 voices were raised in their midst in favour of unification with Hāshemite Syria, although among the heads of the noble families there were still those who called for a large measure of autonomy for Arab Palestine. This trend reached its peak in the months February–April 1920, when a wave of pro-Fayṣal demonstrations surged through the country and bloody riots occurred in Jerusalem.

However, when Fayṣal's government collapsed in July 1920, the factor which had pushed the Palestinians towards unification with Damascus disappeared. Instead of a semi-independent Arab government, French mandatory rule was installed in Damascus, while in Palestine itself there was established a British civil admin-

istration charged with carrying out the Balfour Declaration. These new political conditions determined the political development of the national movement. This movement tried to persuade the British of the injustice in the pro-Zionist policy. For this purpose they were prepared to accept some form of British rule, so long as it was not obligated in any way to carry out Zionism.

The Syrian Arab national movement, which continued to struggle against French rule, was more moderate in its stand on Zionism. The organizations of Syrian exiles tended to believe that if they could win Zionism's support for their national struggle they would be able to further the latter considerably. They believed Zionism had immense power and were therefore willing to recognize the Jewish National Home in Palestine in exchange for Zionist support of their struggle for independence. The Palestinian movement was aware of this Syrian position, which had parallels in Egypt, and was bitter about it. In the past, during the Fayçal period, the Palestinian movement had supported Pan-Syrian unity; now the Syrians were repaying them by making peace with Zionism. This bitter disappointment was one of the main reasons behind the Palestinians' refusal to continue acting within the framework of a Pan-Syrian national movement based on striving for the unification of Syria, Lebanon, Transjordan and Palestine. Noting the futility of this approach, they were also aware that the struggle against Zionism was their main objective; there was therefore no reason to continue to cooperate with an element which took a moderate attitude towards it.

The anti-Zionist struggle of the Palestinians in the 'twenties was not crowned with success. In July 1922 the League of Nations ratified the mandate along with its Zionist clauses, which were more far-reaching in their promises to Zionism than the Balfour Declaration. It seemed that the British Government was set upon continuing its former policy, within the limits of the restricted interpretation of the Balfour Declaration which it made public in June 1922. The Palestinians responded by boycotting the institutions of self-rule that the mandatory government tried to set up. In this way the Government's efforts to establish a legislative council ended in failure, and it was thus impossible to argue that the Palestinians had even indirectly made peace with the pro-Zionist policy.

This achievement cost the Palestinians dearly. Non-cooperation at the highest level of the Government apparatus was not accompanied by a systematic policy of boycotting at the lower levels. The campaign against setting up the legislative council might have been effective had it been accompanied by a boycott of the entire

governing apparatus. The dilemma which the authorities would then have had to face would certainly have been untenable. Instead, the Palestinian leadership was content to have demonstrated its large measure of control over the community by its success in organizing the boycott of elections. However, in more practical terms it was not successful in preventing the various governmental institutions from functioning in an orderly everyday manner, nor in stopping Arabs from selling land to Jews.

The Palestinian AE set up in December 1920 from the start did not represent more than a narrow stratum of urban notables and intellectuals. Its hold over the urban masses and the rural community was not strong, although it was able to recruit the masses for particular projects from time to time. This body was still further weakened when, not long after it was set up, it ceased to represent even the entire social stratum from which it had sprung. Various circles began expressing opposition to the position of primacy which the Jerusalemite al-Husayni family had seized in the AE and the Supreme Muslim Council and stopped seeing the AE as their political representative. Internal division weakened very considerably any capacity for political action on the part of the Palestinian national movement from 1923 onwards; the 1924-5 wave of immigration passed without arousing any noticeable Palestinian opposition.

The nature of Zionism and its methods of action contributed in no small measure to the weakening of Palestinian opposition during this period. There existed a considerable difference between the Palestinians' fears of Zionism from a nationalist point of view and the personal benefit which many of them gained from it. Jewish immigration brought new energy into developing the country; capital flowed into Palestine for purposes of land acquisitions, and land prices rocketed. The Arab landowners made enormous profits from this rise in prices, and few refrained from making personal gains from this, even if politically they expressed opposition to such sales. The growth in the urban market for Arab agricultural products, increase in wages and improvement in public services by the Government brought about a certain sense of prosperity among the lower classes.

In this way no concrete personal motive to express an anti-Zionist stand or to carry on a systematic policy aimed at realizing this stand could be felt. A high degree of national consciousness would have been necessary for the Palestinian community to have ignored the personal benefit it stood to gain from Zionism and to have fought it consistently.

In the 'twenties the Palestinian community was far from so high

a degree of national consciousness. While its leadership did formulate a chain of arguments, aimed at proving the righteousness of its demand to preserve the Arab character of Palestine, even this leadership was powerless to act according to these arguments while the less educated section of the community was a long way from being able to comprehend it. The ideology of national self-determination anchored in separate historical and linguistic identity was a revolutionary innovation in Palestine in the 'twenties, and it is highly doubtful if it could have been grasped by the less educated section of the community. Nevertheless, great importance attaches to the formulation of the Palestinian-Arab nationalist ideology in this period. These were the years in which the image of the Palestinian movement was being formed and in which its future ideological and political trends were determined. The ideological scheme which was defined at that time by the political élite and was accepted without qualification by the enlightened circles became from then on a common inheritance. The absolute rejection of Zionism and the arguments in favour of the Arab character of Palestine were formulated at that time and were hardly ever to be changed.

Towards the close of the period of our study, another force, one much more successful than the Palestinian AE in imparting a sense of the danger from Zionism to the less educated masses, came to the fore—the Supreme Muslim Council under the Presidency of al-Ḥājj Muḥammad Amīn al-Ḥusayni, the Mufti of Jerusalem. Amīn al-Ḥusayni was appointed to the post of Mufti of Jerusalem in May 1921 by the British HC. The need to choose a new Mufti came about because of the demise of the previous holder of the office, Kāmil al-Ḥusayni, in March of that year. This post had become extremely important after the Military Administration had begun to regard the Mufti as the head of the Muslim community in Palestine, expressing this by giving him the title “the Grand Mufti”. The al-Ḥusayni family made great efforts to keep the position within the family and united behind the candidacy of Amīn al-Ḥusayni. Despite the family's efforts, Amīn al-Ḥusayni lost in the primary elections for this post. However, it seems that his appointment had been secured even *before* the primaries were held. The Government leaned towards appointing him, notwithstanding his past—or perhaps because of it—in order to win his support or at least an effort on his part to preserve public order; when Amīn al-Ḥusayni promised to work in this direction, his appointment was ensured and a dubious way to get around the election results was found.

His appointment as Mufti of Jerusalem—“the Grand Mufti” in

the Government's vocabulary—paved the way for his Presidency of the Supreme Muslim Council, which was established in January 1922. The Government entrusted this body with far-reaching authority and made it the all-powerful arbiter of all things connected with the religious affairs of the Palestine Muslims. In this way the Government hoped to satisfy the Palestinian Muslims in everything connected with their religion and thus to compensate for the negative features created by the pro-Zionist policy.

In the course of the 'twenties Amīn al-Ḥusayni succeeded in enhancing Jerusalem's status as a Holy Place for Islam. For this purpose he carried out an impressive reconstruction project in the two mosques of *al-Ḥaram al-Sharīf* and a systematic propaganda campaign on the danger threatening the Islamic Holy Places in Palestine from Zionism. He and the institution he headed constantly explained that Zionism aimed at restoring the glory of Solomon's Temple at the expense of the al-Aqṣā mosque and the Dome of the Rock. Jewish efforts to enforce their rights of worship at the Wailing Wall were represented as decisive proof of their far-reaching designs upon the entire *al-Ḥaram al-Sharīf* area. With the slogan of defending these mosques, Amīn al-Ḥusayni managed to imbue the masses with a sense of the Zionist threat, thus creating the basis for the development of the far more popular anti-Zionist movement of the 'thirties. In this way, too, the groundwork was laid for his rise to a position of primacy in the leadership of the Palestine Arabs from the beginning of the 'thirties onwards.

The Palestinian AE did not succeed in attaining its goal in the 'twenties. The pro-Zionist policy was approved by the various British Governments and continued to advance, although at a fairly modest rate. This failure, the rise of the opposition, which was more moderate in its attitude on British rule, and the deep crisis which the Zionist movement and the *yishuv* underwent in 1926-8 led the Palestinian national movement in 1928 to a new political path. Instead of absolutely rejecting cooperation with the Government in establishing self-governing institutions, the Seventh Palestinian Congress in June 1928 resolved upon a new policy aimed at attaining what had been rejected in 1923. The Palestinian AE opened negotiations with the HC with the aim of attaining some sort of representative council. As a result of these contacts it was decided by the HC on the one hand and Mūsā Kāzīm al-Ḥusayni and Rāghib al-Nashāshībi on the other to establish an appointed legislative council. It seemed as if the Palestinian movement was on the verge of a radical change in its methods of action—but the August 1929 riots, which broke out in the wake of processes noted above, put a brake on this development. Though

the HC tried even after the riots to effect the establishment of a legislative council, the blood-bath had supplied the opponents of this idea in the British Government with an excellent argument, and the HC's initiative was checked. While it is true that the August 1929 riots led to second thoughts in the British Government about the possibility of realizing Zionism in the face of firm Arab opposition, on the other hand they brought about the failure of the attempt by the Palestinian leadership to reach a settlement with the Government over setting up a legislative council and opened a new era in the relations between the Government and the Palestinian community.

However, the activity of the AE in the 'twenties should not be seen as a total failure. During this period the AE laid the foundations for the further struggle of the Palestinian Arabs against Zionism and the protection of the Arab character of the country. A well-argued ideology emerged, and foundations were laid for the political integration of the various elements comprising the Palestinian population: the various districts slowly resigned themselves to the prime position of the Jerusalem élite, the rural population made peace with the idea of political leadership by the urban élite, and large parts of the Christian community, the Greek-Orthodox in the main, came to see themselves as part of the Palestinian Arab people.



# Notes

## INTRODUCTION

### THE RELIGIOUS STATUS OF JERUSALEM AND PALESTINE IN MIEVIAL ISLAM

(pp. 1-4)

1. H. Z. Hirschberg, "Meqomah shel Yerushalayim ba-'Olam Ha-Muslemi", *Yerushalayim*, Vol. 2 (1949), pp. 55-60.
2. The Koran, 17, 1 (N. J. Dawood's translation).
3. See Note 1.
4. M. J. Kister, "You Shall Only Set Out for Three Mosques—A Study of an Early Tradition", *Le Muséon*, Vol. 82 (1969), pp. 173-4.
5. *Ibid.*
6. The Koran, 5, 21: "Enter, my people, the holy land which Allah has assigned for you. Do not turn back, or you shall be ruined" (N. J. Dawood's translation).
7. S. D. Goitein, "The Sanctity of Jerusalem and Palestine in Early Islam" in his *Studies in Islamic History and Institutions*, Leiden, 1966, pp. 135-48.
8. The discussion of the status of Jerusalem on the eve and during the Crusades is based on E. Sivan, "Le caractère sacré de Jerusalem dans l'Islam au XII-XIII siècles", *Studia Islamica*, Vol. 27 (1967), pp. 149-82 and his *L'Islam et la Croisade*, Paris, 1968, pp. 119-20.
9. In 1070 the Turkoman ruler Atsiz conquered Jerusalem from the Fatimides who, in their turn, recovered the city in 1098.
10. Sivan, *L'Islam et la Croisade*, p. 145 ff.
11. E. Ashtor, "Sefer 'Arvi 'al Shivḥey Yerushalayim", *Tarbitz*, Vol. 30 (1961), p. 209.
12. Hirschberg, *op. cit.*
13. See, for example, the boundaries of the Holy Land in Mujir al-Din, *Kitāb al-'Uns al-Jalil bi-Tārīkh al-Quds wa-al-Khalil*, Part 2, p. 430; Goitein, "The Sanctity of Jerusalem . . .", *op. cit.*; Sivan, "Le caractère . . .", *op. cit.*, and his book, *L'Islam et la Croisade*, *op. cit.*, pp. 63-5. It might well be the identification of *Shām* with the Holy Land sprang from the Koranic verse which mentioned the term Holy Land. This verse cited Moses' command to the Children of Israel to enter the Holy Land, a territory which had been defined in the Bible in an almost identical way with the Muslim definition of *Shām*. (For the Biblical definition see Genesis, 15, 18; Deuteronomy, 1, 7 and 11, 24; and Joshua, 1, 4.)
14. See sources mentioned in Note 8.

**FILASṬĪN AS AN ADMINISTRATIVE UNIT DURING MUSLIM  
HISTORY**  
(pp. 4-16)

1. See the maps in the *Hebrew Encyclopaedia*, Vol. 6, pp. 423 and 446 and Guy Le Strange, *Palestine under the Moslims* (rep. ed., Beirut, 1965), p. 26.
2. D. Sourdel, "Filasṭīn", *EP*<sup>3</sup>, Vol. 11, p. 911; Sivan, *L'Islam et la Croisade*, *op. cit.*, p. 64.
3. *Hebrew Encyclopaedia*, Vol. 6, p. 480. *ibid.*
4. Towards the end of the Mameluke period Mujīr al-Dīn described the sub-districts included in 'Arḍ Filasṭīn and gave the following names: Ashkelon, Gaza, Jerusalem, Jericho, Hebron, Nāblus; i.e. an area approaching that of the Roman *Palaestina Prima* and the *Jund Filasṭīn* of the Arab-Muslim conqueror (see Mujīr al-Dīn al Khanbali, *op. cit.*, pp. 422-3; B. Lewis, "Eretz-Israel ba-Yovel Ha-Rishōn la-Shilṭōn Ha-'Othmani 'al-pi Pinqesey Ha-Qaraq'ōt Ha-'Othmaniyyim" in H. Z. Hirschberg and B. Mazar (eds), *Eretz-Israel*, Vol. 4, 1956, p. 171.
5. Uriel Heyd, *Ottoman Documents on Palestine, 1552-1615*, London, 1960, pp. 41, 45, 47-8; U. Heyd, "Yehudey Eretz-Israel be-Sof Ha-Me'ah Ha-Yod-Zayin", *Yerushalayim*, Vol. 4 (1953), pp. 173-84; B. Lewis, in Hirschberg and Mazar, *op. cit.*, pp. 170-87.
6. Heyd, *Ottoman Documents . . .*, *op. cit.*, p. 39. Moshe Ma'oz, *Ottoman Reform in Syria and Palestine, 1840-1861*, London, 1968, pp. 33, 117; James Finn, *Stirring Times*, London, 1872, pp. 160-2.
7. Heyd, *Ottoman Documents . . .*, *op. cit.*, p. 42, 47; Heyd, "Yehudey Eretz-Israel . . .", *op. cit.*, p. 174; Itzhak Ben-Zvi, *Eretz Israel ve-Yishuva bi-Yimey Ha-Shilṭōn Ha-'Utmani*, Jerusalem, 1962, p. 185 (acc. Evlia Chelebi); Amnon Cohen, *Eretz Israel ba-Me'ah Ha-Shmoneh-'Esreh—Defusey Ha-Shilṭōn ve-Ha-Minhal*, Ph.D. thesis, Hebrew University, Jerusalem 1969, p. 145; Iḥsān al-Nimr, *Ta'rikh Jabal Nāblus wa-al-Balqā'*, Part II: *Akhwāl 'Ahd al-Iqtā'*, Nāblus, 1961, p. 120-2. For cases in which a *qādi* and not a *nā'ib* of the Jerusalem *qādi* resided in Nāblus see Heyd, *Ottoman Documents . . .*, *op. cit.*, pp. 118, 143. Iḥsān al-Nimr also speaks of this (see his book, Part II, p. 529). In the opinion of Ben-Zvi the annexation of additional areas into the sphere of jurisdiction of the Jerusalem *qādi* was dependent on his abilities (see Ben-Zvi, *op. cit.*, p. 85).
8. Yūsuf al-Ḥakīm, *Dhikriyyāt al-Ḥakīm*, Part I: *Sūriya wa-al-'Ahd al-'Uthmāni*, Beirut, 1968, p. 216.
9. Iḥsān al-Nimr, *op. cit.*, pp. 204-6, 527-8. In 1568, identical orders were sent to the *alāy beyis* of the *sanjaqs* of Palestine, Lebanon and Damascus regarding the recruitment of archers; the *alāy beyi* of Nāblus was the only one who did not receive such orders. It is very possible that this attests to the fact that in that period, command over the *alāys* of Nāblus and Jerusalem was in the hands of one man (see Heyd, *Ottoman Documents . . .*, *op. cit.*, p. 70).
10. The worship of tombs and saints in Palestine has been described in most interesting fashion by T. Canaan, *Mohammedan Saints and Sanctuaries in Palestine*, London, 1927.
11. Iḥsān al-Nimr, *op. cit.*, p. 330; T. Canaan, "Mohammedan Saints and Sanctuaries in Palestine", *Journal of Palestine Oriental Society*, Vol. 6 (1926), p. 117; Finn, *op. cit.*, pp. 204, 238.

12. Later I will return to the question of the social order.
13. Ihsān al-Nimr, *op. cit.*, pp. 404-5; R. A. S. Macalister and E. W. G. Masterman, "Occasional Papers on the Modern Inhabitants of Palestine", *Palestine Exploration Fund, Quarterly Statement* (hereinafter referred to as *PEFQS*), 1906, pp. 43-4.
14. On these Christian institutions see A. L. Tibawi, *British Interests in Palestine, 1800-1901*, London, 1961, pp. 48-57. James Finn defined, in the 1850s, the territory under the jurisdiction of the Orthodox Patriarchate of Jerusalem according to the Roman administrative division of Palestine: *Palaestina, Phoenicia* (corresponding to *Palaestina Secunda*), *Idumea and Arabia Petraea* (corresponding to *Palaestina Tertia*), (see Finn, *op. cit.*, p. 30).
15. *Filasṭīn*, 26.8.11, 13.3.12, 27.7.12, 25.1.13, 2.8.13. It should be noted that from the second half of the nineteenth century the term *Sūriya* was reintroduced as the name of the area which up until then had been known in Arab geography as *al-Shām* or *Barr al-Shām*.
16. Anonymous manuscript No. AP. Ar. 8° 46 in the National and University Library, Jerusalem, pp. 1, 51, 126, 142. Hālah al-Sakākini (ed.), *Kadhā Anā ya Dunyā; Yawmiyyāt Khalīl al-Sakākini*, Jerusalem, 1955, p. 90.
17. *Filasṭīn*, 12.7.13 and 2.8.13.
18. Exact details of these *nawāhi* and the families of sheikhs who ruled them are to be found in Muḥammad 'Izzat Darwaza, *Al-'Arab wa-al-'Urūbah min al-Qarn al-Thālith ḥatta al-Qarn al-Rābi' al-'Ashar al-Hijri*, Part 2, Damascus, 1959, pp. 132-291; Ihsān al-Nimr, *op. cit.*, pp. 183-6, 404-27; Macalister and Masterman, "Occasional Papers . . .", *PEFQS*, 1905, pp. 352-6; Macalister and Masterman, *ibid.*, 1906, pp. 35-7; Finn, *op. cit.*, pp. 226-43. See also Heyd, *Ottoman Documents . . .*, *op. cit.*, p. 67, 96 and Ma'oz, *op. cit.*, pp. 113-22.
19. Mrs. Finn, "The Fellaheen of Palestine", *PEFQS*, 1879, pp. 38-40.
20. Heyd, *Ottoman Documents . . .*, *op. cit.*, p. 99, Note 10.
21. Darwaza, *op. cit.*, p. 141.
22. Mrs. Finn, *op. cit.*, p. 39.
23. Macalister and Masterman, "Occasional Papers . . .", *PEFQS*, 1905, pp. 334, 345-6.
24. George E. Post, "Essays on the Sects and Nationalities of Syria and Palestine", *PEFQS*, 1891, pp. 107-17; S. Bergheim, "Land Tenure in Palestine", *PEFQS*, 1894, pp. 197-8.
25. G. Baer, "The Evolution of Private Ownership in Egypt and the Fertile Crescent", in C. Issawi (ed.), *The Economic History of the Middle East, 1800-1914*, Chicago, 1966, p. 82.
26. Gad Frumkin, *Derekh Shoṭeṭ bi-Yerushalayim*, Tel-Aviv, 1954, p. 110. On Frumkin's role in the Jerusalem District Administration, see p. 187 of his book.
27. Ihsān al-Nimr, *op. cit.*, pp. 261-2, states this unequivocally. See also Omar es-Saleh el-Barguthy, "Traces of the Feudal System in Palestine", *Journal of Palestine Oriental Society* (hereinafter referred to as *JPOS*), Vol. 9 (1929), p. 70.
28. Ma'oz, *op. cit.*, p. 117, 120, 121-2; Macalister and Masterman, "Occasional Papers . . .", *PEFQS*, 1906, pp. 46-50; Barguthy, *op. cit.*, p. 79.
29. Report of Beshwer, Assistant to the Director of Public Security, 18.1.21, Israel State Archives (hereinafter referred to as ISA), Archives of the Chief Secretary, File 157; the petition of some 150 notables to the

- Governor of Jerusalem regarding the appointment of the Mufti of Jerusalem, 21.3.21, *ibid.*, File 245.
30. Petition of protest of the *mukhtārs* of *nāhiyat* Bani-Zayd al-Shimāliyya to the Chief Secretary, 14.7.23, *ibid.*, File 158.
  31. Protocol of the meeting of the Committee for Collecting Contributions from the Villages, 25.11.29, ISA, AE, File 3098.
  32. A. H. Cohen, "Seder ha-Tahalukhōt bi-Yemei Nebi Mūsā, 22.4.32-29.4.32", Zionist Archives (hereinafter referred to as ZA), S/25, File 3070.
  33. A. Hourani, "The Fertile Crescent in the Eighteenth Century" in his *A Vision of History*, Beirut, 1961, pp. 35-70; Idem, "Ottoman Politics of Notables", in W. R. Polk and R. L. Chambers (eds), *Beginnings of Modernization in the Middle East*, Chicago, 1968, pp. 41-68.
  34. Ma'oz, *op. cit.*, pp. 34-8, 87-107.
  35. Shimon Shamir, "The Modernization of Syria: Problems and Solutions in the Early Period of 'Abdūlḥamid", in Polk and Chambers, *op. cit.*, pp. 351-82.
  36. Frumkin, *op. cit.*, p. 110; Iḥsān al-Nimr, *op. cit.*, p. 262.
  37. See previous note and M. Asaf, *Hir'orerut Ha-'Arvim be-Eretz Israel u-Vriḥatam*, Tel-Aviv, 1967, p. 37; Baer, in Issawi, *op. cit.*, pp. 80-90; Paul J. Klat, "The Origins of Land Ownership in Syria", *Middle East Economic Papers*, 1958, pp. 51-66. Lists of the big landowners in Palestine in the years 1918-20, which contain a large number of urban notables, are to be found in ZA, S/25, File 7433. See also A. Granovsky, *Ha-Mištar 'Ha-Qarqa'i be-Eretz-Israel*, Tel-Aviv, 1949, pp. 34-7, 50-62, 68-79.
  38. See biographical note in ZA, S/25, File 4022.
  39. A. H. Cohen, "Me'ora'ot November bi-Tzefōn ha-Aretz", 1.12.35, *ibid.*, File 4224.
  40. Ibrāhīm al-Sayyid 'Isā el-Miṣri, *Majma' al-'Athār al-'Arabiyyah*, Damascus, 1936, p. 124.
  41. *Mir'āt al-Sharq*, 12.5.27.
  42. See title page of As'ad al-Shuqayri's booklet, *Al-Risālah al-Marjū'ah ita Aṣḥāh al-Jalālah wa-al-sumuww Mulūk al-Muslimin wa-'Umarā'ihim wa-'Ūlī al-Ḥall wa'l-'Aqd*, Acre, 1936.
  43. *Al-Jāmi'ah al-'Arabiyya*, 26.3.34; Frumkin, *op. cit.*, p. 283.
  44. A list of candidates for the 1912 elections in the Jerusalem district is to be found in *Filasṭīn*, 10.2.12. The 4.5.12 issue of the paper reported the results of the elections.
  45. Iḥsān al-Nimr, *op. cit.*, p. 405.
  46. Frumkin, *op. cit.*, p. 282.
  47. *Ibid.*, p. 283; Geoffrey Furlonge, *Palestine is My Country—The Story of Musa Alami*, London, 1969, p. 29.
  48. Asher Druyanov, *Ketavim le-Toldōt Ḥibbat Tziōn*, Vol. 1, Odessa, 1919, p. 770; *Filasṭīn*, 31.1.12; Frumkin, *op. cit.*, p. 283.
  49. Druyanov, *op. cit.*, p. 769-70; Frumkin, *op. cit.*, p. 104.
  50. Iḥsān al-Nimr, *op. cit.*, p. 330; Canaan, *JPOS*, *op. cit.*, p. 117 ff.
  51. 'Abdallah Mukhliṣ and Ya'qūb Abu al-Hudā to the High Commissioner, 25.10.23; ISA, CS, File 189; *Mir'āt al-Sharq*, 7.6.24.
  52. *Filasṭīn*, 8.5.12.
  53. Frumkin, *op. cit.*, pp. 102, 285.
  54. Druyanov, *op. cit.*, p. 770. On other functionaries in the local administration drawn from the local nobility see Document No. 13, 1908, ISA, Archives of 'Ali Ekrem Bey (Governor of the *sanjaq* in 1906-8).

55. Finn, *op. cit.*, p. 180. See also p. 181.
56. Letter of 'Ali Ekrem Bey, Governor of Jerusalem District, to the Ministry of the Interior, Document No. 11, ISA, Archives of 'Ali Ekrem Bey.
57. *Filasṭīn*, 10.2.12.
58. See details of the affair, Iḥsān al-Nimr, *op. cit.*, pp. 417-26.
59. According to reports in ZA, L/4, File 276 IV.
60. The families of Abū-Khaḍrā', Shawā and Bayṭar of Gaza and Jaffa are prominent in the lists of big landowners in Palestine at the end of the second decade of the twentieth century, which are to be found in ZA, S/25, File 7422.
61. Ben-Zvi, *op. cit.*, p. 99.
62. Ma'oz, *op. cit.*, pp. 33, 122.
63. *Ibid.* An ordinary district governor was a pāshā with one or two *tūgh* (horse-tails) while the Governor of the Jerusalem district was a pāshā with three *tūgh*, known as a *mūshir*.
64. *Filasṭīn*, 28.5.13.

#### THE STRUCTURE OF THE PALESTINIAN POPULATION (pp. 16-20)

1. On the development of the Jewish population of Palestine during the nineteenth century see Ben-Zion Gat, *Ha-Yehudim be-Eretz-Israel, 1840-1881*, Jerusalem, 1962, especially pp. 21-2.
2. On the emergence of the modern Jewish community of Palestine see Alex Bein, *Toldōt Ha-Hityashvūt Ha-Ziōnit*, Tel-Aviv, 1954, especially pp. 115-17. See also Y. Slutsky and others, *Sefer Toldōt Ha-Haganah* (hereinafter referred to as *STH*), Book 1, Part 2, Tel-Aviv, 1959, pp. 957-60.
3. *Census of Palestine, 1931*, Summary (London, 1932). See also *Palestine Royal Commission, Memoranda submitted by the Government of Palestine, 1937*, pp. 1-2.
4. M. Asaf, *Ha-Yeḥasim Bein 'Aravim vi-Yehudim be-Eretz-Israel, 1860-1948*, Tel-Aviv, 1970, p. 141.
5. *STH*, *op. cit.*, Book 2, Part 1, Tel-Aviv, 1956, pp. 186-91.
6. *Palestine Royal Commission-Memoranda, op. cit.*, p. 16.
7. On the Jewish land purchases see Granovsky, *op. cit.*, pp. 250-78, especially p. 270.
8. A concise but useful description of the development of the Jewish National Home can be found in the Peel Report, 1937 (Cmd. 5479), pp. 113-25.
9. Asaf, *Ha-Yeḥasim . . .*, *op. cit.*, p. 131.
10. Y. Ben-Aryeh, "The Population of the Large Towns in Palestine during the First Eighty Years of the Nineteenth Century, According to Western Sources" (paper submitted to the *International Seminar on the History of Palestine and its Jewish Settlement during the Ottoman Period*, Jerusalem, July 1970), p. 29.
11. *Census of Palestine, 1931*, Summary, *op. cit.*
12. *Census of Palestine, 1931*, Vol. 2 (London, 1932), pp. 18-19.
13. Z. Abramovitch and I. Goelfat, *Ha-Mesheq Ha-'Aaravi*, Tel-Aviv, 1944, p. 9 (calculated on the basis of the 1931 census returns).
14. A. L. Tibawi, *Arab Education in Mandatory Palestine*, London, 1956, pp. 270-Γ. . .

15. The data on literacy were taken from: the *Census of Palestine, 1931*, Vol. 2, *op. cit.*, p. 110.

### POLITICAL TRENDS AMONG THE PALESTINIANS ON THE EVE OF THE FIRST WORLD WAR

(pp. 20-30)

1. It is not my intention to analyse the growth of Arab nationalism in general within the framework of this book.
2. C. E. Dawn, "The Rise of Atabism in Syria", *Middle East Journal*, Vol. 16 (1962), pp. 148-9. Dawn was referring to members of the Decentralization Party and the *al-'Ahd* and *al-Fatāh* societies.
3. We have drawn up our list according to Amīn Sa'īd, *Al-Thawrah al-'Arabiyyah al-Kubrā*, Cairo, 1934, Part 1, pp. 7, 8, 11, 46. Muḥammad 'Izzat Darwaza, *Ḥawla al-Ḥarakah al-'Arabiyyah al-Ḥadīthah*, Saida, 1950, Part 1, pp. 27, 30, 31, 33; Al-Qā'id Al-'Amm li'l-Jaysh al-Rābi', *'Idāhāt 'an al-Mas'āl al-Siyāsiyyah allati Jarra Tadqīqah bi-Diwān al-Ḥarb al-'Urḡi bi-'Āleyh*, Istanbul, 1916, pp. 49, 66, 119-21; *Al-Mu'tamar al-'Arabi al-'Awwal*, Cairo, 1913, pp. 4, 5, 15-16; Tawfiq 'Ali Barū, *Al-'Arab wa'l-Turk fi al-'Ahd al-Dustūri al-'Uthmāni*, Cairo, 1960, pp. 307-8, 310, 319, 321, 505. We have included three Palestinian Members of Parliament, who were prominent in their struggle for Arabs rights in the Empire, as well as the members of *Al-Muntadā al-'Adabi*. However members of the society *Al-'Ikhā al-'Arabi al-'Uthmāni* were not included because their society had adopted the Ottoman ideology and among its founders there had been those who had explicitly rejected the Arab nationalist movement.
4. Details of these telegrams are to be found in *Al-Mu'tamar al-'Arabi*, *op. cit.*, pp. 26, 122, 123, 164, 166-8, 188, 197, 199, 210.
5. Finn, *op. cit.*, p. 215.
6. N. Azouri, *Le Réveil de la Nation Arabe dans l'Asie Turque*, Paris, 1905.
7. Neville Mandel, "Turks, Arabs and Jewish Immigration into Palestine, 1882-1914", in A. Hourani (ed.), *St. Antony's Papers, No. 17—Middle Eastern Affairs, No. 4*, London, 1965, pp. 91-2. An extremely detailed study in Azouri's book is that of A. Ḥermōni, "Ha-Tenu'ah ha-'Arvit u-Megamoteha", *Ha-Shiloah*, Vol. 15 (1905), pp. 377-90.
8. See Furlong's book; *op. cit.*, pp. 30-3, 47, on the prevailing mood in the al-'Alami family.
9. M. Smilansky, "Moshvotenu be-'Eretz Israel", *Ha-Shiloah*, Vol. 26 (Shevat-Tammuz, 1912), p. 180.
10. 'Ali Ekrem Bey to the Minister of the Interior (no date). Document No. 3, ISA, 'Ali Ekrem Bey Archives.
11. Same to same, Document No. 11, *ibid.*
12. See Note 10.
13. Al-Qā'id Al-'Amm, *op. cit.*, pp. 119-21; *Filasṭīn*, 16.10.12.
14. *Filasṭīn*, 22.3.13.
15. P. Alsberg, "Ha-She'elah Ha-'Arvit bi-Mediniyūt Ha-Hanhalah Ha-Tziōnit lifney Miḥmet Olām Ha-Rishonah", *Shivat-Tziōn*, Vol. 4 (1955-6), p. 169; Arthur Ruppīn, *Pirkey Ḥayay*, Tel-Aviv, 1968, Vol. 2, p. 189.
16. Manuscript AP. Ar. 8° 46, pp. 13, 42, 48, 55, 64, 79, 126, 181; Palin Report, p. 5, F.O., 371/5121. See the balanced and intelligent report of Captain Brunton, the British Intelligence Officer, "The Effect of

- the "Sharifian Movement on the Military Situation in Palestine" Jerusalem, 23.2.21, ISA, CS, File 163.
17. In his memoirs, Jemal Pasha did not mention any activities hostile to the Turks carried out in Palestine, and spoke only of Beirut in this context, stressing the loyalty of the Jerusalemites to the Jihad appeal and to the Ottoman Empire. (See Jemal-Pasha, *Memoirs of a Turkish Statesman, 1913-19*, New-York, 1922, pp. 206-7.)
  18. Tawfiq Barū, *op. cit.*, pp. 376, 379, 508, 543; *Al-Karmil*, 22.10.24, 25.10.24.
  19. Tawfiq Barū, *op. cit.*, p. 541; *Filasṭin*, 24.5.13.
  20. *Filasṭin*, 13.3.12, 23.3.12, 17.4.12, 21.9.12, 5.10.12, 16.10.12, 20.11.12, 28.12.12, 25.1.13, 12.2.13, 3.5.13, 24.5.13, 13.8.13.
  21. *Ibid.*, 19.4.13.
  22. Details of these affairs can be found in Asaf, pp. 13-15, 16; Mandel, *op. cit.*, pp. 84-5; *STH*, *op. cit.*, Book 1, Part 1, pp. 93-110; Druyanov, *op. cit.*, pp. 670-1, 763-4; A. Cohen, *Yisrael ve-Ha-'Olām Ha-'Arvi Merhavia*, 1964, pp. 68-9.
  23. Draft of 'Ali Ekrem's cable to the Office of *Sheikh 'ul-Islām*, 7.7.1907, ISA, Archives of 'Ali Ekrem Bey. See also evidence of H. M. Kalvarisky, who was then engaged in settlement activities in Galilee (H. M. Kalvarisky, "Ha-Yehasim Ben Ha-Yehudim ve-Ha-'Arawim lifney Ha-Milhamah", *She'ifotenu*, Vol. 2 (1931), p. 54).
  24. *Ha-'Or*, 27th of *Nisan*, 1891; Mandel, *op. cit.*, p. 86.
  25. Mandel, *op. cit.*, pp. 89-90.
  26. Azouri, *op. cit.*, p. 5 of Preface (quoted in A. Hourani, *Arabic Thought in the Liberal Age*, London, 1962, p. 279 and Mandel, *op. cit.*, pp. 91-2).
  27. While he was Governor of the Jerusalem District, 'Ali Ekrem Bey did his best to carry out governmental orders regarding the prevention of Jewish immigration to his district. The material in his archives does not include a single piece of evidence to the effect that he was under pressure from the local inhabitants to carry out this policy. His motives were those of loyalty to the Ottoman Empire and his apprehensions were directed against the creation of a new minority problem in the Empire.
  28. Short summary in Asaf, pp. 46-7. See also Mandel, *op. cit.*, p. 92, 94. On the development of the Arabic press in Palestine, see article by N. Malul, "Ha-'Itönüt Ha-'Arvit be-Eretz-Israel", in D. A. Tzifroni and others (eds), *Sefer Ha-Shanah Shel Eretz-Israel*, Vol. 1 (1923), pp. 274-6. See also Y. Yehoshua, "Tel-Aviv bi-Re'i Ha-'Itönüt Ha-'Arvit be-Hamesh Ha-Shanim Ha-Rishönöt le-Hivasadah", *Ha-Mizräh He-Hadash*, Vol. 19 (1969), pp. 218-27.
  29. Kalvarisky, *op. cit.*, p. 54.
  30. *Filasṭin*, 16.9.11, 25.1.13.
  31. *Ibid.*, 9.7.13.
  32. Mandel, *op. cit.*, pp. 94-7; Y. Ben-Hananyah, "Sifrut 'Arvit 'Anti-Tzionit", *Ha-Shiloah*, Vol. 43 (1925), pp. 273-4.
  33. Some of their declarations appear in *Ha-Ahdüt*, 25 Adar 1911, 28 'Iyar 1911, 5 Sivan 1911. See also Alsberg, *op. cit.*, p. 168; Tawfiq Barū, *op. cit.*, pp. 282-3.
  34. *Ha-Herüt*, 30.3.14.
  35. Asaf, p. 55.
  36. Alsberg, *op. cit.*, p. 175.
  37. See article of Sheikh Sulaymān al-Tāji al-Fārūqi on the dispute between

- the settlement of Rehovot and the village of Zarnuqa, *Filasfin*, 30.8.13; Kalvarisky, *op. cit.*, pp. 53-4.
38. *Filasfin*, 9.2.13.
  39. *Ibid.*, 28.5.13.
  40. Mandel, *op. cit.*, p. 93.
  41. Sakākīni, *Kadhā Anā*, *op. cit.*, pp. 63-65.
  42. Manuscript AP. Ar. 8° 46, p. 29. It should be noted that this is the only place in the diary in which Zionism is mentioned.
  43. *Filasfin*, 29.5.12.
  44. *Filasfin*, 20.11.12, 28.12.12.
  45. Tawfiq Barū, *op. cit.*, pp. 282-4; Mandel, *op. cit.*, pp. 95-6, 97-8; *Filasfin*, 25.10.13.
  46. *Ha-Ḥerūt*, 2 of *Heshvan*, 1910.
  47. *Ha-Pō'el ha-Tza'ir*, 4 of *Elul*, 1911; *Ha-Ḥerūt*, 23 *Tammuz*, 1911.
  48. *Filasfin*, 20.9.11.
  49. Y. Yehoshua', *op. cit.*
  50. *Filasfin*, 12.7.13, 2.8.13; Mandel, *op. cit.*, p. 101.
  51. Muḥammad el-Qalqīli, Editor of *Kawkab*, to General Allenby, 29.9.18, PRO, FO, 882/14.
  52. *Filasfin*, 27.7.12, 1.8.12, 3.5.13.
  53. *Ibid.*, 22.10.13, 25.10.13.
  54. Which contains the two following verses: "How can we rest when the meanest and lowest of nations is competing with us in our country, Jews who are not proud, but who have all the money in their hands" (*Filasfin*, 8.11.13).
  55. Alsberg, *op. cit.*, p. 165; *STH*, *op. cit.*, Book 1, Part 1, pp. 225-7; Tawfiq Barū, *op. cit.*, pp. 282-4.
  56. N. Malūl, "Ha-'Itōnūt Ha-'Arvīt", *Ha-Shiloah*, Vol. 31, pp. 439-50.

## CHAPTER ONE

### THE ANTI-ZIONIST AWAKENING AT THE END OF THE FIRST WORLD WAR AND ITS CAUSES

(pp. 31-39)

1. G. F. Clayton [Chief Political Officer, Egyptian Expeditionary Force] to M. Sykes, 4.2.18, FO 371/3398; Dr. C. Weizmann to W. Ormsby-Gore [Liaison Officer between the military authorities and the Zionist Commission], 16.4.18, *ibid.*
2. Clayton's Report, 9.3.18, FO 371/3391. Annex No. 69, ZA, Z/4, File 4113. Clayton to Sykes (including report from 15.6.18), No. 61, 20.9.18, FO 800/221. Ormsby-Gore, "Report on the Political Situation in Palestine", 16.8.18, FO 371/3389.
3. Weizmann to Ormsby-Gore, 16.4.18, *ibid.*, 3398; Sykes to Picot (including article sent to the daily *Al-Mustaqbal*), 7.9.18, *ibid.*, 3388; Clayton's Report, 27.5.18, *ibid.*, 3383.
4. Clayton's Report (including report by Ronald Storrs, Military Governor of Jerusalem), No. 415 A, *ibid.*, 3385; Clayton to the Foreign Office (including a letter from Storrs to the Headquarters), 6.12.18, No. 2611 A, *ibid.*, 3386. The Protest submitted by the MCA, ISA, CS, 140.
5. Jaffa MCA to Clayton, 2.11.18, *ibid.*
6. Frumkin, *op. cit.*, p. 219.
7. See sources in previous notes.
8. ZA, L/4, 2761V. HA, Shneerson's files, No. 5.

9. Eliyahu Elath, *Ḥājj Muḥammad Amin al-Ḥusayni—Mufti Yerushalayim Leshe'avar*, Tel-Aviv, 1968, p. 22. Certainly he meant the military authorities of OETA(S) and not the Palestine Government, which had only been established in July 1920.
10. Lieut.-Col. I. E. Hubbard to OETA Headquarters, 20.11.18, ISA, CS, 140.
11. Maj.-Gen. H. D. Watson [Chief Administrator of OETA(S)] to Chief Political Officer [Col. Meinertzhagen from September 1919], 26.9.19, *ibid.*
12. These statutes can be found in ISA, AE, 1787; English translation in ISA, CS, 156.
13. R. Storrs to OETA Headquarters, No. 2611A, 21.11.18, FO 371/3386. It should be remembered that Mūsā Kāzīm al-Ḥusayni was appointed as Mayor by the British Military Governor in March 1918 upon the death of his predecessor and brother, Ḥusayn al-Ḥusayni.
14. Short Report on the Palestinian Arab Congress, ZA, L/4, 276 II b. Enclosure to a report of 5th February, on the future of Palestine, 10.2.19, ISA, CS, 156. Report on the demonstrations, 27.2.20, ZA, Z/4, 1366.
15. See ISA, CS, 140 and 156. The content of these petitions will be discussed later on.
16. *Do'ar Ha-Yōm*, 7.6.20 (citing Damascene press).
17. Maktab al-Lajnah al-Tanfīdiyyah al-'Arabiyyah, *Bayān 'Alā al-Kitāb al-Abyaḍ* (Jerusalem, 1930), p. 3. Perhaps Herbert Samuel had not precisely said what was later attributed to him, but this was the version that was current among the Arabs who believed in its truthfulness.
18. Memorandum to the League of Nations, 1922, ISA, AE, 1810.
19. President of Jaffa MCA to Clayton, 2.11.18, ISA, CS, 140.
20. Frumkin, *op. cit.*, p. 209.
21. Clayton to Sykes, 4.12.18, FO 371/3398.
22. Clayton to Sykes, 15.6.18, FO 800/221.
23. Storrs to OETA Hq., 19.11.18, FO 371/3386.
24. Sykes' Report, 15.11.18, *ibid.* See also Sakākīni's view regarding "the arrogance and impudence of the Jews" (Sakākīni, *Kadhā Anā, op. cit.*, p. 170).
25. *STH, op. cit.*, Book 1, Part 2, p. 549.
26. Frumkin, *op. cit.*, pp. 205-6.
27. Palin Report (the report of the Military Court of Inquiry appointed to investigate the circumstances of April 1920 disturbances in Jerusalem), pp. 26-8, FO 371/5121.
28. Frumkin, *op. cit.*, p. 120. Frumkin spoke of policemen and not clerks, but the Arabs' protests dealt with clerks and perhaps this was their belief.
29. *Ibid.*, p. 203.
30. Petition of Haifa Arabs to the Peace Conference which was submitted to Haifa Governor, 20.11.19, ISA, CS, 140; To Chief Administrator of OETA, 6.4.20, *ibid.* The Arabs were forbidden to hoist the Arab flag, since it was an official state flag (of the Kingdom of Hejaz). The Zionist flag, on the other hand, was not an official flag.
31. "Protest of Nazareth and its villages", 20.3.20, ISA, CS, 30.
32. Clayton to Sykes, 15.6.18, FO 800/221. This view became the backbone of the Palin Report and was accepted by later commissions of inquiries. (See, for example, Haycraft Report, Cmd. 1540, pp. 54-5).

33. Report by Muḥammad 'Ali al-Qalqīli, the Editor of *al-Kawkab*, to Wingate and Allenby, 29.9.18, FO 882/14. "Report on the Situation in Palestine" submitted by the AE to Winston Churchill, 28.3.21, ISA, AE, 1026. Fayṣal too was of the opinion that the anti-Zionist attitude had resulted from Turkish propaganda (see note on his meeting with Weizmann at the Carlton Hotel in London on 11.12.18, ZA, Z/4, 56).
34. The leaders of the Jewish community regarded this consideration as the main reason for the anti-Zionist attitude of the Arabs.
35. Sakākīni, *Kadhā Anā*, *op. cit.*, p. 171.
36. Clayton to Sykes, 15.6.18, FO 800/221.
37. Palin Report, pp. 36 and 37, FO 371/5121. This report is in itself the best proof for the cleavage which developed between the Military Administration and the Zionist Commission and for the anti-Zionist attitude of members of this Administration.
38. Clayton's letter, 6.12.18, FO 371/3386.
39. Gen. Watson to CPO, 24.9.19, ISA, CS, 140.
40. Miss F. Newton to Col. Waters-Taylor [Chief of Staff, OETA(S)], 25.4.20 (including a note on a conversation held with the leaders of the MCA), *ibid.*, 156; Petition of Nāblus MCA, included in Nāblus Governor to OETA(S) Hq., 29.1.20, *ibid.*, 140. Sakākīni, *Kadhā Anā*, *op. cit.*, pp. 174-5.
41. K. Cornwallis [Director of the British "Arab Bureau"] to Lieut.-Col. S. Symes, 20.4.18, ZA, Z/4, 483. Ormsby-Gore to Clayton, 12.4.18, ISA, CS, 36.
42. Storrs to OETA Hq., 4.11.18, ISA, CS, 140.
43. Frumkin tells in his book about another attempt in 1919 by H. M. Kalvarisky to reach a rapprochement with the Arabs (see Frumkin, *op. cit.*, pp. 219-21 and ZA, 199/A, 45).
44. For these petitions see ISA, CS, 30.
45. See his cable to Herbert Samuel, *ibid.*

### THE PALESTINIAN-ARAB IDEOLOGY

(pp. 39-63)

1. Memorandum to the League of Nations, 1922, ISA, AE, 1810.
2. Palestinian Delegation (hereinafter referred to as PD) to the Colonial Secretary, 17.6.22, Cmd. 1700, 1922.
3. *Al-Quds al-Sharif*, 8.7.20.
4. *Bayt al-Maqdis*, 16.3.21.
5. See Note 1.
6. See, for example, "The Present Situation of Palestine", ISA, AE, 3046; the memorandum submitted to Winston Churchill on 12.3.21, *ibid.*, 1026. Petition of Jaffa, 18.11.18, ISA, CS, 140.
7. Clayton's Report, 6.12.18, FO 371/3386. Palin Report, p. 16, FO 371/5121 states that the number of the population in OETA(S) was about 647,250.
8. Jaffa's protest to Clayton, 2.11.18, ISA, CS, 140; Jaffa's protest, December 1919, *ibid.*; Memorandum by the MCA Congress in Jerusalem to the Peace Conference, 3.2.19, *ibid.*, 156; Safed's protest, 12.3.19, *ibid.*, 30; Report of OETA(S) Hq. (including protest in the name of the "inhabitants of Palestine"), 28.2.20, *ibid.*
9. Jaffa's protest, 16.11.18, *ibid.*, 140. Declaration of the PD, 12.8.21, ISA, AE, 1026.

10. Memorandum of the PD, 26.4.22, *ibid.*, 1810; Memorandum of the PD to the Lausanne Conference, 28.11.22, *ibid.*, 1541.
11. Jerusalem's petition to the CA, 3.11.18, ISA, CS, 140; Jaffa's protest to Clayton, 2.11.18, *ibid.*
12. See Note 10.
13. Memorandum of the MCA Congress in Jerusalem to the Peace Conference, 3.2.19, ISA, CS, 156; Protest of the inhabitants of Ramleh and Lydda, March 1920, *ibid.*, 30.
14. PD to the Colonial Secretary, 17.6.22, Cmd. 1700, 1922.
15. "Declaration to the Civilised World", March 1921, ISA, AE, 1026. Acre's protest, 11.3.20, ISA, CS, 30.
16. Protest of the inhabitants of Palestine, March 1920, *ibid.* Report on the demonstrations in Jerusalem held on 27.2.20, ZA, Z/4, 1366.
17. *Al-Karmil*, 25.12.20. "Report on the Situation in Palestine" submitted to Winston Churchill, 28.3.21, ISA, AE, 1026. Jaffa's protest, 16.11.18, ISA, CS, 140; Nāblus' protest, January 1920, *ibid.* Memorandum submitted by the PD to the Lausanne Conference, 18.11.22, ISA, AE, 1541. "The Resolutions of the Representatives of Palestine or Southern Syria which were sent to the Peace Conference", 5.2.19, ISA, CS, 156. On these promises and the motive for giving them see Elie Kedourie, *Nationalism*, New York, 1962, p. 123 ff.
18. ISA, AE, 1232. In the next chapter we shall further deal with this declaration.
19. MCA to OETA(S), 19.2.19, ISA, CS, 156; Protest of Jerusalem MCA, 18.9.19, *ibid.*, 140; Nāblus' protest included in Governor of Nāblus to OETA(S) Hq., 29.1.20, *ibid.* Memorandum to the League of Nations, 1922, ISA, AE, 180; Memorandum of the PD, 26.4.22, *ibid.* Peel Report, p. 107.
20. Memorandum to the League of Nations, 1922, ISA, AE, 1810; Report on the Situation of Palestine submitted to Churchill, 28.3.21, *ibid.*, 1026. See also the numerous protests in ISA, CS, 30.
21. Great Britain, Foreign Office, *The Covenant of the League of Nations*, London, 1935.
22. Memorandum to the League of Nations, 1922, ISA, AE, 1810.
23. Memorandum of the PD to the Lausanne Conference, 28.11.22, *ibid.*, 1541. The PD to the Colonial Secretary, 21.2.22, Cmd. 1700, 1922. Memorandum of the AE to the League of Nations, 12.4.25, ISA, CS, 176. Peel Report, p. 108. Mogannan, *The Arab Woman and the Palestinian Question*, London, 1937, p. 128 ff.
24. J. Shuckburgh to the PD, 1.3.22, Cmd. 1700, 1922.
25. The PD to the Colonial Secretary, 16.3.22, *ibid.*
26. Especially in July 1922 upon the ratification of the Mandate by the League of Nations and the failure of the talks between the PD and the Colonial Office.
27. See Wadī' al-Bustāni, *Al-Intidāb al-Filasṭīni Bāṭil wa-Muḥāl*, Beirut, 1936.
28. Report on the situation of Palestine, 1922, ISA, AE, 3357; Memorandum submitted to Churchill, 22.8.21, *ibid.*, 1026.
29. G. Antonius, *The Arab Awakening*, London, 1961, pp. 176-83.
30. McMahon to Ḥusayn, 24.10.15, Cmd. 5957, 1939.
31. The PD to Stanley Baldwin, 2nd enclosure, 12.9.23, ISA, SMC, 2671. PD to the Colonial Secretary, 17.6.22, Cmd. 1700, 1922.
32. M. Vereté, "Ha-Masa u-Matan Ha-Tzioni-'Arvi be-Aviv 1919 ve-Ha-Medinyūt Ha-Anglit", *Tziōn*, Vol. 32, (1967, 1-2), pp. 90-1.

33. McMahon and Clayton claimed that Palestine had not been promised to the Arabs. (See J. Shuckburgh to Herbert Samuel, 7.11.22 and H. Samuel to Lord Grey, 12.4.23, ISA, Samuel Papers). The authors of the Palin Report, an extremely anti-Zionist document, were of the same view (see Palin Report, pp. 6 and 7, FO 371/5121). Lord Balfour, still Foreign Secretary, thought that the formula was vague and one could not know the territorial frame of the formula (*BD*, IV, pp. 343 and 344). Lord Curzon was not convinced by MacMahon's view of 1922 that Palestine had not been promised to the Arabs (see the documents of the special Cabinet Committee on Palestine, 1923, Cab. 27/228). Other people too in the Foreign Office were not convinced (see R. C. Lindsay to J. Shuckburgh, 19.2.23, CO 733/55). After many years of painstaking research the Foreign Office regarded the question as doubtful (see CO 733/189, File 77121). On the other hand, Toynbee and M. Sykes thought at the time of the First World War that Palestine had been included in the area promised to Ḥusayn (see previous source and two memoranda: the first of 5.11.18, FO 371/3384 and the second [undated], FO 371/3611). Most impressive is the fact that McMahon himself wrote on 26.10.15, i.e. two days after writing his famous letter to Ḥusayn, that from the areas promised had only been excluded "portions on the Northern Coast of Syria" (see McMahon to the Foreign Office, 26.10.15, 371/2486). These references are only a small part of the vast material pertaining to this notorious debate, which can be found in the British official records. Two scholarly, but diametrically opposing, views are: A. L. Tibawi, *A Modern History of Syria Including Lebanon and Palestine*, London, 1969, Ch. 8, and I. Friedman, "The McMahon-Hussein Correspondence and the Question of Palestine", *Journal of Contemporary History*, Vol. 5, No. 2 (1970), pp. 83-122.
34. The Third Congress to the HC, 18.12.20, ISA, CS, 244. Memorandum of PD, 26.4.22, ISA, AE, 1810; Memorandum of PD to Lausanne Conference, 28.11.22, *ibid.*, 1541; AE report to the Fourth Congress, *ibid.*, 3046. Note on a conversation between L. I. Amery and PD, 21.4.25, ISA, CS, 136.
35. *Al-Karmil*, 25.10.20.
36. Memorandum to the League of Nations, 1922, ISA, AE, 1810. Moganam, *op. cit.*, p. 112. Report on the situation of Palestine, submitted to Churchill, 28.3.21, *ibid.*, 1026. 'Isā Al-Sifri, *Filasṭīn al-'Arabiyyah bayna al-Intidāb wa-al-Ṣahyūniyyah*, Jaffa, 1937, p. 103, regards McMahon's letter as Anglo-Arab Covenant (*Mithāq Inglizi-'Arabi*).
37. Shamir, in Polk and Chambers, *op. cit.*, pp. 296-7, 300.
38. See Note 35.
39. Palin Report, pp. 6-7, FO 371/5121.
40. B. Joseph, *Ha-Shilṭōn Ha-Briti be-Eretz-Israel*, Jerusalem, 1948, pp. 21-5.
41. Fayṣal to Herbert Samuel, 10.12.19, ISA, Samuel Papers. Same to same, 23.11.19, ZA, Z/4, 25001; Fayṣal to Dr. S. Levin, 3.11.19, *ibid.*; Fayṣal to F. Frankfurter, 1.3.19, *ibid.* The Arab spokesmen have for many years denied the existence of this last letter and claimed it was a Zionist forgery. Some years ago the original letter was found in a forgotten file in the old offices of the Zionist Organization in London and was deposited in the ZA in Jerusalem. One could claim that Fayṣal was not too aware of the contents of this letter since it had been written in English by T. E. Lawrence and Fayṣal only signed it.

- But in a later letter Frankfurter explained that at their meeting Fayṣal had expressed his support for the Zionist programme and for Frankfurter's views concerning Jewish-Arab cooperation. Frankfurter explicitly stated that, although Fayṣal's letter to him had been written by Lawrence, it had summarized Fayṣal's views expressed at their meeting (see Frankfurter to M. Weisgal, 3.12.29, ZA, S/25, 3142).
42. *BD*, IV, pp. 411–12, 413–19, 424–5, 440, 441 and 442. These documents expose very clearly the deep confusion which prevailed among the Hashemite Princes concerning "McMahon's promises".
  43. "British Policy in Palestine", 3.6.22, Cmd. 1700, 1922.
  44. *Al-Karmil*, 25.12.20.
  45. Memorandum of MCA Congress in Jerusalem to the Peace Conference, 3.2.19, ISA, CS, 156. Report on the situation of Palestine, submitted to Churchill, 28.3.21, ISA, AE, 1026.
  46. *Al-Karmil*, 15.6.21.
  47. Nāblus' protest, 23.1.20, ISA, CS, 140.
  48. ISA, AE, 1026.
  49. Protest of Ramleh and Lydda, March 1920, ISA, CS, 30.
  50. Declaration to the Arab Nation, 1920, ZA, Z/4, 2800 II.
  51. Haifa Protest, 15.12.19, ISA, CS, 140.
  52. *Al-Karmil*, 15.6.21. PD to the Colonial Secretary, 16.3.22, Cmd. 1700, 1922.
  53. For the Mandate for Syria and Lebanon see League of Nations, *Official Journal*, August 1922, pp. 1013–17.
  54. For the Palestine Mandate see Harry C. Luke and E. Keith-Roach, *The Handbook of Palestine*, London, 1922, pp. 280–90.
  55. On the tense relations between the Zionist Commission and the Military Administration see Ronald Storrs, *The Memoirs of Sir Ronald Storrs*, New York, 1937, pp. 323 ff. and 439–44 and Palin Report, FO 371/5121.
  56. Memorandum of the PD, 26.4.22, ISA, AE, 1810; Memorandum of the PD to Lausanne Conference, 28.11.22, *ibid.*, 1541. Note on a conversation with 'Abd al-Qādir al-Muẓaffar and Jamāl al-Ḥusayni, 21.2.23, ISA, CS, 158.
  57. Memorandum of MCA Congress in Jerusalem to the Peace Conference, 3.2.19, ISA, CS, 156.
  58. Report on the situation of Palestine, submitted to Churchill, 28.3.21, ISA, AE, 1026; Memorandum to the League of Nations, 1922, *ibid.*, 1810. Mogannan, *op. cit.*, pp. 130–4.
  59. PD to the Colonial Secretary, 16.3.22, Cmd. 1700, 1922. AE memorandum to the League of Nations, April 1925, ISA, CS, 176.
  60. Memorandum to the League of Nations, 1922, ISA, AE, 1810.
  61. See Cmd. 1700, 1922.
  62. Report on the situation of Palestine, submitted to Churchill, 28.3.21, ISA, AE, 1026; AE reply to Herbert Samuel's announcement of 3rd June 1921, *ibid.*; PD announcement to Churchill, 12.8.21, *ibid.*; PD memorandum to Lausanne Conference, 28.11.22, *ibid.*, 1541.
  63. Report on the situation of Palestine, submitted to Churchill, 28.3.21, *ibid.*, 1026; AE reply to Samuel's announcement of 3.6.21, *ibid.* This argument was far from being true. Although the position of Jews in the Muslim world was better than in the Christian one, it had nothing to do with equality or the like (see Goitein, *op. cit.*, pp. 62–89 and Ma'oz, *op. cit.*, p. 189 ff. on the nineteenth century).
  64. PD to the Colonial Secretary, 17.6.22, Cmd., 1700, 1922.

65. Note on a conversation at the home of Dr. Ticho (a well-known Jewish physician in Jerusalem), 13.7.23, ZA, S/25, 518. Al-Ḥājj Amin al-Ḥusayni's letter to *The Near East and India*, 31.10.29.
66. Kalvarisky to the Zionist Executive, including report on a conversation with Jamāl al-Ḥusayni, 17.7.23, ZA, S/25, 4380.
67. This claim was widely circulated because of a parallel Zionist claim. The Zionist movement and especially its socialist faction could not believe that the implementation of its ideals might be in contradiction to the national ideals of another people. Nevertheless, when the conflict between the aims of both sides did emerge the Zionists preferred to claim that the Mandatory Government was to be blamed, since it pursued a policy of "divide and rule". In such a way the British Government in Palestine became the scapegoat—both sides, from different motives, were inclined to put the blame on it.
68. Memorandum of MCA Congress in Jerusalem to the Peace Conference, 3.2.19, ISA, CS, 156. Report on the situation of Palestine, submitted to Churchill, 28.3.21, ISA, AE, 1026.
69. Last source in previous note. AE report to the Fourth Congress, May 1921, *ibid.*, 3046. AE memorandum to the League of Nations, 12.4.25, ISA, CS, 176. This claim is completely baseless; Jewish rule endured for 1,250 years; most of the Muslim rulers of Palestine were Mamelukes and Ottomans, not Arabs; and the Muslim period of Palestinian history was anything but peaceful. One has only to remember the perennial wars between the *Qays* and *Yaman* factions, and the endless intrusions of the Bedouins.
70. Jerusalem protest to the CA, 3.11.18, ISA, CS, 140; Jaffa protest, 16.11.18, *ibid.*; Memorandum of MCA Congress in Jerusalem to the Peace Conference, 3.2.19, *ibid.*, 156.
71. Report on the situation of Palestine, submitted to the League of Nations, ISA, AE, 3357. Report on the Situation of Palestine, submitted to Churchill, 28.3.21, *ibid.*, 1026. Note on a conversation held at Dr. Ticho's home, 13.7.23, ZA, S/25, 518.
72. AE memorandum to the League of Nations, 12.4.25, ISA, CS, 176.
73. PD memorandum, 31.7.23, ISA, AE, 1541.
74. AE to the Government, 14.9.25, ISA, CS, 177. Same to same, 3.10.25 and 25.10.25, ISA, AE, 3076.
75. The Arabic press of Palestine from those years is full of such arguments.
76. AE memorandum to the League of Nations, 12.4.25, ISA, CS, 176.
77. Report on the situation of Palestine, submitted to Churchill, 28.3.21, ISA, AE, 1026.
78. 'Izzat Darwaza to the AE, including announcement by the people of Nāblus, 3.8.22, *ibid.*, 1072. Report on a discussion held by Arab notables of Tiberias, 8.9.21, ZA, Z/4, 2800I. Jaffa protest, December 1919, ISA, CS, 140. An appeal by 'Umar al-Bayṭār, President of Jaffa Chamber of Commerce, to the British Nation [beginning of 1920], *ibid.*, 156.
79. Report on the situation of Palestine, submitted to Churchill, 28.3.21, ISA, AE, 1026.
80. Open Letter to the League of Nations, 25.10.19, ISA, CS, 140.
81. AE report to the Fourth Congress, May 1921, ISA, AE, 3046; Report on the situation of Palestine, submitted to Churchill, 28.3.21, *ibid.*, 1026; Declaration to the Civilized World, May 1921, *ibid.* PD to Baldwin, 12.9.23, ISA, SMC, 2671.

82. *Bayt al-Maqdis*, 19.5.21.
83. Herbert Samuel to the Colonial Secretary, including Jenin protest, No. 141, 6.6.21, CO 733/3.
84. PD to the Colonial Secretary, 21.2.22, Cmd. 1700, 1922.
85. HC to the Colonial Secretary, secret dispatch I, 7.12.35, Enclosure No. 1, CO 733/278, File 75156, Part 1.
86. On the history of this book see Philip Graves, *Palestine, the Land of Three Faiths*, London, 1923, Ch. 9 and especially Norman Cohn, *Warrant to Genocide*, London, 1970 pp. 167 ff.
87. Report on the situation of Palestine, submitted to Churchill, 28.3.21, ISA, AE, 1026. Nāblus protest, 29.1.20, ISA, CS, 140.
88. Acre protest, 11.3.20, *ibid.*, 30; Gaza protest, *ibid.* Report on the situation of Palestine, February 1922, ISA, AE, 3046.
89. To the Governor of Jaffa, 12.9.19, ISA, CS, 140.
90. Open Letter to the League of Nations, 25.10.19, *ibid.*; Ṭul-Karm protest to OETA(S) Hq., 6.12.19, *ibid.*, 156.
91. Report on the situation of Palestine, February 1922, ISA, AE, 3046.
92. HC to the Colonial Secretary, secret dispatch I, 7.12.35, Enclosure No. 1, CO 733/278, File 75156, Part 1.
93. Al-Sifri, *op. cit.*, p. 175.
94. This question was thoroughly dealt with in Y. Harkabi, *Arab Attitudes to Israel*, Jerusalem, 1972, and Vallentine Mitchell, London, 1973, pp. 263–70.
95. The Koran, 2, 61 (translation by N. J. Dawood).
96. ‘Izzat Darwaza to the AE, 3.8.22, ISA, AE, 1072.
97. Jerusalem protest to the CA, 3.11.18, ISA, CS, 140.
98. Antonius, *op. cit.*, p. 440.
99. His name was Yosef Lanyado (see Darwaza, *Ḥawla al-Ḥarakah . . .*, *op. cit.*, Vol. 1, p. 98; Yūsuf al-Ḥakīm, *Dhikriyyāt al-Ḥakīm*, Part 3, *Sūriya wa-al-‘Ahd al-Fayṣali*, Beirut, 1968, p. 91).
100. Memorandum of MCA Congress in Jerusalem to the Peace Conference, 3.2.19, ISA, CS, 156.
101. Protest of Nazareth and its villages, 20.3.20, *ibid.*, 30.
102. *STH*, *op. cit.*, Book 2, Part 1, pp. 251–2.
103. Report No. 37, 17.4.20, ZA, Z/4, 2800 II; Kalvarisky to the Zionist Executive in London, 26.4.23, *ibid.*, 1392 II. It may be noted here that the first PD claimed in summer 1921 to represent the Sephardi Jewry of Palestine as well, but all the organs of the Sephardi community immediately denied it (see the exchange of cables in this respect from August 1921 between the Zionist Executive in London and the Zionist Commission in Jerusalem, ZA, Z/4, 1250).
104. *STH*, *op. cit.*, Book 1, Part 2, pp. 603–7 and Haycraft Report.
105. Governor of Galilee to OETA(S), 24.3.20, ISA, CS, 30.

#### THE REALITY OF ANTI-ZIONIST IDEOLOGY

(pp. 64–69)

1. Moslem-Christian delegation from Palestine [memorandum by the Middle East Department], 23.7.21, CO 733/13.
2. Protocol of a conversation between the PD and Churchill held on 12.8.21, ISA, AE, 1026.
3. Dr. Weizmann to Mūsā Kāzīm al-Ḥusayni, 17.8.21, ZA, Z/4, 2512.
4. Report on a conversation between the PD and Churchill held on 22.8.21, ISA, AE, 1026.

5. AE Bureau, "The 5th Newsletter", 26.8.21, *ibid.*, 1722.
6. *Al-Karmil*, 10.8.21.
7. Qayṣar Khalil to the PD, 17.8.21, ISA, AE, 2282.
8. Jubrān Iskandar Kazmā to the AE President, 12.9.21, *ibid.*, 3785.
9. J. Shuckburgh to the PD, 12.11.21, CO 733/16. An identical letter was also sent to the Zionist Organization.
10. Cable from Churchill to the HC for Palestine, 26.11.21, CO 733/15.
11. AE Bureau, "The 21st Newsletter", 16.12.21, ISA, AE, 1722.
12. For the details of this meeting and the remarks of the Colonial Office officials, see CO 537/855.
13. AE Bureau, "The 21st Newsletter", ISA, AE, 1722.
14. Weizmann to the Colonial Under-Secretary, 1.12.21, CO 733/16.
15. See Cmd. 1700, 1922.
16. Private and confidential memorandum of Mr. Bramley [Director of Public Security] to Wyndham Deedes [Chief Secretary], May 1922, ISA, CS, 158.
17. See Note 15.
18. Frumkin, *op. cit.*, pp. 287-90.
19. Kalvarisky to Dr. Nahum Sokolow, Lausanne, 2.12.22, ZA, Z/4, 1392 II. L. Stein to Col. F. Kisch, 16.3.23, ZA, S/25, 4379; Kalvarisky to the Zionist Executive, 18.7.23, *ibid.*, 4380.
20. See last source in previous Note. Later on we shall see that such a method was generally utilized by Kalvarisky.
21. Nāfi' al-'Abūshi to the AE, 31.8.21, ISA, AE, 1061; AE Bureau, "The 1st Newsletter", *ibid.*, 1722.
22. Note on the conversation by Kalvarisky, 22.1.30, ZA, S/25, 3051.

## CHAPTER TWO

### THE IDEA OF THE UNITY OF PALESTINE AND SYRIA

(pp. 70-74)

1. Report on the political situation in Palestine by Ormsby-Gore, 22.8.18, FO 371/3389, 147225.
2. Palin Report, pp. 6-7, FO 371/5121.
3. Report by Clayton on the political future of Syria and Palestine, 21.9.18, FO 371/3384, 171829. Sakākīni, *Kadhā Anā, op. cit.*, p. 90.
4. *Ibid.*, p. 161.
5. Darwaza, *Ḥawla al-Ḥarakah . . .*, *op. cit.*, Vol. 1, p. 72.
6. Clayton on the political stands of the various communities in Syria and Palestine, 18.11.18, FO 371/3385, 191229.
7. Storrs to the OETA Hq., No. 2611A, 19.11.18, FO 371/3388.
8. Antonius, *op. cit.*, p. 436.
9. All the material concerning the drafting of the declaration can be found in FO 371/3381.
10. See Note 6.
11. Clayton to the Foreign Secretary, 5.12.18, FO 371/3386, 213403. See also letters by Storrs, of 21.11.18, and Maj.-Gen. A. W. Money (the CA), of 20.11.18, which are attached to Clayton's letter.
12. According to H. Samuel's view, expressed in April 1920, the desire for unity with Syria sprang from "a natural patriotic sentiment among the small class of politically conscious Arabs", from an objection to the inserting "of economic divisions, which have hitherto been under a single government" and from a consideration that "a united and

- independent Syria . . . is the only means of combating Zionism". (See *BD*, XIII, p. 241.)
13. Leonard Stein, *The Balfour Declaration*, London, 1961, p. 53.
  14. J. C. Hurewitz, *Diplomacy in the Near and Middle East*, Princeton, 1956, Vol. 1, pp. 118-19.
  15. Stein, *The Balfour Declaration*, *op. cit.*, p. 45.
  16. E. Kedourie, *England and the Middle East*, London, 1956, pp. 47-8.
  17. M. Vereté, *op. cit.*, 1967. Illuminating material on this subject can be found in *BD*, IV, and in the books by Kedourie, Cumming, Zeine and Nevakivi.
  18. Numerous reports on the activities of the French agents will be found in HA, Shneorson's files, Nos. 5 and 12; in the files of the "Information Bureau" of the Zionist Commission, ZA, L/4, WI 276, IB 276, IV 276, and V 276; in the files of the Zionist Executive in London, ZA, Z/4, 4113, 2800II and 1366; in the files of the Chief Secretary of the Palestine Government, ISA, CS, 30, 56, 156, 157, 163, 168, 239 and 243; in *BD*, IV, p. 361; in *BD*, XIII, p. 220 and in Meinertzhagen, pp. 58, 70, 76, 82.

### THE ORGANIZATIONAL INSTRUMENTS

(pp 74-79)

1. HA, Shneorson files, No. 5.
2. Storrs to OETA Hq., No. 2611A, 21.11.18, FO 371/3386.
3. *BD*, IV, p. 361. ZA, L/4, 276Ib. HA, Shneorson files, No. 5. Capt. J. N. Camp to Gen. Money, 23.6.19, ISA, CS, 239.
4. See their letter to the CA, 26.6.19, *ibid.*, 156.
5. *BD*, IV, p. 361. ZA, L/4, 276II. HA, Shneorson files, No. 5.
6. ZA, L/4, 276Ib.
7. HA, Shneorson files, No. 5.
8. Lieut.-Col. Postlethwaite, Military Governor of Jaffa, to OETA Hq., 20.5.19, ISA, CS, 156.
9. ZA, L/4, 276IV and 276V. *BD*, IV, pp. 361, 363.
10. Its statutes can be found in HA, Shneorson files, No. 5.
11. See the pro-Zionist petition addressed to the CA, 20.3.20, ISA, CS, 30.
12. Jerusalem protest, 3.11.18, *ibid.*, 140.
13. Secret report on "The Arab movement", 20.3.19, ZA, Z/4, 2500I; Report No. 20, 26.3.20, *ibid.*, 14449. *Al-Karmil*, 7.9.21. *BD*, IV, pp. 361-4.
14. HA, Shneorson files, No. 5.
15. Report by the "Criminal Investigation Department—Palestine Police" on MCA, 23.12.20, ISA, CS, 156.
16. *BD*, IV, p. 361. HA, Shneorson files, No. 5.
17. *BD*, IV, pp. 361-2. ZA, L/4, 276Ib, 276IV. HA, Shneorson files. No. 12.
18. Palin Report, p. 7, FO 371/5121.
19. Frumkin, *op. cit.*, p. 206. Elath, *op. cit.*, p. 20.
20. Report on the "Palestinian Conference", 15.2.19, ISA, CS, 156; Petition to the CA, 16.9.19, *ibid.*, 140; petition to the Governor of Jerusalem, 8.12.19, *ibid.* Report on the demonstrations held on 27.2.20 in Jerusalem, ZA, Z/4, 1366; Report No. 34, 13.4.20, *ibid.*, 2800II. For the composition of this demonstration see ISA, CS, 30.
21. Reports in ZA, L/4, 276VI.

22. V. Levin-Epstein, "Report on the activities in Haifa and Damascus, 18.1.19, ZA, Z/4, 1392 1."
23. Secret report on "The Arab Movement", 20.3.19, ZA, Z/4, 25001. Numerous reports in ZA, L/4, 2761b; ZA, L/3, 278, 13ab. HA, Shneerson files. Nos. 6, 8 and 9. Report addressed to the GPO and CA, 17.11.19.; ISA, CS, 140. See also BD, IV, pp. 267, 441 and 568.
24. Amin Sa'id, *op. cit.*, Part 2, p. 44; Darwaza, *Hawla al-Harakah . . .*, *op. cit.*, Part 1, pp. 91-2.
25. "The Amir Fayṣal", ZA, Z/4, 1366. Darwaza, *op. cit.*, Part 1, p. 78.
26. First source in previous note. Amin Sa'id, *op. cit.*, Part 2, p. 42 also confirms that the leadership of this party was mostly composed of "the notables and dignitaries of Damascus". On the other hand, he claimed that this party also worked for the independence of Syria in its "natural boundaries". It would seem that basically this was the organization of the Damascene élite who resented the overwhelming of the Administration in Damascus by the people of the "Arab revolt". When members of this stratum took part in the Arab nationalist activities they expressed relatively moderate views. 'Ali Ridā al-Rikābi and Haqqi Bey al-'Azm are cases in point. (See Yūsuf al-Ḥakim, *Sūriya wa' al-'Ahd al-Fayṣali*, *op. cit.*, pp. 87-8, 97, 104.) Amin Sa'id failed to say anything about the attitude of this party vis-à-vis Zionism. We think that his silence in this respect sprang from the fact that on 26.3.20 this party concluded a treaty with Mr. Yehoshua Hankin, "the representative of the Zionist Organization in Palestine", according to which the separation of Palestine from Syria and right of the Zionist Organization "to build in it a National Home for the Jewish people by means of organizing mass immigration of Jews from all countries to Palestine and through achieving the necessary political and economic advantages for the peaceful and free development of the National Home" were recognized. In exchange, the Zionist Organization committed itself "not to trespass the boundaries of Syria and Lebanon", which would be agreed upon by both sides, and "to honour the religious property and customs and not to interfere in the questions pertaining to the Holy Places of the Muslims and Christians in Palestine". It also committed itself "to assist the governments of Syria and Lebanon to develop their countries and to lend them money according to conditions to be defined in due time". On behalf of the *Ḥizb al-Waṭani* signed Najib Ṣfer (from Beirut who continued to maintain friendly relations with the Zionist Organization, see M. Sharet, *Yoman Medini*, Tel-Aviv, 1968, pp. 64-5), Yūsuf Mādhin, Dr. Rashid Karam, Najib Ḥāshim and Dr. Antūn Shihādah. (See ZA, S/25, File 9907.) This treaty was concluded after Najib Ṣfer had met with Dr. Weizmann and M. Sharet (Shertok). It was based on giving Syria to the Muslims, Lebanon to the Christians and Palestine to the Jews. (See Sharet, *op. cit.*, p. 65.) It is worth noting that these people did not appear in the list of members of *al-Fatāh* and *al-'Ahd* during the Ottoman period and after or among the members of the Syrian Congress. (See Darwaza, *Hawla al-Harakah . . .*, *op. cit.*; Part 1, pp. 30-1, 33, 77-8, 97-8 and E. Dawn, *op. cit.*, pp. 164-5.)
27. Report on "The Arab movement", ZA, Z/4, 25001; Report No. 32, 1.4.20, *ibid.*, 2800II; Report No. 92, 18.6.20, *ibid.*, and other reports in the same file. Capt. Camp to Gen. Money, 23.6.19, ISA, CS, 239. Palin Report, p. 38, EO 371/5121.

28. 'Amin Sa'īd, *op. cit.*, Part 2, p. 43. "The General Situation in Palestine", 10.6.20, ZA, Z/4, 2800II.
29. 'Abd. al-Qādir. al-Muzaffar, President of. *al-Nādi al-'Arabi*, to the President of the Palestinian Congress, 14.6.23, ISA, AE, 3596.
30. Protest by the Bedouin tribes addressed to Gen. Bols [the third and last CA of QETA(S)], [March 1920], ISA, CS, 30.
31. *BD*, IV, pp. 360-3.
32. Secret report on "The Arab movement", 20.3.19, ZA, Z/4, 2500I; Report No. 92, 18.6.20, *ibid.*, 2800II; Report No. 143; 10.8.20, *ibid.*
33. ZA, L/4, 277Ib, 277IIb. HA, Shneurson files, No. 5.
34. See Darwaza, *Ḥawla al-Ḥarakah* . . ., *op. cit.*, Part 1, p. 46.

### THE TRIUMPH OF THE "SOUTHERN SYRIA" TREND

(pp. 79-85)

1. Sakākīni, *Kadhā Anā*, *op. cit.*, pp. 165-7.
2. Short report on the Palestinian-Arab Congress, 9.2.19, ZA, L/4, 276Ib.
3. According to the British report (ISA, CS, 156) the number of the representatives was only 27.
4. See Note 2.
5. *Ibid.* Capt. Camp to the Hq., 15.2.19, ISA, CS, 156.
6. Waters-Taylor [Acting Governor of Jerusalem] to the CA, No. 3026, 3.2.19, *ibid.*; Storrs [Acting CA of OETA(S)], to CPO, 25.2.19, *ibid.*
7. The Palestinian Arab Congress, 9.2.19, ZA, L/4, 276Ib. Khalīl al-Sakākīni, *Filasṭīn ba'da al-Ḥarb al-Kubrā*, Jerusalem, 1925, Part 1, p. 46. Darwaza, *Ḥawla al-Ḥarakah* . . ., *op. cit.*, Part 1, p. 96. Jubrān Iskandar Kazmā to the AE, 12.9.21, ISA, AE, 3785.
8. See sources in three previous notes.
9. *Ibid.* Henceforward the story is based on these sources, unless otherwise indicated.
10. Memorandum submitted to the Peace Conference, 3.2.19, ISA, CS, 156.
11. They are kept in ISA, CS, 30.
12. In this speech M. Pichon said that France would be the Protecting Power in Syria and Palestine by virtue of its historical right there.
13. Storrs to CPO, Enclosure B, 25.2.19, ISA, CS, 156.
14. Col. Waters-Taylor, who reported on the Conference on 3.2.19, cited a preliminary draft of the resolutions. This draft asked for independence for "Southern Syria", while it accepted British protection and rejected Zionism. It seems that this was the stand of the pro-British delegates, whereas the final text of the resolutions was a compromise solution which aimed to please everyone. This conclusion is strengthened by the fact that Capt. Camp cited a different version of Article 4 of the Resolutions: "The Government of Palestine should be constitutional and independent".
15. Clayton to the Foreign Secretary, 2.3.19, ISA, CS, 156.
16. For their declarations see *ibid.*
17. *Ibid.*
18. *Ibid.* The relevant entry in Khalīl al-Sakākīni's diaries makes it very clear that the majority view in the MCA of Jerusalem was against unity with Syria (Sakākīni, *Kadhā Anā*, *op. cit.*, p. 160).
19. During the First World War he was a prisoner-of-war in Russia. After

- returning to Palestine he became one of the main leaders of *Jam'iyyat al-Ikkā' wa-al-'Aḡāf* and of the pro-unity movement.
20. Rāghib Abū-Sa'ūd al-Dajāni to the Governor of Jerusalem, 8.2.19, ISA, CS, 156.
  21. Jerusalem MCA to the Governor of Jerusalem, 11.2.19, *ibid.*
  22. CPO to the CA, 23.2.19, *ibid.*; CA to the Governor of Jerusalem, 26.2.19, *ibid.*; CPO to the CA, 2.3.19, *ibid.*
  23. *Al-Nādi al-'Arabi* and *al-Muntadā al-Adabi* to the Governor of Jerusalem, 8.12.19, *ibid.*, 140. "Announcement to the Arab Nation in Southern Syria (Palestine)", ZA, Z/4, 2800II.
  24. Petition of *al-Nādi* and *al-Muntadā*, 19.1.20, ISA, CS, 140. Nāblus protest, 23.1.20, *ibid.*; Ṭul-Karm protest, 6.2.19, *ibid.*, 156.

### THE IDEA OF ALL-SYRIA UNITY IN POLITICS

(pp. 85-92)

1. "Copy of the Power of Attorney given to Amir Fayṣal", 14.3.19, *ibid.*
2. ZA, L/4, Files 276Ib, 276IIb.
3. Weizmann to Lord Curzon, 2.2.20, ZA, Z/4, 3665. Weizmann expressed the view that Nāblus had developed into an Arab nationalist centre, since its people were afraid of possible Jewish competition with their soap and olive-oil industries. The fact that a chemical scientist was the Leader of Zionism aggravated their anxiety, according to Weizmann.
4. For such a theory see Frumkin, *op. cit.*, p. 219.
5. Amīn Sa'īd, *op. cit.*, Part 2, p. 43. Secret report on "The Arab movement", 20.3.19, ZA, Z/4, 2500I.
6. BD, IV, pp. 264-5. *Do'ar Ha-Yōm*, 19.10.19, 23.11.19, 26.12.19, 3.2.20, 18.3.20. P. David, *Un Gouvernement Arabe à Damas, Le Congrès Syrien*, Paris, 1923, pp. 91-2. Darwaza, Ḥawla al-Ḥaraka, Part 1, pp. 91-2. Amīn Sa'īd, *op. cit.*, Part 2, p. 44.
7. BD, IV, pp. 263-6. ZA, L/3, 13ab, 278; L/4, 276Ia, 276. HA, Shneorson files, No. 5.
8. These details were taken from Amīn Sa'īd, *op. cit.*, Part 2, pp. 36-7; from biographical notes in ZA, S/25, 4022 and 3008, from L/4, 276Ib, 276IV; HA, Shneorson files, Nos. 5, 6 and 8; and from report on Aleppo, 28.1.20, ISA, CS, 2.
9. One should not accept the list of delegates compiled by Darwaza, since he himself confessed that he had compiled it according to the collective photograph of the delegates, taken during the Second Congress in March 1920, with additions "from his personal memory."
10. Col. Popham [acting Governor of Jerusalem] to OETA(S) Hq., 21.6.19, ISA, CS, 239.
11. ZA, L/3, 13ab, 278.
12. Stein (*Balfour Declaration*, *op. cit.*, pp. 313-15) suggested this possibility. Now we have the testimony of one of those who took part in the events, completely confirming this suggestion (see Yūsuf al-Ḥakīm, *Sūriya wa-al-'Ahd al-Fayṣali*, *op. cit.*, pp. 100, 108).
13. Al-Sifri, *op. cit.*, pp. 34-5. Amīn Sa'īd, *op. cit.*, Part 2, p. 45. ZA, L/3, 278. Al-Sifri, (p. 34) and Amīn Sa'īd (Part 3, p. 53) mentioned a "Second Palestinian Congress" held in Damascus on 27.2.20. According to the evidence of these two authors, it is clear that no delegates came from Palestine to this meeting, but there were representatives of the nationalist societies of Damascus and of the Palestinians

- living there. The resolutions adopted called for independence, unity of Palestine with Syria and rejection of Zionism. A British source confirmed this evaluation and added that the meeting had taken place in the club of *al-Nādi al-'Arabi* in Damascus and that 'Abd al-Qādir al-Muẓaffar had been its Secretary (see report by H. W. Young on the meeting, FO 371/5034).
14. *Do'ar Ha-Yōm*, 19.8.20.
  15. Al-Sifri, *op. cit.*, p. 17.
  16. *BD*, IV, p. 364; *BD*, XIII, p. 243.
  17. *Do'ar Ha-Yōm*, 6.6.20 (citing the Damascene press).
  18. *Bayt al-Maqdis*, 7.7.20, 17.7.20, 24.7.20, 7.8.20, 11.9.20. It should be noted that *al-Karmil* used to repeat its criticism of the Fayṣal-Weizmann agreement whenever it needed arguments against one of the Hashemite dynasty. It is especially valid for the years 1923-4, when the issue of the Anglo-Hejazi treaty got publicity.
  19. It is interesting to note that 'Awni 'Abd al-Hādi, in those times the only one perhaps whose Pan-Arabism did not spring from a need for strong support against Zionism but from a broad national conception, shared Fayṣal's attitude toward Zionism (see a note on a conversation between him and Herbert Samuel in Herbert Samuel to the Colonial Secretary, Dispatch No. 83, 12.2.21, CO 733/13). In the twenties Mu'in al-Mādi also shared the same attitude and was connected with the attempt of Ri'ād al-Ṣulḥ (from Beirut and a former member of *al-Fatāh* in Damascus) to influence the Palestinians to moderate their hostility to Zionism (see report on the Fourth Congress and remarks on the First PD, 21.6.21, *ibid.*; Herbert Samuel to the Colonial Office, secret dispatch, 15.6.23, CO 733/46). After the Hashemites' split with the Arab Nationalists Fayṣal's image began to change (see Anīs Ṣā'igh, *al-Hāshimīyyūn wa-al-Thawrah al-'Arabiyyah al-Kubrā*, Beirut, 1966).
  20. *ZA*, L/4, 276Ib, 276Ib, 276IV. Muḥammad Yūsuf Jamā'ah al-Kināni to Sa'id Zayn al-Dīn, 19.5.19, ISA, CS, 156; Lieut.-Col. Postlethwaite to OETA(S) Hq., 20.5.19, *ibid.* On the process of constituting the Committee and its functioning see Harry N. Howard, *The King-Crane Commission*, Beirut, 1963.
  21. Cable by Maj.-Gen. Money to CPO, 27.5.19, ISA, CS, 156; Clayton to the Foreign Office, 1.6.19, *ibid.* Sakākīni, *Kadhā Anā*, *op. cit.*, pp. 174-6.
  22. Maj. Camp to Gen. Money, 23.6.19, ISA, CS, 239.
  23. Al-Kināni to Zayn al-Dīn, 19.5.12, *ibid.*, 239; Lieut.-Col. Postlethwaite to OETA(S), 20.5.19, *ibid.*; Same to same, 26.5.19, *ibid.*; General Staff of OETA(S) to Military Governor of Jaffa, 30.5.19, *ibid.*
  24. *BD*, IV, pp. 275-6, 285-8, 298.
  25. Almalīḥ's report, *ZA*, L/3, 13Ib. Darwaza, *Ḥawla al-Ḥarakah . . .*, *op. cit.*, Part 1, p. 100.
  26. Yūsuf al-Ḥakīm, *Sīriya wa-al-'Ahd al-Fayṣali*, *op. cit.*, pp. 87-8, 97, and 104. Kedourie, *England and the ME*, *op. cit.*, p. 158.
  27. Money to Clayton, 28.5.19, ISA, CS, 156; Clayton to Money, 29.5.19, *ibid.*; Lieut.-Col. C. H. Y. Cox to Governor of Jerusalem, 29.5.19, *ibid.*; Same to all District Governors, 31.5.19, *ibid.*
  28. Howard, *op. cit.*, pp. 92, 94. Storrs pretensions (pp. 375-6, Note No. 1 in his memoirs) that neither he nor any other Governor tried to influence the representations made by the local leaders before the King-Crane Commission, are completely refuted by the exchange of

- directives and reports between OETA(S) Hq. and the District Governors.
29. Postlethwaite to OETA(S) Hq., 20.5.19, ISA, CS, 156; Same to same, 26.5.19, *ibid.*; Cox to Governor of Jaffa, 30.5.19, *ibid.*
  30. Money to CPO, 26.4.19, *ibid.*, 239.
  31. Popham to OETA(S) Hq., 21.6.19, *ibid.*, 234.
  32. Howard, *op. cit.*, p. 92.
  33. *Ibid.*, pp. 93, 102.
  34. *Ibid.*, pp. 91, 93. Report by Sokolow, 16.7.19, ZA, Z/4, 62.
  35. One should not forget that the new leadership of the Jaffa MCA was pro-British and elected after the Military Governor had seen to it that the previous extreme Pan-Arab President was dismissed.

#### THE SUPPORTERS OF UNITY AT THE PEAK OF THEIR POWER (pp. 93–100)

1. See the petitions from September 1919 and henceforward in ISA, CS, 140.
2. Petitions of *al-Nādi* and *al-Muntadā* to the Governor of Jerusalem, 8.12.19, *ibid.*; Petition of Nāblus MCA, 18.12.19, *ibid.*; Petition of Haifa, 26.1.20, *ibid.*; Petition of *al-Nādi* and *al-Muntadā*, 19.1.20, *ibid.*; Petition of Nāblus MCA, 23.1.20, *ibid.*
3. Jaffa MCA to Jaffa Governor, 12.9.19, *ibid.*; same to the League of Nations, 25.10.19, *ibid.*; same to Jaffa Governor, 12 *Rabī' al-Awwal* 1338 (5.12.19), *ibid.*
4. Jerusalem MCA to Jerusalem Governor, 20.8.19, *ibid.*, 156; Protest of Jerusalem MCA, 18.9.19, *ibid.*, 140.
5. *Do'ar-Ha-Yōm*, 7.12.19, 9.12.19. ZA, L/4, 276IV, 276V, 276VI.
6. Maj. Kinsman [acting Governor of Haifa] to OETA(S) Hq., 10.12.19, ISA, CS, 140.
7. See numerous reports in ZA, L/4, 276V, 276VI, 276Ia; L/3, 278. HA, Shneorson files, Nos. 5 and 12.
8. *BD*, IV, p. 370. However, one cannot be sure whether this operation would not have failed even had not the Military Authorities intervened.
9. Haifa protest, 15.12.19, ISA, CS, 140.
10. Zionist Commission to J. Simon, 20.10.19, ZA, Z/4, 936. For many years Zionist circles have held the opposite view that the anti-Zionist activities increased in that period because the Military Administration prevented the publication in Palestine of an official announcement that the British Government intended to implement the Balfour Declaration.
11. *BD*, IV, pp. 592–5, 625–7. Yūsuf al-Ḥakīm, *Sūriya wa-al-'Ahd al-Faysali*, *op. cit.*, pp. 128–9, 162–4.
12. Amin Sa'id, *op. cit.*, Part 2, pp. 125–6. See also, Jukka Nevakivi, *Britain, France and the Arab Middle East, 1914–1920*, London, 1969, pp. 207–8.
13. Cable Nos. 76A and 77A, ISA, CS, 7.
14. Palin Report, pp. 50–1, FO 371/5121. *BD*, XIII, pp. 223, 231, 233–4. Echoes of this idea exist in Herbert Samuel to Lord Curzon, 26.6.20, ISA, Samuel Papers.
15. Palin Report, p. 39, FO 371/5121.
16. Report No. 32, 1.4.20, ZA, Z/4, 2800II.
17. R. Meinertzhagen, *Middle East Diaries, 1917 to 1956*, London, 1959,

- pp. 69-70. Meinertzhagen who became CPO in September 1919, put pressure on the Foreign Office to take this measure, whereas the Military Administration officers objected to such a step.
18. Cable by D. Eder to the Zionist Executive in London, 4.3.20, ZA, Z/4, 1366. Reports on the demonstrations in Jaffa and Jerusalem on 27.2.20, *ibid.* BD, XIII, pp. 219-20. The protests submitted are kept in ISA, CS, 30; see also Col. Stanton, Military Governor of Haifa, to OETA(S) Hq., 28.2.20, *ibid.*; Report on the demonstration in Jerusalem, *ibid.* Meinertzhagen's report, No. 15, 2.3.20, FO 371/5200, 920. Palin Report, p. 56, FO 371/5121.
  19. For all the reports on these demonstrations see ISA, CS, 30; Bramley to CS, 20.9.21, *ibid.*, 157. Palin Report, pp. 56-7, FO 371/5121.
  20. Eder to Storrs, 9.3.20, ISA, CS, 140; David Yellin to same, 10.3.20, *ibid.*
  21. Cable by OETA(S) Hq. to all District Governors, 11.3.20, *ibid.*, 30.
  22. Stanton to OETA(S) Hq., 28.2.20, *ibid.*; Maj. Nott, Military Governor of Tul-Karm, to OETA(S) Hq., 10.3.20, *ibid.* Palin Report, p. 53, FO 371/5121.
  23. Mr. Keisermann to Stanton, 10.3.20, ISA, CS, 30. Elath, *op. cit.*, p. 24, citing *Sūriya al-Janūbiyyah*, 2.3.20. Haifa protest, 15.12.19, ISA, CS, 140; Protest by "The Supreme Committee of the Palestinian Associations", 27.11.19, *ibid.*
  24. Palin Report, p. 57, FO 371/5121.
  25. They were described in detail in STH, *op. cit.*, Book 1, Part 2, pp. 609-15.
  26. It is worth noting that Ronald Storrs was more afraid in April 1919 than in April 1920 of the possibility that such disturbances would occur (see Note 24).
  27. Palin Report, p. 58 FO 371/5121.
  28. *Ibid.*
  29. ZA, L/4, 276Ia; L/3, 333. HA, Shneerson files No. 12. Reports Nos. 39 and 40, 19 and 20.4.20, ZA, Z/4, 2800II; A letter dated 20.3.20, *ibid.*, 1212I; *ibid.*, 1212II. Report dated 8.4.20, *ibid.*, 2800II.
  30. Report No. 26, 26.3.20, ZA, Z/4, 14449.
  31. Report Nos. 31 and 32, 1.4.20, *ibid.*, 2800II.
  32. Meinertzhagen, *op. cit.*, pp. 56, 79-84.
  33. Palin Report, pp. 81-2, FO 371/5121.
  34. Report No. 32, 1.4.20, ZA, Z/4, 2800II. The authors of the Palin Report admitted that had the Arab population known that the Heads of the Military Administration supported the coronation of Fayṣal of Palestine as well, they would have been, to a large extent, encouraged in their anti-Zionist attitude. However, the authors were not sure whether or not the population had known it (see Palin Report, p. 39, FO 371/5121).
  35. Storrs, *op. cit.*, p. 349.
  36. Report No. 33, 2.4.20, ZA, Z/4, 2800II. Also after the outbreak of the riots these two people continued to hold to their view that it would have been better for the Arab case had the riots not broken out, whereas Kāmil al-Budayri, one of their chief instigators, praised them (see Report No. 39, 19.4.21, *ibid.*).
  37. BD, IV, p. 363. ZA, L/3, 278; L/4, 276Ia.
  38. Darwaza, *Ḥawla al-Ḥarakah . . .*, *op. cit.*, Part 3, p. 33. ZA, L/3, 278. *Do'ar Ha-Yōm*, 3.5.20. See also reports in ISA, CS, 35. Description of the battle is given in STH, *op. cit.*, Book 1, Part 2, pp. 592-4.

39. About the expectation for such a signal see report from Jerusalem, 9.4.20, ZA, Z/4, 2800 II.

### THE DECLINE OF THE IDEA OF "SOUTHERN SYRIA"

(pp. 100-103)

1. This description is based on the reports included in ZA, Z/4, 2800II and 14449.
2. *Al-Quds al-Sharif*, 13.5.20.
3. Storrs, *op. cit.*, p. 351. It might well be that the announcement of "The Committee of Jerusalem Jews" that they would not recognize him any more as Mayor, as a result of his part in the 8.3.20 demonstrations, influenced Storrs' decision, since this Committee represented the Jewish majority of Jerusalem. After some years the supporters of Mūsā Kāzīm al-Ḥusayni suggested another explanation for his dismissal: he had been dismissed, so they claimed, because he had refused to recognize the Hebrew Language as far as the Municipality was concerned (see Jamāl al-Ḥusayni's article, *al-Karmil*, 29.11.24). Although this claim is true and it aroused the indignation of Jerusalem Jews, it is very doubtful whether Ronald Storrs was influenced by it.
4. Storrs to OETA(S) Hq., No. 2611A, 21.11.18, FO 371/3386.
5. Report on the demonstrations, 8.3.20, ISA, CS, 30. On the appointment of the new Mayor see source quoted in Note 3.
6. Report No. 27, 27.3.20, ZA, Z/4, 14449.
7. It may be noted that *al-Muntadā al-Adabi* continued to exist until 1923 as a small and inactive body of the Nashāshibi family and its followers.
8. See the numerous reports in ZA, Z/4, 2800 II; Announcement by the Zionist Commission Press Bureau, No. 325, 1.6.20, *ibid.*, 1454. Miss Newton to Waters-Taylor, 25.4.20, ISA, CS, 156.
9. For the text of CA's speech before the Heads of the Religious Communities, 28.4.20, see *ibid.*, 141.
10. *Al-Quds al-Sharif*, 13.5.20.
11. Jerusalem MCA to Jerusalem Governor, 3.5.20, ISA, CS, 156; Waters-Taylor to Jerusalem MCA, 5.5.20, *ibid.*; Same to same, 7.5.20, *ibid.*
12. Report dated 22.4.20, ZA, Z/4, 2800 II. *Do'ar-Ha-Yōm*, 11.5.20.
13. See exchange of letters between Jerusalem MCA and the Governor, 3.5.20, 5.5.20, and 7.5.20, ISA, CS, 156.
14. *Al-Quds al-Sharif*, 25.5.20, 24.6.20. *Al-Karmil*, 8.6.20. *Do'ar-Ha-Yōm*, 27.5.20, 3.6.20, 11.6.20, 21.6.20, 22.6.20. See also reports from June 1920, ZA, Z/4, 2800 II.
15. *Al-Quds al-Sharif*, 31.6.20.
16. Report from Haifa, 15.6.20, ZA, Z/4, 2800 II.
17. Report No. 124, 19.7.20, *ibid.*; Report No. 126, 23-5.7.20, *ibid.*; Report No. 130, 27.7.20, *ibid.*

### PALESTINE AS THE OBJECT OF STRUGGLE

(pp. 103-108)

1. Darwaza, *Ḥawla al-Ḥarakah . . .*, *op. cit.*, Part 3, p. 34. *Al-Karmil*, 16.11.20. Report No. 126, 23-5.7.20, ZA, Z/4, 2800 II. AE report to the Fourth Congress, ISA, AE, 1026.

2. As'ad Dāghir to Mu'in al-Māḍi, 15.12.20, included in E. P. Quigley [Assistant Director of Public Security] to ACS (P), 25.1.21, ISA, CS, 157.
3. Intelligence report on Jenin sub-district for the week ending 14.8.20, *ibid.*, 11. Report Nos 111 and 112, 6.7.20 and 8.7.20, ZA, Z/4, 2800 II.
4. 'Umar al-Baytār to the HC, 14.10.20, ISA, CS, 156. Jaffa Governor to the CS, 1.11.20, *ibid.*, 4; first source in previous note.
5. *Bayt al-Maqdis*, 7.7.20, 17.7.20, 24.7.20, 31.7.20, 7.8.20.
6. *Ibid.*, 12.5.21.
7. H. C. Luke [Assistant Governor of Jerusalem] to CS, 2.11.20, ISA, CS, 163. HC to Prodrome, Cable No. 349, 4.11.20, *ibid.*; Questionnaire sent by E. T. Richmond, ACS (P), to the District-Governors concerning this issue, 9.12.20, and the replies accepted, *ibid.*
8. Report No. 131, Jerusalem, 28.7.20, ZA, Z/4, 2800 II; Report No. 140, 7.8.20, *ibid.*; Report No. 146, 13-14.8.20, *ibid.*
9. Report No. 138, 5.8.20, *ibid.* Report of the CID to the CS, 30.9.20, ISA, CS, 163.
10. Report No. 143, 10.8.20, ZA, Z/4, 2800II. *Al-Karmil*, 16.11.20.
11. First source in previous note.
12. Report No. 147, 15-16.8.20, *ibid.*
13. Report by the PP-CID on "Moslem-Christian Associations in Palestine", 23.12.20, ISA, CS, 156.
14. These organizational problems will be further discussed later on. As for *al-Muntadā al-Adabi* see report by the PP-CID on Jamil Bey al-Ḥusayni, 15.2.21, ISA, CS, 157. *Mir'āt al-Sharq*, 26.4.22. Storrs to the CS, 1.9.22, ISA, CS, 168. Cable by *al-Muntadā al-Adabi* to the Fifth Congress, ISA, AE, 1058; same to the members of the AE, 30.8.22, *ibid.*
15. Report No. 138, 5.8.20, ZA, Z/4, 2800 II.
16. Report No. 146, 13-14. 820, *ibid.*
17. AE report to the Fourth Congress, ISA, CS, 1026.
18. E. P. Quigley to CS, 21.10.20, ISA, CS, 163.
19. Jaffa Governor to CS, 1.11.20, *ibid.*, 4; CID report to the CS, 30.9.20, *ibid.*, 163; Quigley to CS, 14.10.20, *ibid.*; same to same, 21.10.20, *ibid.*
20. *Mir'āt al-Sharq*, 27.2.24.
21. See Note 19.
22. Report No. 143, 10.8.20, ZA, Z/4, 2800II.
23. *Al-Karmil*, 19.10.20, 31.10.20, 26.11.20, 30.11.20. This Congress was numbered as the Third since the MCA Congress at the end of January 1919 was regarded as First, whereas the Second was the Congress that should have been convened in May 1920, but was cancelled as a result of an official ban (see Akram Zu'aytir, *Al-Qaḍīyyah al-Filastīniyyah*, Cairo, 1955, p. 58; Darwaza, *Ḥawla al-Ḥarakah . . .*, *op. cit.*, Part 1, p. 34, note). Al-Sifri, *op. cit.*, p. 34 and Amin Sa'id, *op. cit.*, Part 3, pp. 51, 53 were of the opinion that the Second Palestinian Congress had been the meeting held in Damascus on 27.2.20. Amin Sa'id went further and regarded the General Syrian Congress of July 1919 as the First Palestinian Congress as well. His information about the January 1919 Congress in Jerusalem was very fragmentary and unreliable.

## NEGLECT OF THE "SOUTHERN SYRIA" IDEA

(pp. 108-122)

1. "To The Arab Palestinian Nation" (proclamation of the Congress), in J. Beshwer [of the CID] to the ACS(P), 4.1.21, ISA, CS, 244.
2. CID report to the CS, 4.11.20, *ibid.*, 163.
3. *Al-Karmil*, 16.12.20.
4. *Ibid.*
5. *Ibid.*, 25.12.20.
6. *Ibid.*
7. See Note 1.
8. *Al-Karmil*, 25.12.20.
9. *Ibid.*
10. *Al-Karmil*, 19.2.20. AE to the HC, ISA, AE, 1058; Certificate confirming the election signed by the Congress Secretaries Aḥmad al-Imām and Wadī' al-Bustāni (both from Haifa; the first was Muslim, the second—Maronite), 19.12.20, *ibid.*, 2699.
11. See Note 1. *Al-Karmil*, 25.12.20.
12. D. Eder to the secretary of ZE in London, 4.6.21, ZA, Z/4, 4112.
13. Capt. C. D. Brunton to the EEF General Staff, 1.6.21 and 11.6.21, ISA, CS, 163.
14. "Fifth Congress agenda", ISA, AE, 1771.
15. Al-Sifri, *op. cit.*, p. 95.
16. "Proposals", 22.8.22, ISA, AE, 1771.
17. "Summary of the resolutions of the Fifth Congress held in Nāblus on 20.8.22", *ibid.*, 1058.
18. For the proposals of subjects for discussion, see *ibid.*; on the discussions themselves—*Mir'āt al-Sharq*, 20.6.23, 23.6.23, and 27.6.23. Clayton [acting HC] to the Colonial Secretary, 25.6.23, ISA, CS, 171. For the resolutions, see "Summary of the Resolutions", ISA, AE, 1058.
19. *Mir'āt al-Sharq*, 27.6.23.
20. Stein to Shuckburgh, 8.11.21, CO 733/16. A distorted description of this issue is that of I. Ben-Avi, *op. cit.*, pp. 416-17.
21. W. H. Deedes [acting HC] to the Colonial Office, secret dispatch, 30.12.21, CO 733/8.
22. Eder's cables, 19.3.22 and 21.3.22 and the protocols of the meeting that took place on 2nd, 3rd and 4th April 1922, ZA, S/25, 4380. Capt. Brunton to EEF General Staff, 1.6.22, ISA, CS, 164. Protocol of the meeting held on 18.3.22, *ibid.*, 145; Deedes to Churchill, 8.6.22, *ibid.* Eder to Weizmann, 20.5.22, ZA, Z/4, 16056.
23. R. Graham (British Ambassador in Rome) to Lord Curzon, 29.3.22, ISA, CS, 145; Deedes to Churchill, 8.6.21, *ibid.* F. H. Kisch [Head of the Political Department of the ZE in Jerusalem] to the Secretary of the ZE in London, 12.12.22, ZA, Z/4, 4113. ZA, Z/4, 16056 (the whole file). See also the brochure of E. Sapir, *Kovetz Mikhtavei, Eliyahu Sapir*, Jaffa, 1913; A. Cohen, *Israel ve-Ha-'Olam Ha-'Arvi*, Merhavia, 1964, pp. 178-83 and M. Asaf, pp. 106-7.
24. Protocol of the first meeting, ISA, CS, 145. See also E. Sapir and A. Cohen, *ibid.*
25. *Al-Karmil*, 5.7.22.
26. HC to the Colonial Secretary, secret dispatch, 15.6.23, CO 733/46.
27. *Mir'āt al-Sharq*, 21.6.28, 28.6.28. *Ṣawt al-Sha'b*, 23.6.28. *Al-Jāmi'ah al-'Arabiyya*, 21.6.28, 25.6.28. Darwaza, *Ḥawla al-Ḥarakah . . .*, *op.*

- cit.*, Part 3, pp. 54–5. Ḥamdi al-Ḥusayni, *Kalimah ilā al-Sha'b al-'Arabi al-Filasṭīni ḥawla al-Mu'tamar al-'Arabi al-Filasṭīni al-Sābi'*, pp. 10–13.
28. Report on the situation of Palestine, submitted to Churchill, 28.3.21, ISA, AE, 1026.
  29. Announcement of the PD, sent to Churchill, CO 733/14.
  30. Adīb Abū Ḍabba to Jamāl al-Ḥusayni, No. 17, 9.8.22, ISA, AE, 1721.
  31. Darwaza, *Ḥawla al-Ḥarakah . . .*, *op. cit.*, Part 1, p. 89.
  32. Deedes to Churchill, 8.6.22, ISA, CS, 145. *BD*, IV, 264, 294.
  33. Salīm Sarkīs [General Secretary of Party of Syrian Unity] to Palestinian Congress President, 19.4.21, ISA, AE, 1026.
  34. Eder to the Secretary of the ZE in London, 4.6.21, ZA, Z/4, 4112. Khalil al-Sakākīni was a Greek-Orthodox Palestinian who at that time was working as a teacher in Egypt. After his return to Palestine he became one of the most distinguished Palestinian-Arab educationists.
  35. AE Bureau, "The 1st Newsletter", 29.7.21, ISA, AE, 1722. Cable to the Colonial Office, 20.7.21, CO 733/17A. Colonial Office to the Foreign Under-Secretary, secret, 22.7.21, *ibid.*; "Moslem-Christian Delegation from Palestine", CO 733/13. Miss F. Newton, an Englishwoman who had been living in Palestine, joined the Delegation. The British authorities tried through this woman to influence the PD not to join the Syrian Delegation.
  36. *Filasṭīn*, 27.8.21, 31.8.21.
  37. See cuttings from *Tribune de Genève*, ISA, AE, 1058.
  38. Jubrān Iskandar Kazmā to AE Secretary, 12.9.21, *ibid.*, 3785.
  39. Amīn Sa'īd, *op. cit.*, Part 3, p. 54.
  40. M. K. al-Ḥusayni to AE, No. 6, 19.12.22, ISA, AE, 1541.
  41. HC to Churchill, secret dispatch, 4.11.21, CO 733/7.
  42. Najīb Sifri [General Secretary of the Syrian-Palestinian Congress] to AE, 21.9.22, ISA, AE, 1058.
  43. AE Secretary to the President of Syrian-Palestinian Congress, 22.11.21, *ibid.*, 1773.
  44. "Announcement of Syrian-Palestinian Congress", 1.2.22, *ibid.*, 1058.
  45. Michel Lutfāllah [President of the Syrian-Palestinian Congress] to M. K. al-Ḥusayni, 21.9.22, *ibid.*
  46. Najīb Sifri to AE President, 21.9.22, *ibid.*
  47. Jamāl al-Ḥusayni to the President of Syrian-Palestinian Congress, 4.10.22, *ibid.*; Ḥāfiẓ Ṭawqān [Secretary of Nāblus MCA] to AE Secretary, 11.12.22, *ibid.*, 1072.
  48. Najīb Sifri to Jamāl al-Ḥusayni, No. 1399, 17.10.22, *ibid.*, 1058.
  49. M. K. al-Ḥusayni to the AE, No. 6, 19.12.22, *ibid.*, 1541.
  50. "Memorandum to the Lausanne Conference on behalf of the Syrian-Palestinian Delegation", 28.11.22, *ibid.*
  51. 'Abd al-Qādir al-Muẓaffar [of the Second Delegation] to the AE, 8.11.22, *ibid.*
  52. Memorandum of the PD, 28.11.22, *ibid.*
  53. Tawfiq al-Yāziji to the AE Secretary, No. 1659, 14.6.23, *ibid.*, 1058.
  54. "Summary of the Resolutions of the Sixth Congress", Article No. 24, *ibid.*
  55. A member of the Syrian Delegation [probably Sulaymān Kan'ān] to M. K. al-Ḥusayni, 2.7.23, *ibid.*, 1541.
  56. M. K. al-Ḥusayni to Emir Michel Lutfāllah, 10.4.24, *ibid.*, 3589; last to first, 29.5.24, *ibid.*, 3596; same to same, No. 2670, 6.6.24, *ibid.*, 3520; first to last, 11.6.24, *ibid.*; Najīb Shuqayr [General Secretary of

- the Syrian-Palestinian Congress] to AE Secretary, 6.6.25, *ibid.*; Michel Lutfällah to M. K. al-Ḥusayni, 28.8.25, *ibid.*; AE Secretary to Shakib Arslän, 5.10.25, *ibid.*; same to same, 7.11.25, *ibid.*, 1785; Michel Luṭ-fällah to Jamāl al-Ḥusayni, 18.12.26, *ibid.*, 3520.
57. Annex to the political report of the Zionist Executive on the Arab Question (prepared by Kalvarisky), ZA, S/25, 4210.
  58. Secretary of the Palestinian Committee to AE, 12.11.22, ISA, AE, 1541; Cable by Muḥammad 'Ali al-Ṭāhir to Jamāl al-Ḥusayni, 11.11.22, *ibid.*; President of the Palestinian Committee in Cairo to the AE President, 22.11.22, *ibid.*; M. 'A. al-Ṭāhir to Jamāl al-Ḥusayni, 24.12.25, *ibid.*, 3520.

### CHAPTER THREE

#### ACTIVITIES IN THE COUNTRY

(pp. 123-137)

1. Frumkin, *op. cit.*, pp. 91, 94. Kedourie, *England and the ME, op. cit.*, pp. 63-4.
2. Palin Report, p. 7, FO 371/5121.
3. Storrs, *op. cit.*, p. 359.
4. Richmond to CS, 12.3.24, ISA, CS, 158. "Arab Statement on Palestine", 1929, CO 733/178.
5. *Bayt al-Maqdis*, 18.4.21.
6. Deedes to Sir John Tilley, 14.1.21, CO 733/17A.
7. Deedes to M. K. al-Ḥusayni, 22.12.20, ISA, CS, 244.
8. H. Samuel to Lord Curzon, 19.12.20, ISA, Samuel Papers.
9. Notes on the meetings held on 16.1.21 and 4.2.21, ISA, CS, 244.
10. *Bayt al-Maqdis*, 26.1.21, 5.2.21. *Al-Karmil*, 25.12.20, 12.1.21, 15.1.21. David Miller (a Jewish teacher who taught the Samaritan children in Nāblus) to Kisch, 8.5.22, ZA, S/25, 4380.
11. Note on a conversation between the HC and the AE, held on 20.3.23, ISA, CS, 158.
12. Richmond to Clayton and Clayton's reaction, 10.7.23, *ibid.* A. L. Kirkbride to Jamāl al-Ḥusayni, 6.9.23, ISA, AE, 1059.
13. I. J. K. Loyd (The Secretary of the Shaw Commission of Inquiry) to AE President, *ibid.*, 3505.
14. See protocols of AE sessions, especially session held on 8.10.33, *ibid.*, 3797.
15. See the various letters and cables concerning this issue, *ibid.*, 1058. *Al-Karmil*, 18.3.21, 22.3.21, 5.4.21. Deedes to Colonial Secretary, secret dispatch, No. 32, 8.4.21, CO 733/2.
16. See correspondence concerning this issue, ISA, CS, 244.
17. Churchill's reply to the PD, March 1921, *ibid.*
18. On the disturbances see *STH, op. cit.*, Book 2, Part 1, pp. 77-94. Analysis of their background was done in the Haycraft Report.
19. AE Secretary to the HC, 27.8.23, ISA, AE, 2700. C. Reading [Governor of Ṭul-Karm sub-district] to the Governor of Samaria, 13.9.22, ISA, CS, 168; Summary of the discussions of the Sixth Congress (M. K. al-Ḥusayni's words), 16-20.5.23, *ibid.*, 171. "To the HC for Palestine" (a leaflet distributed on 13.10.21 by MCA and *al-Nādi al-'Arabi* in Jerusalem), ISA, AE, 1026. Meinertzhagen wrote in his book (*op. cit.*, p. 109) that Herbert Samuel had been of the opinion that the riots had been organised and premeditated.

20. HA, Shneerson files, No. 5. ZA, L/4, 276Ib, 276II, 276V, 276VI. "The Arab Movement", 20.3.19, Z/4, 25001. *BD*, IV, pp. 362-3.
21. PP-CID report, 23.12.20, ISA, CS, 156; CID report on Jamil al-Ḥusayni, 12.5.21, *ibid.*, 157; report on "political suspects", 20.10.20, *ibid.*; H. Abū Ṣamad [Assistant Chief of Police, Nāblus District] to DPS in Nāblus, 29.7.22, *ibid.*, 156; Bramley [General Inspector of the Police and Prisons] to CS, 5.8.22, *ibid.*; Report on *al-Fiddā'iyyah* association, *ibid.* *Al-Karmil*, 21.12.21. Acting HC [G. Clayton] to Colonial Secretary, secret dispatch, 13.9.23, CO 733/49.
22. Anonymous letter to the HC, 5.4.21, ISA, CS, 157. 'Ārif al-Ārif was pardoned by the HC together with al-Ḥājj Amin al-Ḥusayni in September 1920, after they had been sentenced to 15 years' imprisonment for their part in the April 1920 riots in Jerusalem. On 1.10.20 'Ārif al-Ārif was appointed as Assistant Governor of Jenin sub-district in order to tame him by giving him public authority.
23. "Information gathered in Zikhron Ya'acov sub-district", *ibid.*, 144.
24. Report by B. Saig [Police Inspector], 20.6.21, *ibid.*
25. Quigley to ACS(P), 12.9.21, *ibid.*
26. S. Symes [Governor of Phoenicia District] to CS, 4.6.21, *ibid.*
27. Dr. Brin and Zvi Butkowsky (on behalf of Ḥadera colony) to the Government, 6.5.21, *ibid.*, 144; Report No. 95/PS, 6.5.21, *ibid.* 'Abdāllah Samārah to Jamāl al-Ḥusayni, No. 12, 28.7.21, ISA, AE, 1059.
28. Symes to CS, 14.5.21, ISA, CS, 144.
29. Herbert Samuel to Churchill, 15.5.21, *ibid.*
30. Bramley's memorandum, 7.5.21, *ibid.*; Zionist Commission to HC (including the leaflet distributed in Jerusalem), 3.5.21, *ibid.* The District Chief of Police confirmed the existence of this leaflet.
31. B. Saig to Jaffa Governor, 16.7.21, *ibid.*, 157.
32. Note on interviews with Tāhir al-Ḥusayni held on 30.4.25 and 16.5.25, secret document, 19.5.25, ZA, S/25, 517.
33. It should be stressed that the numerous police reports from different sources corroborated one another. The information given by the anonymous writer to the HC was almost identical to that independently collected by the police.
34. M. K. al-Ḥusayni to the HC, 10.5.21, ISA, CS, 244.
35. Report No. 5/64, 6.5.21, *ibid.*, 144; Al-Fārūqi's leaflet "My Brothers, The Villagers", *ibid.* *Al-Karmil*, 14.5.21.
36. *Al-Karmil*, 4.5.21, 7.5.21, 14.5.21.
37. B. Saig to Jaffa Governor, 14.7.21, ISA, CS, 157; same to same, 16.7.22, *ibid.*
38. See the cables and letters of protest on behalf of the AE, 10.5.21, CO 733/16.
39. Report on the Fourth Congress, 21.6.21, CO 733/13.
40. *STH*, *op. cit.*, Book 2, Part 1, pp. 83-90. Herbert Samuel to Churchill, 15.5.21, ISA, CS, *ibid.*, 144; HC announcement to the District Governors, 14.5.21, *ibid.*
41. HC's cable to CO, No. 132, 5.5.21, *ibid.* See also the exchange of cables concerning this issue in this file.
42. Al-Sifri, *op. cit.*, p. 73.
43. 'Abdāllah Samārah to AE, 26.10.21, ISA, AE, 1059; same to Jamāl al-Ḥusayni, *ibid.*
44. See Frumkin, *op. cit.*, p. 252. Jamāl al-Ḥusayni to the HC, 8.7.21, ISA, CS, 244.

45. H. Samuel to Churchill, 15.5.21, *ibid.*, 144; HC's Notice to the District Governors, 14.5.21, *ibid.*
46. For the text of the speech and all the correspondence pertaining to its preparation, see CO 733/14.
47. See Asaf, pp. 100-1. *STH*, *op. cit.*, Book 2, Part 1, pp. 111-13. It seems that the Zionist reaction was exaggerated. Already on 28.4.20 the CA declared that immigration to the country would be permitted so long as it was needed for the development of the country and it would be under Government control (see his speech of 28.4.20, ISA, CS, 141). Therefore the 3rd June speech of Herbert Samuel did not contain a far-reaching innovation, but a confirmation of a previous principle. Furthermore, the speech reconfirmed the basic premises of the Zionist policy, i.e. the recognition of the connection of the Jewish people with Palestine and the right of the Jews to build their home there, although the adjective "National" was omitted from its place before the term "Home". The historical development of the National Home proved that the regulation of immigration according to the economic capacity of absorption did not in fact impede its development, but the other way round. When in 1925 a huge number of immigrants (34,000) entered the country, the result in the three subsequent years (1926-8) was the gravest economic and moral crisis of the Zionist enterprise in Palestine.
48. Saig to Jaffa Governor, 14.7.21, ISA, CS, 147.
49. Jamāl al-Ḥusayni to the HC, 5.7.21, *ibid.*, 244.
50. Deedes to Shuckburgh, 22.11.21, CO 537/852.
51. See reports on this issue in ZA, Z/4, 2800I. Also the CID was afraid lest a rebellion broke out in September 1921. It is worth noting that among the six possible leaders of such a rebellion five people were members of the *al-Nādi al-'Arabi* and former supporters of the "Southern Syria" trend (see a secret circular of the CID, signed by Quigley, to the District Chiefs of Police, 22.9.21, ISA, CS, 149/1).
52. *STH*, *op. cit.*, Book 2, Part 1, pp. 134-8.
53. "To The Noble People" (AE leaflet for 2nd November 1921), ISA, CS, 141. Herbert Samuel to Colonial Secretary, confidential dispatch, 27.1.22, CO 733/18.
54. AE Bureau, "The 15th Newsletter", 6.11.21, ISA, AE, 1722; Jamāl al-Ḥusayni to the PD, 5.11.21, *ibid.* HC to the Colonial Office, conf. dispatch, 11.11.21, CO 733/7.
55. Report on Kāmil al-Budayri, ISA, CS, 168. H. Samuel to Colonial Secretary, secret dispatch, 6.10.22, CO 733/26; same to same, secret dispatch, 10.11.21, CO 733/27.
56. Same to same, secret dispatch, 6.12.21, CO 733/8.
57. See Samuel's first witness before the special Cabinet Committee on Palestine, Cab. 27/222, p. 2.
58. See Note 53, first source.
59. *Filasṭīn*, 10.12.21.
60. The details of this issue can be found in Granovsky, *op. cit.*, pp. 187 and 301-3 and the sources cited therein.
61. AE Bureau, "The 38th Newsletter", 21.4.22. ISA, AE, 1722.
62. H. Samuel to the Colonial Secretary secret dispatch, 6.12.21, CO 733/8; Deedes to the same, secret dispatch, 30.12.21, *ibid.*; Keith-Roach to the Colonial Secretary, secret dispatch, 2.2.22, CO 733/18.
63. See previous note.

64. See Samuel's second witness before the Cabinet Committee, Cab. 27/222, p. 7.
65. J. Chancellor to the Colonial Secretary, conf. 17.1.30, CO 733/182, 77050, Part A.
66. Deedes to Shuckburgh, 22.11.21, CO 537/852.
67. See the minutes pertaining to H. Samuel's cable to the Colonial Secretary, No. 447, 2.11.21, CO 733/7.

### THE FIRST DELEGATION TO BRITAIN

(pp. 137-147)

1. Elath, *op. cit.*, p. 74. Elath mistakenly gave the date of the Congress as 26th June. Al-Sifri also erred, when he gave the date as 25th July (p. 88 in his book). See also D. Gillon, "Were the British Wrong about Palestinian Nationalism?", *The New Middle East*, January 1969, p. 35.
2. AE report to the Fourth Congress, ISA, AE, 1026.
3. *Al-Karmil*, 12.3.21.
4. Note on a conversation between a delegation of the Muslim and Christian Societies of Haifa and Lord Milner on 11.4.22, ISA, AE, 1772.
5. See Note 2 and D. P. Stanton to M. K. al-Ḥusayni, 15.3.21, *ibid.*, 1773.
6. *Al-Karmil*, 19.9.26.
7. Eder to the Secretary of the ZE in London (including report on the Congress), 4.6.21, ZA, Z/4, 4112. *Al-Karmil*, 11.6.21. *Bayt al-Maqdis*, 9.6.21.
8. *Al-Karmil*, 18.6.21, 23.7.21. *Bayt al-Maqdis*, 18.6.21, 5.7.21.
9. H. Samuel to the Colonial Secretary, secret dispatch, 17.7.21, CO 733/4.
10. Saig to Jaffa Governor, 16.7.21, ISA, CS, 157.
11. On his appointment as a district officer see *Quarterly List . . .*, *ibid.*, 217/2. *Mir'at al-Sharq*, 3.7.27.
12. *Al-Karmil*, 18.6.21.
13. Protocol of the meeting held on 23.6.21, ISA, AE, 2425. For the Delegation reaction see its declaration, ZA, Z/4, 2512.
14. Jamāl al-Ḥusayni to Najīb Naṣṣār, 3.7.21, ISA, AE, 1058.
15. See the exchange of letters and cables concerning this issue, August 1921, *ibid.*; AE Bureau, "The 3rd Newsletter", 10.8.21, *ibid.*, 1722; Same, "The 5th Newsletter", 26.8.21, *ibid.* *Al-Karmil*, 20.8.21. *Ha'-Aretz*, 6.10.21. Asaf, pp. 101-2.
16. AE Bureau, "The 1st Newsletter", 29.7.21, ISA, AE, 1722. *Al-Karmil*, 13.7.21. AE circular, signed by M. K. al-Ḥusayni, 17.7.21, ISA, AE, 1713.
17. Protocol of meeting with H. Young [of the Colonial Office], 22.8.21, ISA, AE, 1026.
18. "The Moslem Christian Delegation from Palestine", 23.7.21, CO 733/13.
19. Churchill's memorandum to the Cabinet, CP 3213 (secret), CO 733/14.
20. CP 70(21), *ibid.*
21. R. Drayton [acting Legal Secretary] to the CS and the Chief Justice (including the draft Constitution), 14.8.21, ISA, CS, 244.
22. Note on the committee meetings on 12th and 13th August, CO 733/14.
23. See protocol of a conversation between the HC and Mr. Sulaymān Naṣīf, 11.2.23, ISA, CS, 242.
24. PD memorandum, 12.8.21, CO 733/14.

25. Protocols of the discussions held on 12.8.21 and 22.8.21, ISA, AE, 1026.
26. Protocol of the discussion held on 23.8.21, *ibid.*, 1810.
27. This fact misled H. Young to think that the whole Delegation accepted it (see note on his conversation with H. Sacher and Chaim Weizmann, 23.8.21, ZA, Z/4, 2512).
28. PD to Churchill, 1.9.21, CO 733/16.
29. Protocol of the conversation between the HC and Sulaymān Naşif, 16.2.23, ISA, CS, 242.
30. Report on a meeting about Palestine affairs, 15.9.21, CO 733/15.
31. PD to Churchill, 24.10.21, CO 733/16.
32. Memorandum, dated 7.11.21, *ibid.*
33. AE Bureau, "The 24th Newsletter", 6.1.22, ISA, AE, 1722.
34. PD to Churchill, 4.2.22, CO 733/36.
35. Same to same, 11.2.22, *ibid.*
36. Colonial Secretary's cable to the HC, 21.2.22, *ibid.*
37. PD to Churchill, 21.2.22, Cmd. 1700, 1922.
38. E. Mills [then of the Colonial Office] to W. Deedes, 30.3.22, ISA, CS, 158. Minute on the Delegation letter of 16.3.22, CO 733/36.
39. Frumkin (*op. cit.*, pp. 255-6) gave a very colourful description of this session.
40. AE cable to Churchill, 7.7.22, CO 733/36.
41. Protocol of the meeting, held on 23.8.21, ISA, AE, 2671.
42. Storrs to ACS (P), reporting on his conversation with Ibrāhīm Shammās, 23.9.22, ISA, CS, 168.
43. Protocol of the meeting held on 12.8.21 (English version), ISA, AE, 1026.
44. *Al-Karmil*, 20.8.21.
45. The Arabic protocol of the meeting held on 12.8.21 does not contain what Mr. Shibli al-Jamal said about an agreement with the "other body" (both English and Arabic versions are kept in ISA, AE, 1026) and the Arabic protocol of the meeting held on 23.8.21 does not contain the moderate views of Mu'in al-Māḍi and Shibli al-Jamal concerning the Legislative Council (For the Arabic version, see *ibid.*, 1810 and for the English one, see *ibid.*, 2671). See also Deedes to Shuckburgh, 15.9.22, CO 733/38. *Mir'āt al-Sharq*, 15.7.33.
46. "Report on November the Second in Nāblus", ISA, AE, 1072.
47. *Mir'āt al-Sharq* (the mouthpiece of the opposition), 15.7.33, 10.1.34.
48. *Al-Karmil*, 20.8.21 (this critical article was written in reaction to the moderate statement given by Shibli al-Jamal to the correspondent of the extremely pro-Arab *Morning Post*). Jubrān Iskandar Kazmā to the AE Secretary, 12.9.21, ISA, AE, 3785; Qayşar Khalil to the Delegation, 17.8.21, *ibid.*, 2282.
49. *Ibid.*
50. Nāblus MCA to the Colonial Secretary, 13.9.21, CO 733/16. Jubrān Iskandar Kazmā to the AE, 15.2.22, ISA, AE, 3785. 'Abdāllah Samārah to the AE, 14.2.22, *ibid.*, 1059. It is worth noting that Kāmīl al-Budayri, of the leaders of *al-Nāḍi al-'Arabi*, was again prominent in organizing this pressure.
51. Palestinian Committee in Cairo to the AE, 24.6.22, ISA, AE, 1026; Adīb Abū Ḍabbah to Jamāl al-Ḥusayni, 5.8.22, *ibid.*, 1721.
52. Cmd. 1700, 1922.
53. *Ibid.*

THE BOYCOTT OF THE ELECTIONS TO THE LEGISLATIVE  
COUNCIL

(pp. 147-158)

1. AE Bureau, "The 38th Newsletter", 21.4.22, ISA, AE, 1722.
2. Bramley to Deedes, 5.5.22, ISA, CS, 158.
3. H. Samuel to the Colonial Secretary, secret dispatch, 4.8.22, CO 733/24.
4. See AE leaflets in ISA, AE, 1026. The resolutions of the AE stressed the need to keep order and peace, *ibid.*, 1058.
5. Samuel to Colonial Secretary, secret dispatch, 7.7.22, CO 733/23.
6. AE to Ḥāfiẓ Ṭawqān and Dr. Muṣṭafā Bushnāq in Nāblus, ISA, AE, 1072.
7. "Announcement to the Honourable Nation" (AE leaflet), *ibid.*, 1058.
8. Deedes to Shuckburgh, 15.9.22, CO 733/58.
9. Ḥāfiẓ Ṭawqān to Jamāl al-Ḥusayni, 11.8.22, ISA, AE, 1072.
10. Jamāl al-Ḥusayni to Nāblus Governor, 16.8.22, ISA, CS, 168.
11. Cable by Jamāl al-Ḥusayni to the notables of Transjordan and their Executive Committee, ISA, AE, 1058. Ḥāfiẓ Ṭawqān to the AE, 9.8.22, *ibid.*, 1072.
12. The various proposals are kept in *ibid.*, 1771; The resolutions—*ibid.*, 1058.
13. Cox to ACS (P), 25.8.22, ISA, CS, 168.
14. *Ibid.*
15. C. Reading [Governor of Ṭul-Karm sub-district] to the Governor of Samaria District, 17.9.22, *ibid.*
16. Draft dispatch to the Colonial Office, ISA, Samuel Papers. Deedes to Shuckburgh, 15.9.22, CO 733/38.
17. Storrs to the ACS (P), 23.9.22, ISA, CS, 168.
18. Deedes to Shuckburgh, 6.10.22, CO 733/38.
19. Jamāl al-Ḥusayni to M. K. al-Ḥusayni, 5.8.23, ISA, AE, 2480.
20. Samuel to the Colonial Office, secret dispatch, 6.10.22, CO 733/26; HC's cable to the same, 16.10.22, *ibid.*
21. Same to same, 4.1.23 and last to first, 23.1.23, CO 733/41.
22. See previous note. See also AE report to the Sixth Congress, ISA, AE, 1026; Ḥāfiẓ Ṭawqān to the AE, 19.10.22, *ibid.*, 1072. HC to the Colonial Office, secret dispatch, 10.11.22, CO 733/27; Deedes to Shuckburgh, 20.10.22, CO 733/38. *Al-Karmil*, 18.10.22.
23. Such three explanatory leaflets can be found in ISA, CS, 242/1. See also Nāfi' 'Abūshi to AE, ISA, AE, 1061.
24. Report on a conversation between the HC and members of the AE held on 6.2.23, ISA, CS, 158.
25. S. Tchernowitz to Kisch, 6.3.23, ZA, S/25, 665; Murshid Shāhīn to Dr. N. Malūl, 24.2.23, *ibid.*, 518. Symes to CS, 10.3.23, ISA, CS, 242/2. F. H. Kisch, *Palestine Diary*, London, 1938, pp. 35, 46-7.
26. Ṭāhir al-Ṭabari, Mufti of Tiberias, to the AE, 19.3.23, ISA, AE, 1057.
27. Murshid Shāhīn to Malūl, 24.2.23, ZA, S/25, 518.
28. Same to same (no date), *ibid.*; Tchernowitz to Kisch, 6.3.23, *ibid.*, 665.
29. Memorandum on the attitudes of Būlus Shihādah and his paper *Mir'āt al-Sharq* towards the elections, ZA, S/25, 4378.
30. AE report to the Sixth Congress, on 16.6.23, ISA, AE, 1026.
31. A note on AE session, 1.9.22, *ibid.*, 1058.
32. Ḥāfiẓ Ṭawqān to AE, 24.8.22, *ibid.*, 1072; 'Abdāllah Samārah to AE, 11.10.22, *ibid.*, 1059.

33. See Nāfi' 'Abūshi's letters to the AE of the end of 1922 and beginning of 1923, *ibid.*, 1061; Ḥāfiẓ Ṭawqān's cable to the AE, 29.8.22 and Nāblus MCA to AE, 28.12.22, *ibid.*, 1072; Jubrān Iskandar Kazmā to Jamāl al-Ḥusayni, 16.2.23, *ibid.*, 3785. Ḥāfiẓ Ṭawqān to the HC, 31.1.23, ISA, CS, 242/1; Cox to ACS(P), 5.2.23, *ibid.* Murshid Shāhin to Malūl, 24.2.23, ZA, S/25, 518. *Al-Karmil*, 10.2.23.
34. Kalvarisky to ZE in London, 26.4.23, ZA, Z/4, 1392II. M. Shāhin to Malūl, no date, ZA, S/25, 518. Samuel to Colonial Secretary, secret dispatch, 13.4.23, CO 733/44.
35. Ḥāfiẓ Ṭawqān to the AE, 1.12.22, ISA, AE, 1072. *Al-Karmil*, 9.12.22. Announcement No. 7 about the boycott of the elections, 4.3.22, ISA, CS, 242/1. A. Eisenberg to Kisch, 25.2.23, ZA, S/25, 518.
36. Cox to ACS (P), 5.2.23, ISA, CS, 242/1; Nāblus MCA cable to HC, 14.2.23, *ibid.*; Quigley [District Chief of Police, Jerusalem-Jaffa District] to Storrs, No. 127, *ibid.* *Al-Karmil*, 20.2.23, 24.2.23. Murshid Shāhin to Malūl, 24.2.23, ZA, S/25, 518. Samuel to the Colonial Secretary, secret dispatch, 13.4.23, CO 733/44. Kisch, *op. cit.*, p. 35.
37. Note by Richmond on the activities of the Mufti of Gaza, ISA, CS, 242/1; Abramson [Governor of Southern district] to ACS(P), 11.2.23, *ibid.*, 172. Sa'īd Abū Ḥamad (of Nazareth) to Kisch, ZA, S/25, 665.
38. N. Malūl, "Le-Toldōt Ha-Tenu'ah Ha-'Arvit", *Sefer Ha-Shanah shel Eretz-Israel*, Vol. I (1923), p. 272.
39. Symes to ACS(P), 10.3.23; ISA, CS, 242/2. Ibrāhīm 'Ābdin to Malūl, 17.2.23, ZA, S/25, 518; S. Tchernowitz to Kisch, 6.3.23, *ibid.*, 665; Sa'īd Abū Ḥamad to Kisch, *ibid.* *Mir'āt al-Sharq*, 24.3.23. *Al-Karmil*, 20.2.23, 24.2.23. HC to Colonial Secretary, secret dispatch, 7.2.23, CO 733/42; same to same, 9.3.23, CO 733/43; same to same, 13.4.23, CO 733/44.
40. See sources quoted in previous Note.
41. *Mir'āt al-Sharq*, 30.10.31.
42. Elath, *op. cit.*, pp. 83-8.
43. According to Cmd. 1889, 1923.
44. This argument was brilliantly stated by George E. Kirk, *A Short History of the Middle East*, New York, 1959, pp. 318-25.

#### THE SECOND DELEGATION—THE APPEAL TO THE TURKS

(pp. 158-169)

1. *Al-Karmil*, 16.9.22.
2. H. Arlozoroff's reply to Kisch's questionnaire concerning "The Arab question and its influences on the establishment of representative bodies in Palestine", p. 14, ZA, S/25, 4164.
3. HC to the Colonial Secretary, secret dispatch, 6.10.22, CO 733/26. Jamāl al-Ḥusayni to the President of the Khaliphate Committee in Bombay, 25.9.22, ISA, CS, 168; same to same, 1.10.22, *ibid.*
4. HC to Colonial Secretary, secret dispatch, 20.11.22, CO 733/27.
5. Ya'qūb al-Ṭawil to Jamāl al-Ḥusayni, 28.10.22, ISA, AE, 1541.
6. See Cmd. 1700, 1922.
7. See note on a meeting between the HC and ACS(P) and M. K. al-Ḥusayni, Jamāl al-Ḥusayni and 'Abd al-Qādir al-Muẓaffar, 30.10.22, ISA, CS, 168.
8. See the material on the "Palestinian Committee" in Cairo, *ibid.*, 170. Samuel, Draft Dispatch to the Colonial Office", ISA, Samuel Paper.

9. See Introduction.
10. Palin Report, p. 10, FO 371/5121. At that time contacts were established between the Arab nationalists and Mustafa Kemal in order to have a joint anti-Allied front (see *BD*, IV, pp. 478, 523, 566 and 569. Z. N. Zeine, *The Struggle for Arab Independence*, Beirut, 1960. pp. 146-7).
11. See articles by Ḥusni 'Abd al-Hādī in *Bayt al-Maqdis*, 7.7.20, 24.7.20, 31.7.20, 7.8.20.
12. *Mir'āt al-Sharq*, 27.2.24.
13. Leaflet "Muslims Awake" (distributed in Jerusalem on 19.4.20), ISA, CS, 245.
14. Quigley to ACS(P), 30.10.20, *ibid.*, 163; See also reports of District Governors on this issue, December 1920, *ibid.* Report No. 32, 1.4.20, ZA, Z/4, 2800II.
15. HC to Colonial Office, cable 412, 19.12.23, CO 733/52; same to same, secret dispatch, 10.1.24, CO 733/63; same to same, secret dispatch, 18.4.24, CO 733/67; same to same, secret dispatch, 21.11.24, CO 733/75.
16. Memorandum to the League of Nations, 1922, ISA, AE, 1810; "The Present Situation of Palestine" submitted by the AE to Lord Northcliff, February 1922, *ibid.*, 3046; "Report on the Situation of Palestine during Four Years of Civil Administration", submitted by the AE to the League of Nations, 1925, *ibid.*, 3357. Report on a meeting of Palestinian representative with L. S. Amery, 21.4.25, ISA, CS, 136; "Proceedings of the Sixth Congress, 16-20.6.23", *ibid.*, 171.
17. See British Intelligence reports, *ibid.*, 1 and 2; Brunton's report, 23.2.21, *ibid.*, 163.
18. Leaflet addressed to the inhabitants of "Southern Syria", quoted in communiqué No. 325 of the Zionist Commission, Press Bureau, 1.6.20, ZA, Z/4, 1454. Some authors, who discerned the sympathy of the Palestinian Arabs towards Mustafa Kemal and his movement, inclined to attribute the various manifestations of the nationalist awakening in Palestine to the activities of Kemalist agents (see for example, Elath, *op. cit.*, pp. 74-5). However, there is no evidence in the available source material for such a belief.
19. *Al-Ahrām*, 6.12.22. Luke to CS, ISA, CS, 131.
20. Ḥāfiẓ Ṭawqān to the AE, 19.3.22 and 22.3.22, ISA, AE, 1072.
21. Richmond to the CS (reporting on a conversation with Jamāl al-Ḥusayni and al-Muẓaffar), 21.2.23, ISA, CS, 158.
22. L. Harrington (Deputy Chief of Police, Jerusalem District) to Chief of Police, in Quigley to the District Governor, 17.2.23, *ibid.*, 169. HC to the Colonial Secretary, secret dispatch, 19.10.23, CO 733/50; same to same, secret dispatch, 10.1.24, CO 733/63.
23. Jamāl al-Ḥusayni to "The Khaliphate Committee", in Bombay, 1.10.22 and 5.10.22, ISA, CS, 168. It should be noted that in that period the secularist components of Kemalism had not yet been noticed in Turkey itself.
24. Sab' al-'Aysh to AE Secretary, 16.10.22, ISA, AE, 1541.
25. CID report to ACS(P), 7.11.22, ISA, CS, 168.
26. Shibli al-Jamal to the AE President (no date), ISA, AE, 1541.
27. Mu'īn al-Māḍī to the AE, 11.11.22, *ibid.*
28. Jamāl al-Ḥusayni to the "Khaliphate Committee", 1.10.22, ISA, CS, 168. 'Abd al-Qādir al-Muẓaffar to the AE, No. 2, 17.11.23, ISA, AE, 1541. The composition of the delegation given in Al-Sifri, *op. cit.*, p. 96, is not precise.
29. M. K. al-Ḥusayni to the AE, No. 3 (no date), ISA, AE, 1541. See the

- receipt given by Shibli al-Jamal on 19.11.22 to the AE, for the remittance he got for his travel expenditure, *ibid.*, 1713.
30. M. K. al-Ḥusayni to the AE, No. 7, 13.1.23, *ibid.*, 1541.
  31. Same to same, No. 3 (2.12.22), *ibid.*
  32. 'Abd al-Qādir al-Muẓaffar to the AE, No. 2, 17.11.22, *ibid.*; M. K. al-Ḥusayni's cable to the AE, 16.11.22, *ibid.*
  33. See previous note and Amin al-Tamimi's speech in the Sixth Congress, "Proceedings of the Sixth Congress, 16-20.6.23", ISA, CS, 171.
  34. 'Abd al-Qādir al-Muẓaffar to the AE, No. 5, 22.11.22, ISA, AE, 1541; same to same, No. 6, 26.11.22, *ibid.*; same to same, 5.12.22 (the date was mistakenly written as 5.11.22), *ibid.*; M. K. al-Ḥusayni to the AE, No. 3, (2.12.22), *ibid.*
  35. HC to the Colonial Secretary, secret dispatch, 8.1.23, CO 733/41.
  36. M. K. al-Ḥusayni to the AE, No. 2 (no date), ISA, AE, 1541.
  37. Same to same, No. 5, 16.1.23, *ibid.*
  38. Same to same, No. 6, 19.1.23, *ibid.*
  39. Circular signed by Khalil al-Sakākini [acting AE Secretary], 5.11.23, *ibid.*, 3589. See the memoranda of the Delegation, enclosed with that of M. K. al-Ḥusayni to AE, No. 6, 19.1.23, *ibid.*, 1541. Z. Shāhin, *Sodot she'od terem Nitgalu*, Tel-Aviv, 1930, p. 16.
  40. See Note 37.
  41. Second Delegation report to the Sixth Congress, ISA, AE, 1771. See Amin al-Tamimi's speech, "Proceedings of Sixth Congress, 16-20.6.23", ISA, CS, 171. M. K. al-Ḥusayni to the AE, No. 9 (no date), ISA, AE, 1541.
  42. See Delegation letters to the AE, Nos. 2-6, *ibid.*
  43. L. Oliphant (of the Foreign Office) to the Colonial Under-Secretary, 20.10.22, CO 733/31.
  44. HC to the Colonial Secretary, secret dispatch, 10.11.22, CO 735/27. Samuel, "Draft Dispatch to the Colonial Office", ISA, Samuel Papers.
  45. Anonymous letter to the AE, 6.11.22, ISA, AE, 1541. Kāmil Wafā to Jamāl al-Ḥusayni, 16.11.22, *ibid.*
  46. M. K. al-Ḥusayni to the AE, No. 3 [2.12.22], *ibid.*; same to same, No. 4, 7.12.22, *ibid.* HC to Colonial Secretary, secret dispatch, 7.2.23, CO 733/42.
  47. M. K. al-Ḥusayni to the AE, No. 7, 13.1.23, ISA, AE, 1541.
  48. *Ibid.* Colonial Office to the HC, Cable No. 31, 3.2.23, ISA, CS, 242/1. See also minutes prepared by Shuckburgh for this meeting and the official announcement on it, CO 733/54.
  49. CP 106 (23) secret, CO 735/58.
  50. Memorandum by the General Staff, "The Strategic Importance of Palestine", 18.6.23 (Enclosure No. 3 in the Imperial Defence Committee document, 2.7.23), Cab. 27/222.
  51. See all the letters of the Delegation to the AE, mentioned in the previous notes, ISA, AE, 1541.

#### MORE BRITISH PROPOSALS AND THEIR REJECTION

(pp. 169-183)

1. All the material concerning this issue can be found in ISA, CS, 127 and 242/2 and CO 733/43 and 733/44. See also Cmd. 1889, 1923, second document and enclosure.
2. E. T. Richmond, "Memorandum on the present attitude of the Arabs

- and the Government towards the new Constitution for Palestine with proposals for overcoming present difficulties", 12.3.23, ISA, CS, 242/2.
3. The AE people knew Richmond very well and had great esteem for him. In August 1923 Jamāl al-Ḥusayni heard that Richmond might be dismissed. He immediately wrote to M. K. al-Ḥusayni, who was then in London as the head of the Third Delegation, and asked him to do whatever he could to prevent the dismissal. He wrote: "You know that the only man who helps us in Mount Scopus [Government House was then located in Augusta Victoria building, on Mount Scopus—Al-Ṭūr] is Richmond and had it not been for him the policy of intimidation by imprisonment and deportation would have long ago been used . . . Richmond is the only man we have" (see Jamāl al-Ḥusayni to "my honourable uncle" [M. K. al-Ḥusayni], 17.8.23, ISA, AE, 2480).
  4. Note on a conversation held in Government House on 20.3.23, ISA, CS, 158.
  5. Jamāl al-Ḥusayni to the HC, 22.3.23, *ibid.*
  6. Enclosure to HC to the Colonial Office, dispatch No. 596, 15.6.23, CO 733/46.
  7. See dispatch cited in previous note. *Mir'āt al-Sharq*, 18.7.23. The names of the nominees were: Rāghib Bey al-Nashāshibi (Mayor of Jerusalem), 'Arif Pāshā al-Dajāni (Jerusalem), Ismā'il Bey al-Ḥusayni (Jerusalem), 'Abd al-Fattāḥ al-Sa'di (Mayor of Acre), Amīn 'Abd al-Hādi (Haifa), Sulaymān 'Abd al-Razzāq Ṭawqān (Nāblus), Maḥmūd Abū Khaḍrā' (Mayor of Gaza), Sheikh Frayīḥ Abū Madyan (of the Neggev tribes)—all of whom were Muslims; Sulaymān Bey Naṣif (Haifa, Protestant of Lebanese origin), and Anṭūn Jallād (Jaffa, Greek-Orthodox).
  8. See details of such a conversation in *Mir'āt al-Sharq*, 21.12.32.
  9. *Ibid.*, 2.6.23, 6.6.23, 9.6.23, HC to the Colonial Office, Cable No. 205, 13.6.23, CO 733/45; same to same, dispatch No. 596, 15.6.23, CO 733/46; "Announcement to the Honourable Nation", 6.6.23, ISA, AE, 1026.
  10. Clayton to the Colonial Office, secret dispatch, 12.7.23, CO 733/47. Anṭūn Jallād's speech in the Sixth Congress, ISA, CS, 171.
  11. See Note 6. See also HC to the Colonial Office, Cable No. 206, 13.6.23, CO 733/45.
  12. Same to same, Cable No. 205, 13.6.23, *ibid.* See the memorandum of the Acting Group of Members of Parliament from the Conservative party to Stanley Baldwin, 24.7.23, ISA, AE, 853.
  13. Proceedings of the Congress, *Mir'āt al-Sharq*, 20.6.23, 23.6.23, 27.6.23 and the reports in ISA, CS, 171. For the resolution see ISA, AE, 1058.
  14. *Mir'āt al-Sharq*, 18.7.23.
  15. *Ibid.*, 21.12.32 (reporting a conversation between Būlus Shihādah, the newspaper's Editor, and Clayton when Clayton entered his new office).
  16. Clayton to Colonial Secretary, secret dispatch, 6.7.23, CO 733/47.
  17. Colonial Secretary to HC, Cable No. 195, 15.6.23, CO 733/45; last to first, Cable No. 217, 18.6.23, CO 733/46; same to same, Cable No. 239, 1.7.23, CO 733/54; same to same, secret dispatch, 16.8.23, CO 733/98. *Mir'āt al-Sharq*, 18.7.23. Al-Sifri, *op. cit.*, p. 87, gives a fragmentary and unprecise story.
  18. M. K. al-Ḥusayni to the Chairman of the Cabinet Committee, 24.2.23, ISA, AE, 853.
  19. E. Marsh (private secretary of the Colonial Secretary) to M. K. al-

- Ḥusayni, 1.8.23, *ibid.*, 1231. See also the minute on the letter cited in Note 18, CO 733/58.
20. See memoranda written by Shuckburgh, 16.7.23, 18.7.23 and note written by Samuel, 19.7.23, CO 733/54. See also HC to the Colonial Secretary, Cable No. 317, 21.9.23, ISA, CS, 171; last to first, Cable No. 287, 22.9.23, *ibid.*
  21. W. C. Hankinson to the PD, 28.8.23, ISA, AE, 1231. PD to Baldwin, 12.9.23, ISA, SMC, 2671.
  22. Two cables by the PD to the AE, 23.7.23, ISA, AE, 1541; Wadi' al-Bustāni to Jamāl al-Ḥusayni, 10.8.23, *ibid.*; M. K. al-Ḥusayni to the AE, 13.8.23, *ibid.*; same to same, 4.9.23, *ibid.* Acting HC to the Colonial Secretary, Cable No. 276, 3.8.23, CO 733/48; same to same, secret dispatch, 24.8.23, *ibid.* Kisch to Stein, KL/335, 15.7.23, ZA, S/25, 4383. John Marlowe, *Seat of Pilate*, London, 1959, p. 92.
  23. On their activities, pressure and their memoranda, see ISA, AE, 855 and 1541, and CO 733/57.
  24. PD to the AE [Aug. 1923], ISA, AE, 2480. The Cabinet Committee decided that their decisions would be published upon the return of the HC to Palestine in September. The Delegation attributed the delay of the publication to the Government fears of the pro-Arab group and Delegation! See also *al-Karmil*, 25.8.23. Clayton to the Colonial Secretary, secret dispatch, 24.8.23, CO 733/48.
  25. Same to same, secret dispatch 16.8.23, CO 733/48. As'ad al-Ḥājj Yūsuf [Qaddūrah], Mufti of Safed, to the AE Secretary (enclosing a copy of his appeal to 'Abd al-Fattāh al-Sa'di, Mayor of Acre), 7 Dhū al-Ḥijjah, 1341 (21.7.23), ISA, AE, 1057; Ḥāfiẓ Ṭawqān to Jamāl al-Ḥusayni, 21.7.23, *ibid.*, 1072.
  26. Kisch to Stein, KL/335, 15.7.23, ZA, S/25, 4383. Acting HC to the Colonial Secretary, Cable No. 273, 1.8.23, CO 733/48.
  27. Same to same, Cable No. 276, 3.8.23, *ibid.*; last to first, Cable No. 247, 3.8.23, *ibid.*
  28. Kalvarisky to the ZE in London, 3.8.23, ZA, Z/4, 1392II. Jamāl al-Ḥusayni to the PD President, 5.8.23, ISA, AE, 2480; same to same, 23.8.23, *ibid.* Acting HC to the Colonial Secretary, Cable No. 302, 7.9.23, ISA, CS, 171.
  29. Last to first, Cable No. 247, 3.8.23, CO 733/48.
  30. Palestine Committee, "The Future of Palestine", Report, Cab. 23/46. See also Marlowe, *op. cit.*, pp. 93-4, 152. Meinertzhagen, *op. cit.*, p. 154.
  31. Memorandum by Shuckburgh, 24.7.23, CO 733/54.
  32. Same, 25.7.23, *ibid.*
  33. Report on a conversation between the HC and Palestinian leaders, 5.10.23, ISA, AE, 3076.
  34. HC to the Colonial Secretary, Cable No. 338, 8.10.23, CO 733/58. Dr. Fu'ād Shaṭārah to M. K. al-Ḥusayni, 12.10.23, ISA, AE, 3520.
  35. See Note 33.
  36. [M. K. al-Ḥusayni] to Fu'ād Shaṭārah, 3.11.23, ISA, AE, 3520.
  37. Memorandum on "The Future of Palestine", CP 433(23), CO 733/58.
  38. Duke of Devonshire [The Colonial Secretary] to the HC, private and confidential Cable No. 314, 17.10.23, CO 733/50.
  39. Cabinet decisions, 9.11.23, Cab. 53(23), CO 733/58. Document No. 4 in Cmd. 1989, 1923.
  40. The developments of these negotiations were discussed by me in a separate article: "The Palestinians, and the Negotiations for the

- British-Hijazi Treaty, 1920–1925”, *Asian and African Studies*, Vol. 8 (1972), pp. 20–48.
41. Memorandum on the negotiations written by Mr. Carnegie of the Foreign Office, FO 371/7711. Minute from 18.7.23, FO 371/8939.
  42. Special delegates were sent to him in order to assure it (see AE report to the Sixth Congress, 16.7.23, ISA, AE, 1026). On the pressure through the press campaigns see G. Smith (Acting British Agent in Jedda) to Foreign Office, 4.6.23, FO 371/8938.
  43. Colonial Office to the HC, Cables Nos. 149, 5.5.23, and 173, 29.5.23, ISA, CS, 129. Nāji al-Aṣīl to the Foreign Under-Secretary, 11.6.23, FO 371/8938. Acting Agent in Jedda to the HC, Cable No. 31, 17.5.23, ISA, CS, 129. Same to the Foreign Office, 20.5.23, FO 371/8938.
  44. Colonial Office to the HC, Cable No. 173, 29.5.23, ISA, CS, 129. For the summary of the draft Treaty see ISA, AE, 2424.
  45. AE report to the Sixth Congress, 16.6.23, *ibid.*, 1026.
  46. *Al-Karmil*, 30.6.23.
  47. See Note 45. See also Ḥāfiẓ Ṭawqān to Jamāl al-Ḥusayni, 7.6.23, ISA, AE, 1072.
  48. *Al-Karmil*, 27.6.23, 30.6.23, 7.7.23, 11.7.23, 14.7.23. *Filasṭīn*, 3.7.23, 6.7.23, 10.7.23. *Ṣawt al-Sha'b*, 8.8.24. Nāblus MCA cable, 14.6.23, ISA, AE, 1058. It should be noted that the Nāblus people accused ‘Abd al-Qādir al-Muzaffar of selling himself to the King of Hejaz (see Clayton to the Colonial Secretary, secret dispatch, 16.8.23, CO 733/48).
  49. Summary of the proceedings of the Sixth Congress, 16–20.6.23, ISA, CS, 171.
  50. Kisch to the Political Secretary of the ZE in London (reporting on the Sixth Congress), 25.6.23, ISA, CS, 171.
  51. The text can be found in ISA, AE, 1026.
  52. See Note 49. See also *al-Karmil*, 27.6.23; *Filasṭīn*, 3.7.23.
  53. *Mir’āt al-Sharq*, 23.6.23.
  54. *Ibid.*, 27.6.23.
  55. See Note 49. See also Kisch to ZE in London, 25.6.23, *ibid.* M. K. al-Ḥusayni to the AE, 25.7.23, ISA, AE, 1541.
  56. *Mir’āt al-Sharq*, 27.6.23.
  57. *Al-Karmil*, 27.6.23, 30.6.23, 7.7.23, 14.7.23, 28.7.23. See copies of cables dated 20th and 22nd June concerning the trip to England, exchanged between Jamāl al-Ḥusayni and the pro-Arab committee in London, ISA, AE, 1541; “Youth of Nazareth” to Jamāl al-Ḥusayni, 2.7.23, *ibid.*, 1057. When the Delegation returned to the country the delay in its departure had been attributed to “various factors” (see the Delegation report, 5.10.23, ZA, S/25, 4378).
  58. M. K. al-Ḥusayni’s cable to King Ḥusayn, 26.7.23, ISA, AE, 2424; same to the AE, 31.7.23, *ibid.*, 1541; same to same, 28.8.23, *ibid.*
  59. Same to same, 25.7.23, *ibid.*; same to same, 13.8.23, *ibid.*; same to Dr. Nāji al-Aṣīl, 13.9.23, *ibid.* The Delegation report, 5.10.23, ZA, S/25, 4378.
  60. See last source quoted in previous note.
  61. Amīn al-Tamīmī to the AE secretary, 16.9.23, ISA, AE, 1541; Amīn al-Tamīmī’s cable to M. K. al-Ḥusayni, 17.9.23, *ibid.*, 2480.
  62. See Note 60. Amīn al-Tamīmī’s cable to M. K. al-Ḥusayni, 29.10.23, ISA, AE, 1541; Wadī’ al-Bustāni to M. K. al-Ḥusayni, 9.11.23, *ibid.*, 2699.
  63. See *al-Karmil*’s view, 1.3.24 and 5.4.24. See also HC to the Colonial Secretary, secret dispatch, 4.2.24, CO 733/65.

64. This description is based on my article mentioned in Note 40.  
 65. See cables from all over the country telling of the strikes, ISA, CS, 158.

## CHAPTER FOUR

## HIS APPOINTMENT AS MUFTI OF JERUSALEM

(pp. 184-194)

1. Report of the Palin Commission, p. 7, FO 371/5121.
2. Muḥammad Šāliḥ Ibn 'Abd al-Ghani al-Ḥusayni, *al-Nafḥah al-Ḥabībah Fi Ma'rifat al-Awqāt al-Shar'iyyah* (MS., National and University Library, Jerusalem, AP. Ar., No. 8°1), p. 3.
3. 'Abd al-Raḥmān al-Jabarti, *'Ajā'ib al-Āthār Fi al-Tarājim wa-al-Akhbār*, Bulāq, 1297, Part 1, p. 375. Ihsān al-Nimr, *op. cit.*, Part 2, p. 405.
4. Muḥammad Šāliḥ al-Ḥusayni, *op. cit.*
5. Murādi, *Silk al-Durar Fi A'yān al-Qarn al-Thāni 'Ashar*, Bulāq, 1301, Part 3, pp. 89, 124; Jabarti, *op. cit.*, Part 1, p. 372.
6. Muḥammad Šāliḥ al-Ḥusayni, *op. cit.*
7. C. Van Arendonk, "Sharīf", *EI*, Vol. 4, pp. 324-9.
8. Ihsān al-Nimr, *op. cit.*, Part 2, p. 405.
9. Elath, *op. cit.*, pp. 16-17. My sources fail to confirm part of Elath's version. It should be kept in mind, however, that Elath based his version on evidence given by families opposed to Amīn al-Ḥusayni, who no doubt wished to cast aspersions on his ancestry.
10. *Ibid.* p. 17. Druyanov, *op. cit.*, Part 1, pp. 769-70. In the 1870s, the office was held by Salīm al-Ḥusayni (*ibid.*); it afterwards passed to his son, Ḥusayn Salīm al-Ḥusayni (see diary of an anonymous Jerusalem youth, MS., National and University Library, Jerusalem, AP. Ar., 8°46, p. 123), and on his death, the British authorities confirmed his older brother Mūsā Kāẓim Pāshā al-Ḥusayni in the office (see Frumkin, *op. cit.*, pp. 282-3).
11. *Düstūr, Tertīb-i Thāni*, Vol. 5, Istanbul, 1332 Hijri, p. 359.
12. Draft dispatch to the Colonial Office, 25.10.21, ISA, CS, 245. See also Sakākīni's testimony on the good relations between Ronald Storrs and Kāmil al-Ḥusayni, the Mufti of Jerusalem (Sakākīni, *Kadhā Anā*, *op. cit.*, p. 172).
13. Report No. 32, Jerusalem, 1.4.20, Z/4, 2800II. The High Commissioner to "Prodrome" (telegraphic code of the Foreign Office), Cable No. 443, 21.12.20, ISA, CS, 163.
14. Interview with Ṭāhir al-Ḥusayni at the Zionist Executive, 16.5.25, ZA, S/25, 517; conversation between the HC and Mr. A. Laniado of the Jewish Agency Executive, 30.3.30, *ibid.*, 3006. See also Frumkin, *op. cit.*, p. 216. It should also be mentioned that, under the influence of the April 1920 disturbances, Kāmil al-Ḥusayni signed an anti-Zionist petition sponsored by the notables of Arab Jerusalem (see the petition to "His Excellency the Chief Administrator of Occupied Enemy Territories", 6.4.20, ISA, CS, 140), but immediately afterwards reverted to his traditional position.
15. Report No. 92, Jerusalem, 18.6.20, ZA, Z/4, 2800II.
16. See source in Note 12 above; also a memorandum on the Mufti's status (without address, date or signature), ISA, CS, 245. (It appears from the handwriting and content that this was written by al-Ḥājj Amīn shortly after he became Mufti.) Storrs, *op. cit.*, pp. 308, 349. Granovsky, *op. cit.*, p. 141.

17. E. Richmond (Assistant Chief Secretary) to the Chief Secretary, 15.10.21, ISA, CS, 245; H. A. Smellwood (Financial Secretary) to the Chief Secretary, 19.10.21, *ibid.*; draft of dispatch to the Colonial Office, 25.10.21, *ibid.*
18. Palin Report, p. 15, FO 371/5121. Amin al-Ḥusayni's Memorandum, ISA, CS, 245; Richmond to the HC, 20.10.21, *ibid.* This term was used throughout the Mandatory period by the Government and the public alike. However, when the Jordanian authorities appointed in 1948 a new Mufti for the office, vacant since 1937, they no longer used this exalted title.
19. Amin al-Ḥusayni's Memorandum, ISA, CS, 245. On Khalil al-Khālidi see al-Miṣri, *op. cit.*, p. 125.
20. Paragraphs 38–41 of the "Temporary Law for the Appointment of Shar'i Judges and Other Shar'i Officials", 19 Jumādā al-Ūlā, 1331 Hijri [26.4.13], *Düstūr, Tertīb Thāni*, Vol. 5, pp. 359–60.
21. W. Deedes (Chief Secretary) to the Colonial Secretary (including political report for February 1921), 3.3.21, CO, 233/1.
22. E. al-Ghawri, *Filasīn*, p. 57. CID to ACS(P), 23.3.21, ISA, CS, File 245.
23. Same to same (from a report on the elections), 14.4.21, *ibid.* *Mir'āt al-Sharq*, 27.11.31. Ṭāhir al-Ḥusayni during a meeting with I. Ben-Zvi, 2.4.30, ZA, S/25, 3006. See also Elath's description, *op. cit.*, p. 27ff and Dr. D. Eder's note of "Confidential Interview with the Civil Secretary", 21.4.21, ZA, L/3, 222.
24. Muḥammad Abu Sa'ūd al-'Awri to the Governor of Jerusalem District, 21.3.21, ISA, CS, File 245; CID Staff to ACS(P), 22.3.21, *ibid.*
25. These petitions are preserved in ISA, CS, File 245. According to a Zionist source, many of these petitions were signed after the village *mukhtārs* had been bribed (see al-Ḥājj Muḥammad Amīn al-Ḥusayni's biography, ZA, S/25, 3008).
26. See, for example, Sa'ūd al-'Awri, *Qāḍi* of Jerusalem, to the HC, 24.3.21, ISA, CS, File 245. This has no foundation in Islamic tradition, but has nevertheless become deeply rooted in the social reality of the towns and cities of Syria and Palestine where, from the eighteenth century onwards, there emerged a class of 'ulamā' families who claimed *Sharīfi* origin and who monopolized the important religious offices, which were passed on from generation to generation.
27. Gaza petitions to the HC (attached to a letter written by the Governor of Gaza, Mr. Nott, 8.4.21), *ibid.*; Muḥammad Sa'ūd al-'Awri to the HC, 29.3.21, *ibid.*
28. A summary of all these petitions is contained in Richmond's memorandum to the HC, 7.6.21, *ibid.* E. al-Ghawri, *Filasīn*, p. 58.
29. Al-Ḥājj Amin al-Ḥusayni's biography, ZA, S/25, 3008.
30. Translation of a proclamation displayed in the Old City, 19.4.21, ISA, CS, File 245.
31. Muḥammad Amīn al-Ḥusayni [to the Government], [beginning of June], ISA, CS, 245; Governor of Nāblus District to the Chief Secretary (submitting the Nāblus petitions), 18.4.21, *ibid.* The argument put forward by al-Ḥājj Amīn's opponents is given in a letter written by Muḥammad Munīb al-Hāshimi, Mufti of Nāblus, to the Legal Secretary, 25 Ramaḍān, 1329 Hijri [21.6.21], *ibid.*
32. Richmond's minutes, 3.5.21, *ibid.*; Ditto re the "Grand Mufti", *ibid.*; same to the HC, 7.6.21, *ibid.*
33. Herbert Samuel to the Chief Secretary (reporting his conversation with al-Ḥājj Amīn), 11.4.21, *ibid.*

34. Al-Miṣri, *op. cit.*, p. 109. Al-Miṣri points out that Amīn al-Ḥusayni "entered" al-Azhar, but does not mention his having completed his studies there. Aḥmad Sāmīḥ al-Khālidi, a Palestinian educationalist, gives in his book *Ahl al-'Ilm bayn Sūriya wa-Filasṭīn*, Jerusalem, undated, pp. 39-40, a comprehensive list of Palestinians who had studied at al-Azhar—and the name of Amīn al-Ḥusayni does not appear! See also Elath, *op. cit.*, pp. 18-20.
35. 'Izzat Darwaza, *Ḥawla al-Ḥarakah . . .*, *op. cit.*, Part 3, pp. 46-7.
36. The HC to the Chief Secretary, 11.4.21, ISA, CS, 245. Al-Ḥājj Amīn's somewhat different version, claiming that the HC had suggested a choice between "a frank opponent or a devious friend", is given in Frumkin, *op. cit.*, p. 285.
37. Muḥammad Sa'ūd al-'Awri to the HC (thanking him for the appointment), 8.5.21, ISA, CS, 245; Quigley, Assistant Director of Public Security, to ACS(P), 12.5.21, *ibid.*
38. Draft of a letter (never dispatched) from Ḥusām al-Dīn Jārāllāh, for the Legal Secretary, to al-Ḥājj Amīn al-Ḥusayni, 10.5.21, ISA, CS, 245.
39. Memorandum by Richmond re the "Grand Mufti" (with comments by Deedes noting his opposition), *ibid.*; Richmond to the HC, 7.6.21, *ibid.*
40. Al-Ḥājj Amīn al-Ḥusayni [to the Government], ISA, CS, 245.
41. Richmond to the HC, 7.6.21, *ibid.*
42. The compilers of the Peel Commission Report (Cmd. 5479) established this conclusively (see p. 177). Likewise, File 245 in the Chief Secretary's Archive in the Israel State Archives, which contains the Government records of this incident, includes only a draft of the various proposals put forward for a letter of appointment, but no trace of an actual letter of appointment or of any decision to issue such a document. It had apparently come to be accepted in British Government circles that al-Ḥājj Amīn's appointment was made on the basis of the fact that once Ḥusām al-Dīn Jārāllāh had withdrawn, al-Ḥājj Amīn was one of the three successful candidates in the election, and could thus be appointed on the basis of the election results (see al-Ḥājj Amīn al-Ḥusayni's biography, CO, 733/248, File 17693).
43. Memorandum by al-Ḥājj Amīn al-Ḥusayni, ISA, CS, 245.
44. Richmond to the HC, 20.10.21, *ibid.*
45. Richmond to the Financial Secretary. 2.7.21, *ibid.* It should be pointed out that Richmond followed this line even though the CID believed at the time that were riots to break out in Palestine, al-Ḥājj Amīn was one of the most likely men to organize such disturbances. (See the CID circular, signed by Quigley, sent out to District Police Chiefs, 22.9.21, ISA, CS, 149/1.)

#### ESTABLISHMENT OF THE SUPREME MUSLIM COUNCIL AND ITS EMERGENCE AS AL-ḤĀJJ AMĪN'S STRONGHOLD

(pp. 194-207)

1. Quigley to the Chief Secretary, Jerusalem, 14.10.20, ISA, CS, File 163; same to same, 21.10.20 and 4.11.20, *ibid.* *Al-Karmil*, 12.10.20, 12.12.20.
2. It should be kept in mind that the running of the law courts, especially the Shar'ī courts, was at this time still left to the Legal Secretary's

Department. It was only some years later that the courts were taken out of the hands of this Department and placed under the supervision of the Chief Justice.

3. Herbert Samuel to Curzon, 11.11.20, ISA, Samuel Papers.
4. Elath, *op. cit.*, p. 28.
5. Muḥammad Murād, Mufti of Haifa, to the HC, 8.4.21, ISA, CS, 245; The HC to Muḥammad Murād, 26.4.21, *ibid.*
6. Elath, *op. cit.*, p. 37.
7. W. Deedes, for the HC, to the Colonial Secretary (including Political Report for August), secret dispatch, 8.9.21, CO, 733/6.
8. The HC to the Colonial Secretary, Dispatch No. 369, 8.10.21, *ibid.*
9. W. Deedes, for the HC, to the Colonial Secretary, Dispatch No. 551, 29.12.21, CO, 733/8. The order was published in the *Palestine Gazette*, 1.1.22.
10. *Filasṭīn*, 26.11.21, 10.12.21, 14.12.21.
11. A list of these electors is preserved in ISA. CS, 140. A less complete list may be found in *Bayān min al-Majlis al-Islāmi al-A'lā*, Jerusalem, 1924, p. Iff.
12. Herbert Samuel to the Colonial Secretary, Dispatch No. 20, 20.1.22, CO, 733/18. AE Bureau, "The 25th Newsletter", January 1922, ISA, AE, No. 1722.
13. Richmond to the Chief Secretary, 25.10.21, ISA, CS, 245.
14. W. Deedes, for the HC, to the Colonial Secretary (including Political Report for August 1921), secret dispatch, 8.9.21, CO, 733/6; Herbert Samuel to the Colonial Secretary (including Political Report for November 1921), secret dispatch, 6.12.21, CO, 733/8. See also 'Izzat Darwaza, *Ḥawla al-Ḥarakah . . .*, *op. cit.*, Part 3, p. 46.
15. W. Deedes, for the HC, to the Colonial Secretary, Dispatch No. 551, 29.12.21, CO, 733/8.
16. See the text of this order in the *Palestine Gazette*, 1.1.22.
17. Memorandum by N. Bentwich re "Elections to the SMC", ISA, CS, 189; N. Bentwich to the Assistant Chief Secretary (Political) (re "Elections to the SMC"), 9.1.24, *ibid.*
18. See the text in the *Palestine Gazette*, 1.1.22; also see the second source in Note 17 above, and Elath, *op. cit.*, pp. 38-9.
19. Memorandum by H. Luke enclosed with J. Chancellor's (HC, 1928-31) dispatch to the Colonial Secretary, 18.6.29, CO, 733/172.
20. In Iraq and Egypt the Shar'i courts and *awqāf* were run as regular Government departments, but it should be kept in mind that, theoretically, these two countries were independent, and Britain's role was formally that of an advisor only. In Cyprus, on the other hand, *Qādis* were appointed and even dismissed by the British administration, while the *awqāf* were run by two delegates—the one British and the other a Turkish Muslim. But in Cyprus the problem did not arise of having a Jew represent a Christian power in a predominantly Muslim land (see the source in Note 19 above).
21. AE Bureau, "The 25th Newsletter", January 1922, ISA, AE, 1722.
22. *Al-Karmil*, 22.8.25.
23. *Al-Karmil*, 4.1.22. See also W. Deedes, for the HC, to the Colonial Secretary (including Report for December, 1921), secret dispatch, 30.12.21, CO, 733/8; E. Keith-Roach, for the HC, to the Colonial Secretary (including Political Report for January, 1922), secret dispatch, 2.2.22, CO 733/18.

24. W. Deedes, for the HC, to the Colonial Secretary (including Political Report for April 1922), secret dispatch, 10.5.22, CO, 733/21.
25. The HC to the Colonial Secretary, Dispatch No. 601, 11.8.22, CO, 733/24.
26. Richmond to the Chief Secretary (G. Clayton), 2.5.23, ISA, CS, 158.
27. Richmond to the Acting HC [G. Clayton], 16.7.23, *ibid.*
28. R. Storrs to the Chief Secretary, 1.9.22, *ibid.*, 168.
29. See the minutes prepared by Shuckburgh, 11.3.26, CO, 733/113.
30. In a letter explaining his resignation, Richmond wrote that his opposition to Zionism "is not only political, but also of a moral and religious nature [he was a Catholic]. As part of this [Government] set-up I tried to change this [Zionist policy], but failed completely". (See Richmond to Herbert Samuel, Jerusalem, 13.3.24, ISA, Samuel Papers.)
31. The Government collected the 'ushr due on waqf land and handed this over to the SMC.
32. Precise figures of the SMC's budget for the years 1923-31, with detailed analyses, are preserved in ZA, S/25, 3480. The awqāf budget for 1924-5 is given in Muḥammad Amīn al-Ḥusayni's letter to the Chief Secretary, No. 4681, 4.11.24, ISA, CS, File 192. Figures for the 1922 budget are given in F. Kisch's letter to the Political Secretary of the Zionist Organization in London, KL/156, 23.5.23, ZA, S/25, 4387.
33. The details given by Amīn al-Ḥusayni in his letter (see Note 32 above) are not very clear, and his figures do not enable an itemized check to be made of the budget.
34. Muḥammad Sa'īd al-Fāhūm, for the *Ḥizb al-Zurrā'* in Nazareth, to the Chief Secretary, 8.10.24, ISA, CS, File 189; *al-Ḥizb al-Waṭani al-'Arabi al-Filasṭīni* (organization of the SMC's opponents) to the Chief Secretary, 25.10.24, *ibid.*; other petitions preserved in this file. F. Kisch to the Chief Secretary KG/14, ZA, S/25, 151; interview with Ṭāhīr al-Ḥusayni, 30.4.25, ZA, S/25, 517. Elath, *op. cit.*, pp. 52-3.
35. *Filasṭīn*, 22.7.27, 26.8.27.
36. Ya'qūb Abū al-Hudā, former administrator of awqāf in Jerusalem, and 'Abdāllah al-Mukhlīṣ, former Chief Accountant of the SMC, to the HC, 25.10.23, ISA, CS, 189. This letter of complaint, written by two men who had previously held high-ranking positions in the Muslim religious establishment, contains much highly convincing information and evidence (in the form of photographed letters).
37. *Al-Karmil*, 17.6.25.
38. Maḥmūd al-Māḍī and Ramzi 'Umar to the HC, 11.9.24, ISA, CS, 189; 'Abdāllah Mukhlīṣ, Secretary of the *al-Ḥizb al-Waṭani*, to the HC, Jerusalem, 26.10.24, *ibid.* *Bayān wa-Radd* (a publication containing anti-SMC polemic), pp. 40-1. Herbert Samuel to the Colonial Secretary (submitting reports from the District Governors for August 1924), secret dispatch, Jerusalem, 11.9.24, CO, 733/73.
39. F. Kisch to the Chief Secretary, No. KG/14, Jerusalem, 21.3.23, ISA, CS, 151; Ya'qūb Abū al-Hudā and 'Abdāllah Mukhlīṣ to the HC, 25.10.23, *ibid.*, 189; Muḥammad Shākīr al-Shākīr [al-Ḥusayni] to the HC, 21.10.24, *ibid.*; S. Symes, Governor of the Northern District, to the Chief Secretary, 6.12.23, *ibid.*, 172; A. Abramson, Governor of the Southern District, to the Political Secretary, Gaza, 11.12.23, *ibid.*; R. Storrs to the Chief Secretary, 4.1.24, *ibid.* *Bayān wa-Radd*, pp. 40-1. *Al-Karmil*, 18.4.25. *Mīr'āt al-Sharq*, 10.3.23, 24.9.23, 6.1.27. *Al-Jāmi'ah*

- al-'Arabiyyah*, 27.5.31. *Filasṭīn*, 15.12.25. H. Luke to the Colonial Secretary, Dispatch No. 980, Jerusalem, 1.10.28, CO, 735/161, File 57561. See also 'Izzat Darwaza's biography, CO, 733/248, File 17693. Also Elath, *op. cit.*, pp. 46-9.
40. Muḥammad Amin [al-Ḥusayni], President of the SMC, to the Political Secretary, No. 554, Jerusalem, 23.4.24, ISA, CS, 189; see also the Minute Sheet written on this answer by Max Nurock, 5.4.24, *ibid.*
  41. See *Bayan wa-Radd*, pp. 23-6.
  42. The Fifth Congress in August 1922 was attended by three of the four SMC members, a number of muftis, and the Chief Accountant of the SMC (the list of delegates is preserved in ISA, CS, 168). There was similar participation in the Sixth Congress in June 1923 (see the report on this Congress in ISA, CS, File 171).
  43. L. Harrington, a police officer serving in the Jerusalem district, to the District Commander [March 1923], ISA, CS, 169.
  44. 'Abdāllah Mukhlīṣ to the Chief Secretary, No. 8, Jerusalem, 21.11.23, ISA, CS, 172. Herbert Samuel to the Colonial Secretary (submitting the Political Report for November 1923), secret dispatch, Jerusalem, 14.12.23, CO, 733/52. Frumkin, *op. cit.*, pp. 285-8.
  45. Symes to the Chief Secretary, Haifa, 6.12.23, ISA, CS, 172; Abramson, Governor of the Southern District, to the ACS(P), Gaza, 11.12.23, *ibid.* Herbert Samuel to the Colonial Secretary (submitting the Political Report for March 1924), secret dispatch, Jerusalem, 18.4.24, CO, 733/67; same to same, secret dispatch, 31.11.24, *ibid.*, Vol. 75.
  46. Amin al-Ḥusayni, *Fatwā Samāḥat al-Muṭṭi al-Akbar; Al-Fatwā al-Khaṭīrah*; see also, Amin al-Ḥusayni, *Ḥaqā'iq*, p. 10.
  47. *Filasṭīn*, 26.8.11, 31.1.12, 25.1.13.
  48. Elath, *op. cit.*, pp. 50-3. M. Asaf, p. 116.
  49. L. Oliphant (British Foreign Office official) to R. Bullard, British Consul at Jeddah, Cable No. 105, 13.9.23, ISA, CS, 184.
  50. Bullard to Clayton, 20.9.23, *ibid.*; Clayton to the Duke of Devonshire [the Colonial Secretary], 24.8.23, *ibid.*, 129. *Al-Karmil*, 11.8.23.
  51. Wadi' [al-Bustani] to Amin al-Tamimi, Jerusalem, 3.10.23, ISA, AE, 1541. The latter two made up the delegation to Hejaz.
  52. On the support of the Palestine Government for the delegation and the efforts made on its behalf, see material in ISA, CS, File 184. See also the letters from the Indian Office to the Foreign Under-Secretary, 5.10.23, 2.10.23, 6.10.23, and the cable from the Office for External and Political Affairs of the Viceroy in India to the Secretary of the India Office, 13.10.23, in CO, 733/56.
  53. *Bayān Min al-Majlis*, p. 5. Jamāl al-Ḥusayni to the President of the AE, Haydarabad, 23.12.23, ISA, AE Files, No. 3589. The Nizam's contribution was made through a bank to the Palestine Government, which forwarded it on to the SMC. The Nizam insisted on this procedure in order to make sure that the money was in fact used for the purpose for which it was donated. The SMC also assured the Government that all accounts connected with the restoration project would be available for checking by Government accountants (see ISA, CS, File 184).
  54. See the first source in Note 53 above. These delegations also received help from the Palestine Government (see ISA, CS, File 184).
  55. Elath, *op. cit.*, p. 52.
  56. Memorandum from Luke, Chief Secretary of the Palestine Government, to the SMC, 14.1.29, CO, 733/172.

57. For the origin of this event, its characteristics, and the Mufti's role in it see the Palin Report, pp. 58-9, FO, 371/5121. See also T. Canaan, "Mohammedan Saints and Sanctuaries in Palestine", *Journal of the Palestine Oriental Society*, Vol. 6 (1926), pp. 117-63.
58. The point of view of his opponents is well presented in Elath, *op. cit.*, pp. 50-3. The material in ISA, CS, File 184, does not substantiate the exaggerated rumours concerning donations totalling £150,000 from India which "disappeared" into the SMC's treasury.

## CHAPTER FIVE

### THE BASIC REASONS FOR ITS EMERGENCE

(pp. 208-213)

1. Frumkin, *op. cit.*, pp. 282-6.
2. See *al-Karmil*, 23.1.24.
3. *Ibid.*, 19.9.26.
4. Report on the Fourth Congress, 21.6.23, CO, 733/13.
5. 'Umar al-Baytār to the Fifth Congress, 25.8.22, ISA, AE, 1771; al-Fārūqī's cable to the same, 20.8.22, *ibid.*, 1058.
6. Kāmil al-Budayri to the AE, 2.6.22, *ibid.*, 1773; protocol of the AE session held on 26.6.22, *ibid.*, 1058. 'Ārif Pasha al-Dajāni's announcement that he had resigned from his position in the AE owing to his objection to its methods was published in *Mir'āt al-Sharq*, 1.7.22. For the AE letter on his dismissal, his reaction and the notice to the Government, see, ISA, AE, 1773. 'Ārif al-Dajāni's nephew and close assistant, Ḥasan Ṣidqī al-Dajāni, wrote then an article denying the right of the AE to decide upon sending a delegation to Hejaz (See *Bayt al-Maqdis*, 10.6.22 and 21.6.22).
7. Eder to the Secretary of the ZE in London, 17.7.22, ZA, Z/4, 1053. ZE in Jerusalem to Eder, 16.8.22, ZA, S/25, 4377.
8. See reports in ZA, L/4, 276IV. *Filasṭīn*, 10.2.12, 17.4.12. *Mir'āt al-Sharq*, 7.2.24. D. Miller to Eder, 9.6.22, ZA, S/25, 4380.
9. AE Bureau, "The 35th Newsletter", 24.3.22, ISA, AE, 1722; Ḥāfiẓ Ṭawqān to Jamāl al-Ḥusayni, 9.10.21, *ibid.*, 1072. Last source in previous note.
10. On his jobs see Khālidi, *Ahl al-'Ilm . . .*, *op. cit.*, p. 39 and As'ad Shuqayri, *Al-Risālah al-Marṣū'ah . . .*, inside the cover. On his political views see Tawfiq Barū, *op. cit.*, pp. 507-8 and 543.
11. *Al-Karmil*, 22.10.24.
12. *Ibid.*, 31.10.20.
13. *Ibid.*, 25.10.24.
14. Doc. No. 15 A (Aug. 1920), ISA, CS, 33. *Mir'āt al-Sharq*, 4.8.27
15. *Al-Karmil*, 8.8.26. See also *ibid.*, 17.5.30 and 10.8.30.
16. As for 'Ārif al-Dajāni and Ya'qūb Farrāj see Ch. 2. On Rāghib al-Nashāshibi see *al-Jāmi'ah al-'Arabiyyah*, 29.11.32 and *Mir'āt al-Sharq*, 21.4.27. See the articles by Ḥusni 'Abd al-Hādi (a prominent opposition leader from Nāblus), in *Bayt al-Maqdis*, 7.7.20, 17.7.20, 24.7.20, 31.7.20, 7.8.20, 12.5.21. *Al-Karmil*, 22.8.31, tells about a group of Palestinians who clashed with Fayṣal during his rule in Damascus. All these Palestinians later became supporters of the Opposition. See also *Mir'āt al-Sharq*, 27.2.24.
17. In the next sub-chapter we shall return to this issue.

POLITICAL AND ORGANIZATIONAL DEVELOPMENT OF THE  
OPPOSITION

(pp. 213-230)

1. M. K. al-Ḥusayni to the HC, 20.12.20, ISA, CS, 144. On the indifference and even hostility of certain circles, see *Bayt al-Maqdis*, 23.4.21.
2. Ḥāfiẓ Ṭawqān to Jamāl al-Ḥusayni, 9.10.21, ISA, AE, 1072.
3. Al-Fārūqī's cable to M. K. al-Ḥusayni, 26.5.21 and 30.5.21, *ibid.*, 1058.
4. Report on the Fourth Congress, 21.6.21, CO 733/13. List of Fifth Congress delegates, ISA, CS, 168; Kisch to Political Secretary of the ZE in London (reporting on the Sixth Congress), *ibid.*, 171.
5. Cox to ACS(P) (reporting on the Congress and its resolutions), 25.8.22, *ibid.*, 168; See also Ḥusni 'Abd al-Hādī's petition, *ibid.*
6. *Al-Muntadā al-Adabi*'s cable to the Fifth Congress, 23.8.22, ISA, AE, 1058; same to same, 30.8.22, *ibid.*
7. See Note 4.
8. *Mir'āt al-Sharq*, 27.6.23. Ḥasan Šidqī al-Dajāni to the delegates of the Sixth Congress, 20.6.23, ISA, AE, 1771.
9. The "National Muslim Association" cable to the Colonial Secretary, 24.6.23, ISA, CS, 158.
10. Note by H. Samuel remarking on Clayton's dispatch of 6.7.23, 18.7.23, CO 733/47.
11. Secret memorandum to Eder, 5.5.20, ZA, Z/4, 2800II. Many details of this "encouragement" can be found in ZA, S/25, 517, 518 and 665.
12. L. Stein, *The Truth about Palestine*, London 1922, p. 1.
13. [Kisch] to the ZE, 13.12.22, ZA, S/25, 518. AE Bureau, "The 4th Newsletter", 18.8.21, ISA, AE, 1772; "The 5th Newsletter", 26.8.21, *ibid.*; Ḥāfiẓ Ṭawqān to Jamāl al-Ḥusayni, 9.10.21, *ibid.*, 1072; same to same [no date], *ibid.*
14. Memorandum to Eder, 5.5.20, ZA, Z/4, 2800II; Kalvarisky to the ZE in London, 26.4.23, *ibid.*, 1392. See also in ZA, S/25, 517.
15. First source in previous note. *Filasṭīn*, 26.11.21. Kalvarisky to the Political Dept. in the ZE, 24.3.23, ZA, S/25, 4379; report on the meeting of the members of the "National Muslim Association" with Dr. Eder, 3.4.22, *ibid.*, 4380. Jubrān Iskandar Kazmā to the AE, 24.8.21, ISA, AE, 3785; same to same, 12.9.21, *ibid.*
16. Same to Jamāl al-Ḥusayni, 24.8.21, *ibid.*; same to same, 29.11.21, *ibid.*; same to same, 20.2.22, *ibid.*; Farid Fakhr al-Dīn to same, 30.7.23, *ibid.*, 1057.
17. Conversations between members of the "National Muslim Association" and Dr. Eder, 30.3.22 and 3.4.22, ZA, S/25, 4380.
18. AE Bureau, "The 2nd Newsletter", 10.8.21, ISA, AE, 1722.
19. CID report, signed by E. H. Howard, 16.8.23, ISA, CS, 158.
20. See Note 16. See also Jubrān Iskandar Kazmā to Jamāl al-Ḥusayni, 13.4.22, ISA, AE, 3785; same to the AE President, 7.7.21, *ibid.*, 1058.
21. Same to Jamāl al-Ḥusayni, 4.7.22, *ibid.*, 3785.
22. See Note 19; See also Ḥāfiẓ Ṭawqān to Jamāl al-Ḥusayni [no date], *ibid.*, 1072.
23. Nāfi' 'Abūshi to the same, 17.8.21, *ibid.*, 1061; AE Bureau, "The 5th Newsletter", 26.8.21, *ibid.*, 1722.
24. For details on this family, see ISA, CS, 151. A list of the active

- members of the National Muslim Association all over the country can be found in ZA, S/25, 6310.
25. AE Bureau, "The 3rd Newsletter", 10.8.21, ISA, AE, 1722; "The 4th Newsletter", 18.10.21, *ibid.*; "The 36th Newsletter", 30.3.22, *ibid.*
  26. "The 21st Newsletter", 16.12.21, *ibid.*; "The 42nd Newsletter", 19.5.22, *ibid.*; "The 47th Newsletter", 14.7.22, *ibid.*
  27. "The 2nd Newsletter", 5.8.21, *ibid.* *Filasṭīn*, 10.8.21. *Al-Karmil*, 10.11.21.
  28. Cable of The National Muslim Association of Haifa to Churchill, 10.7.22, ISA, CS, 158; same of Jerusalem to the Colonial Secretary, 24.6.23, *ibid.*
  29. *Mir'āt al-Sharq*, 22.6.22, 15.7.33, 10.1.34.
  30. AE Bureau, "The 32nd Newsletter", 10.3.22, ISA, AE, 1722.
  31. See first source in Note 28.
  32. *Ibid.* and second source there. Besides the Haifa and Jerusalem branches, similar cables were sent by the Nazareth branch, Beisan Bedouin sheikhs and Tiberias notables as well (See Eder to the secretary of the ZE in London, 5.7.22, ZA, Z/4, 1053).
  33. Jubrān Iskandar Kazmā to the AE, 15.7.22, ISA, AE, 3785; same to same, 19.7.22, *ibid.*; Muḥammad Ṭāhir al-Ṭabari and others to the AE [June 1922], *ibid.*, 1057. Ḥasan Shukri to the HC, 28.7.22, ISA, CS, 131. D. Miller to the ZE, 10.7.22, ZA, S/25, 4380. Eder to the Secretary of the ZE, 17.7.22, ZA, Z/4, 1053.
  34. Ḥusni 'Abd al-Hādi to the HC, 25.8.22, ISA, CS, 168. Deedes to Shuckburgh, private and confidential letter, 15.9.22, CO 733/38; HC to the Colonial Secretary, secret dispatch, 6.10.22, CO 733/26.
  35. Symes to the CS, secret report, 10.3.23, ISA, CS, 242/2. Kalvarisky to the ZE in London, 12.4.23, ZA, Z/4, 1392II. Letters by Ibrāhīm 'Abdīn, Kāmil al-Mubāshir and Murshid Shāhīn to Dr. N. Malūl and various letters to Kisch, Feb. 1923, ZA, S/25, 518.
  36. Kisch, *op. cit.*, p. 35. *Mir'āt al-Sharq*, 4.9.22, 10.2.23, 24.2.23, 10.3.23. *Do'ar Ha-Yōm*, 9.3.23.
  37. Ḥāfiẓ Ṭawqān to the AE Secretary, 1.12.22, ISA, AE, 1072. Quigley to the Governor of Jerusalem District, 23.3.23, ISA, CS, 242/1. HC to the Colonial Secretary, secret dispatch, 9.3.23, CO 733/43.
  38. Deedes to the Colonial Secretary, secret dispatch, 10.5.22, CO 733/21. HC to the same, secret dispatch, 15.6.23, CO 733/46. Kalvarisky to the ZE in London, 12.4.23, ZA, Z/4, 1392II. CID report, 16.8.23, ISA, CS, 158.
  39. A document indicating to what extent this body was politically dependent upon Zionist initiative is a letter from Kāmil al-Mubāshir to Malūl, 15.2.23, ZA, S/25, 518. See also the notes on the talks between the members of this association and Dr. Eder and Col. F. H. Kisch, *ibid.*, 4380.
  40. [Kisch] to the ZE, 13.12.22, *ibid.*, 518.
  41. See Ḥāfiẓ Ṭawqān to the AE, 6.4.22, ISA, AE, 1072; AE Bureau, "The 42nd Newsletter", 19.5.22, *ibid.*, 1722.
  42. See in ISA, CS, 151 and 161. AE Bureau, "The 35th Newsletter", 24.3.22, ISA, AE, 1722; "The 36th Newsletter", 30.3.22, *ibid.*
  43. "The 35th Newsletter" cited above.
  44. Richmond to the Acting CS, 8.8.23, ISA, CS, 151. HC to the Duke of Devonshire (The Colonial Secretary), private and confidential letter, 8.12.22, CO 733/28.
  45. *Mir'āt al-Sharq*, 21.4.22 and 28.4.23. *Al-Karmil*, 22.10.21. Ḥāfiẓ Ṭawqān

- to the AE, 1.12.22, ISA, AE, 1072; AE Bureau, "The 47th Newsletter", 14.7.22, *ibid.*, 1722. A note on conversation between members of the Association and Dr. Eder, 2.3.22, ZA, S/25, 4380.
46. 'Uthmān 'Awnāllah's cable to the CS, 3.4.22, ISA, CS, 161. AE Bureau, "The 40th Newsletter", 5.5.22, ISA, AE, 1722.
  47. Quigley to Jerusalem-Jaffa District Governor, 23.2.23, ISA, CS, 242/1. A cable by 'Abd al-Salām al-Burqāwi and Nāfi' 'Abūshi to the AE, 6.4.23, ISA, AE, 1061; see also AE report to Fifth Congress, *ibid.*, 1026.
  48. All the material pertaining to these proposals, the talks held and cables and dispatches exchanged with London can be found in ISA, CS, 129 and 242/1.
  49. Jamāl al-Ḥusayni to the Delegation President, 5.8.23, ISA, AE, 2480; same to same, 13.8.23, *ibid.*; PD to the AE [no date], *ibid.*; Jamāl al-Ḥusayni to PD President, 27.8.23, *ibid.*; Wadi' al-Bustāni to Jamāl al-Ḥusayni, 17.8.23, *ibid.*, 1541; M. K. al-Ḥusayni to AE, 18.8.23, *ibid.*
  50. *Mir'āt al-Sharq*, 7.7.23, 18.7.23, 6.9.23, 24.9.23. *Al-Karmil*, 8.8.23.
  51. AE to Mufti Safed, 11.11.23, ISA, AE, 3589.
  52. Kisch to Political Secretary of the ZE in London, 15.11.23, ZA, Z/4, 4112.
  53. *Ibid.* See also *Mir'āt al-Sharq*, 21.4.27.
  54. *Ibid.*, 28.7.27.
  55. Kisch, *op. cit.*, p. 82, and Note 52.
  56. Muḥammad Ṭāhir al-Ṭabari to the AE, 7.7.23, ISA, AE, 1057; Ḥāfiẓ [Ṭawqān] to the AE [no date], *ibid.*, 3589.
  57. Aḥmad al-Imām to the AE, 4.11.23, *ibid.*
  58. *Filasṭīn*, 26.11.21.
  59. *Mir'āt al-Sharq*, 26.5.27.
  60. Kisch, *op. cit.*, p. 87.
  61. Darwaza, *Ḥawla al-Ḥarakah . . .*, *op. cit.*, Part 3, pp. 42-3. Kalvarisky's memorandum, 9.10.24, ZA, S/25, 518. F. Kisch, "The Political Development of the Arabs in Palestine", 6.6.25, *ibid.*, 517.
  62. Kalvarisky to Kisch, 31.8.23, ZA, S/25, 4380; same to same, 16.8.23, *ibid.*, 4379. On Murshid Shāhīn, Deputy-President of the Party in Hebron, see his various letters to Kisch and the ZE in *ibid.*, 518; on his position in the Party, see his letter to the HC, 22.2.25, ISA, CS, 189.
  63. Secretary of ZE to D. Miller, 6.12.23, ZA, S/25, 669.
  64. *Mir'āt al-Sharq*, 20.6.23, 7.7.23.
  65. *Ibid.*, 6.2.24, 1.8.25.
  66. *Ibid.*, 14.6.24, 9.11.24, 16.8.25. Sulaymān al-Tāji al-Fārūqi to Lord Plumer (the new HC), 28.8.25, ISA, CS, 172.
  67. *Mir'āt al-Sharq*, 6.4.27, 21.4.27, 28.7.27, 29.9.27.
  68. *Ibid.*, 19.1.28 We have already seen that this claim was exaggerated since in 1922 the paper's position had been very hesitant and it used to write in equivocal language. Nevertheless this boasting is good indication of his real position in years following 1922.
  69. *Mir'āt al-Sharq*, 4.3.22.
  70. *Ibid.*, 13.6.23, 20.6.23.
  71. *Ibid.*, 24.9.23, 1.12.23, 14.6.24. See also *al-Karmil* (which began at the end of 1923 to support the Opposition), 30.1.24, 5.3.24.
  72. *Mir'āt al-Sharq*, 13.6.23, 20.6.23.
  73. Hence the rumours that Emir 'Abdāllah and King Ḥusayn were in

- one way or another connected with the endeavours to establish a moderate party in Palestine. (See, for example, *al-Karmil*, 30.11.21, 7.12.21, 8.8.23.)
74. See Ch. 3.
  75. See the issues of these papers during the period under discussion. See also HC to the Colonial Secretary, secret dispatch, 21.3.24, CO 733/66.
  76. *Mir'at al-Sharq*, 16.1.24, 26.1.24, 7.2.24, 27.2.24, 2.7.24, 5.7.24. *Al-Karmil*, 29.3.24, 15.7.25.
  77. *Mir'at al-Sharq*, 14.5.24.
  78. See issues of this paper during the "hot" period, Sep. 1928–Aug. 1929. Frumkin, *op. cit.*, p. 279. We shall refer to this question in Ch. 7.
  79. Ḥusni Khayāl to the HC, 26.11.23, ISA, CS, 158; Sulaymān al-Ṣalāḥ and others to the Govt., 21.11.23, *ibid.*; similar letters of protest can be found *ibid.*, 172. HC to the Colonial Secretary, secret dispatch, 14.12.23, CO 733/52. Abramson to the ACS(P), 11.12.23, ISA, CS, 172. Ṣiddīq al-Tamīmi, to the AE, 10.12.23, ISA, AE, 3714.
  80. See letters of these societies to the AE, 20.3.25 and 16.5.25, *ibid.*, 3589 and the Jerusalem branch letter to the Govt., 2.8.25, ISA, CS, 189. *Mir'at al-Sharq*, 16.1.24. *Al-Karmil*, 2.8.24.
  81. His brother Qāsim became a member of the branch committee and another relative of his, Muḥammad Kamāl was the Branch Secretary (see *Mir'at al-Sharq*, 9.7.24). HC to the Colonial Secretary, secret dispatch, 10.1.24, CO 733/63. *Al-Karmil*, 2.8.24. Letters from the branch to the Govt. can be found in ISA, CS, 189.
  82. All the material is included in ISA, AE, 3714. Mūsā Hudayb to Kisch, 9.12.23, ZA, S/25, 518 and other letters written by him and by Murshid Shāhīn included in this file.
  83. Salīm ['Abd al-Raḥmān] al-Ḥajj Ibrāhīm to the AE, 5.1.25, ISA, AE, 3589; Sa'īd al-Khalīl to the same, 23.12.24, *ibid.*, 1825. *Mir'at al-Sharq*, 7.1.25.
  84. See petition of this branch to the Govt., 28.2.25, ISA, CS, 189.
  85. The petitions are kept in *ibid.*, 30. Communiqué of the Zionist Commission Press Bureau, No. 325, 1.6.20, ZA, Z/4, 1454; report No. 37, 17.4.20, *ibid.*, 2800II; report No. 41, 21.4.20, *ibid.*; report from Haifa, 24.5.20, *ibid.*
  86. Secret memorandum to Eder, 5.5.20, *ibid.* See also *al-Quds al-Sharif*, 29.7.20.
  87. Petitions and letters signed by 'Abd al-Ḥamīd Abū Ghaush and others, of March–April 1920, ISA, CS, 30.
  88. See, for example, Nāfi' 'Abūshi to the AE, 17.8.21, ISA, AE, 1061; same to same, 4.1.22, *ibid.*
  89. Cox to ACS(P), 25.8.22, ISA, CS, 168.
  90. *Mir'at al-Sharq*, 9.7.24. *Al-Karmil*, 19.7.24. On the activities of this organization against the SMC and its part in the negotiations held at the end of 1924 between the rival factions see Maḥmūd al-Māḍī to the HC, 11.9.24, ISA, CS, 189. "Resolutions of the Reconciliation Committee", ISA, AE, 1825. *Al-Karmil*, 15.9.25.
  91. Cox to the ACS(P), 17.1.24, ISA, CS, 173, see also the various petitions in *ibid.*, 189. Darwaza, *Ḥawla al-Ḥarakah . . .*, *op. cit.*, Part 3, p. 41. *Mir'at al-Sharq*, 1.12.23.
  92. See his claim in his book, p. 89, but the huge amount of letters, reports and summaries included in ZA, S/25, 517, 518 and 665 proves my argument.
  93. Ḥaydar Ṭawqān to [Kalvarisky], 1.3.24, *ibid.*, 518. Various drafts

- reflecting the stages of formulating the programmes and the role of the Zionist factor in it can be found in ZA, A/113 (Kalvarisky Papers), 16 and 23/A; *ibid.*, Z/4, 1445 VII; *ibid.*, S/25, 517 and 665. Cox to ACS(P), 17.1.24, ISA, CS, 173. *Al-Karmil*, 11.6.24, 18.6.24, 30.7.24, 6.8.24. *Mir'at al-Sharq*, 7.6.24.
94. Kisch, "The Political Development of the Arabs in Palestine", 6.6.25, ZA, S/25, 517; Kalvarisky, "Remarques sur la situation politique", 9.10.24, *ibid.*, 518; same to Kisch, 27.6.26, *ibid.*, 665. Clayton to Colonial Secretary, 17.7.24, CO 733/71.
95. Memorandum by Mr. Hason, 1927, ZA, S/25, 517.
96. A leaflet signed by Jamāl al-Ḥusayni, "The Policy of Imperialism—Divide and Rule", ISA, AE, 1825; Ḥāfiẓ Ṭawqān to AE, No. 2, 6.5.25, *ibid. Filasṭin*, 29.1.26.
97. *Mir'at al-Sharq*, 14.6.24.
98. For this issue, which will be discussed later on, see ISA, AE, 1825.

### THE OPPOSITION AT THE PEAK OF ITS POWER

(pp. 230–240)

1. 'Abdāllah Mukhliṣ (Secretary of the Party) to the CS, No. 8, 21.11.23, ISA, CS, 172.
2. All these protests are included in *ibid.*, 172, 189 and 190. See also *al-Karmil* and *Mir'at al-Sharq*, from the end of 1923 onwards and the brochure *Bayān wa-Radd*.
3. *Mir'at al-Sharq*, 8.12.33. *Bayān wa-Radd*, p. 42.
4. 'Abdāllah Mukhliṣ to the HC, 26.10.24, ISA, CS, 189; Muḥammad Shākīr al-Ḥusayni to the Colonial Secretary, 18.4.25, *ibid.*
5. The SMC was entrusted with the management of, and the control over, the *Awqāf al-Maḍbūṭah*, i.e. all the endowments which had during the Ottoman period been administered by *Mā'mūr al-Awqāf* (Commissioner of Endowments) under the control of the Ministry of *Awqāf* outside the jurisdiction of the Shar'i Courts. On the other hand, the *Awqāf al-Mulḥaqah*, which had during the Ottoman period been administered by private administrators (*Mutawallūn*), were included under the exclusive jurisdiction of the Shar'i Courts whereas the SMC was left with their administration only. However, this distinction was not practically effective, since the SMC succeeded in having complete control over the Shar'i Courts (see A. Layish, "Ha-Waqf Ha-Muslemi bi-Israel", *Ha-Mizraḥ He-Ḥadash*, Vol. 15 and the sources mentioned there).
6. Ya'qūb Abū al-Hudā and 'Abdāllah Mukhliṣ to the HC, 25.10.23, ISA, CS, 189 and many other petitions in this file. See also *Mir'at al-Sharq* of Sep.–Oct. 1924.
7. Circular of CS, 4.12.23, ISA, CS, 172.
8. Symes to the CS, 6.12.23, *ibid.*
9. Cox to the same, 11.12.23, *ibid.*
10. Abramson to the same, 11.12.23, *ibid.*
11. Storrs to the same, 4.1.24, *ibid.*
12. Same to the same, 28.2.24, *ibid.*, 189.
13. See Ch. 4.
14. See their remarks at the bottom of Storrs' reply of 4.1.24, ISA, CS, 172.
15. HC to the Colonial Secretary, secret dispatch, 11.9.24, CO 733/73.
16. See Opposition petition to the Colonial Secretary, ISA, CS, 189 and

- al-Karmil*, 9.5.25. On the dissolution of this branch see ZE Press Bureau communiqué (according to *Mir'at al-Sharq*, 12.7.24, and *Lisān al-'Arab*, 16.7.24), No. 427, 11.8.24, ZA, S/25, 517. HC to Colonial Secretary, secret dispatch, 14.12.23, CO 733/52; Clayton to the same, secret dispatch, 17.7.24, CO 733/71.
17. HC to the Colonial Secretary, secret dispatch, 23.5.24, CO 733/68; Clayton to the Colonial Secretary, secret dispatch, 24.10.24, CO 733/74; HC to the same, secret dispatch, CO 733/93.
  18. *Al-Karmil*, 25.2.25. *Mir'at al-Sharq*, 1.2.25, 25.8.27. *Filasṭīn*, 2.10.25, 29.1.26. Leaflet signed by Jamāl al-Ḥusayni, "The Policy of Imperialism—Divide and Rule", ISA, AE, 1825; Ḥāfiẓ Ṭawqān to the AE, No. 2, 6.5.25, *ibid.*
  19. *Mir'at al-Sharq*, 23.6.23, 1.2.25. It is not surprising therefore that Col. F. Kisch discerned this process already at the beginning of 1924 (see his book, *op. cit.*, p. 92).
  20. *Mir'at al-Sharq*, 2.12.25, 5.12.25.
  21. *Filasṭīn*, 8.12.25, 29.12.26. *Al-Karmil*, 23.12.25, 31.1.26, 14.2.26. See also Darwaza, *Ḥawla al-Ḥarakah . . .*, *op. cit.*, Part 3, pp. 50–1.
  22. The petitions are kept in ISA, CS, 172.
  23. HC to the Colonial Secretary, secret dispatch, 11.9.24, CO 733/73. The list of the members of the Electoral Committee can be found in ISA, CS, 190.
  24. Copies of the petitions are included in *ibid.*, 190. See also *Bayān min al-Majlis*, p. 1.
  25. An English edition of the Ottoman Electoral Law is included in ISA, CS, 81.
  26. The whole issue is described according to the brochure *Bayān min al-Majlis* and the material included in ISA, CS, 189 and 190. The Law confirming this amendment was published in the *Official Gazette*, No. 148, 1.10.25. The procedure of the Elections was discussed by N[orman] B[entwich] (The Attorney General), "The Election of the SMC", ISA, CS, 189.
  27. *Al-Karmil*, 16.12.25, 19.12.25, 31.12.25, 6.2.26. *Mir'at al-Sharq*, 16.1.26, 23.1.26. *Filasṭīn*, 31.12.25.
  28. *Al-Karmil*, 31.1.26. *Mir'at al-Sharq*, 16.1.26.
  29. *Filasṭīn*, 3.2.26. *Mir'at al-Sharq*, 13.2.26. The decision of the High Court of Justice was published in Rotenberg, V, pp. 1685–7. The reasons for this decision were: 1) There was a difference between the amendment passed by the Electoral Committee and the Law published by the Govt. in the *Official Gazette*; 2) The majority in the Electoral Committee which passed the amendment was less, if only marginally, than the necessary two-thirds.
  30. *Filasṭīn*, 16.2.26, 23.2.26. *Mir'at al-Sharq*, 27.2.26. *Al-Karmil*, 28.2.26.
  31. *Mir'at al-Sharq*, 20.2.26. *Al-Karmil*, 21.2.26.
  32. *Mir'at al-Sharq*, 3.3.26.
  33. HC to the Colonial Secretary, dispatch No. 208, 19.2.26, CO 733/112; same to same, Cable No. 76, 6.3.26, CO 733/113; Amery to the HC, Cable No. 83, 19.3.26, *ibid.* *Al-Karmil*, 2.4.26. *Ṣawt al-Sha'b*, 31.3.26, 3.4.26. *Mir'at al-Sharq*, 28.3.26.
  34. See *al-Karmil*, April 1926 and thereafter.
  35. *Ṣawt al-Sha'b*, 5.1.27. *Mir'at al-Sharq*, 6.4.27.
  36. *Al-Karmil*, 9.12.26.
  37. Jamāl al-Ḥusayni to the HC, 6.11.26, ISA, AE, 3076. *Al-Karmil*, 28.11.26.

38. CS to Jamāl al-Ḥusayni, 26.11.26, ISA, AE, 3076.
39. I shall return to this subject in the next chapter.
40. See note on the meeting with these two men held on 11.1.27, ZA, S/25, 668.
41. Frumkin, *op. cit.*, pp. 285–90.
42. See Note 40.
43. *Al-Karmil*, 6.2.27. *Mir'āt al-Sharq*, 6.4.27.
44. *Ibid.*, 14.4.27.
45. The analysis of the results was carried out according to the data on the inter-communal distribution of the votes given by *Mir'āt al-Sharq*, 14.4.27.
46. *Al-Karmil*, 3.4.27, 17.4.27, 1.5.27, 15.5.27, 5.6.27. See also "The Municipal Elections in Arab Centres", ZA, S/25, 668.

## CHAPTER SIX

### THE WEAKENING OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE AND THE CHANGE IN ITS POLITICAL POSITIONS

(pp. 241–247)

1. 'Umar Ḥusayn to the AE, 25.11.23, ISA, AE, 3520.
2. HC to J. Thomas (The Colonial Secretary in Ramsay MacDonald's first Labour Govt.), secret dispatch A, 25.1.24, CO 733/63. CP, 121(24), Feb. 1924, CO 733/78; Cabinet Decisions, 16(24), 19.2.24, CO 733/83.
3. Symes to Clayton, 26.3.24, ISA, CS, 158. *Al-Karmil*, 23.1.24. Clayton to the Colonial Secretary, secret dispatch, 13.8.24, CO 733/72; HC to the same, secret dispatch, 12.12.24, CO 733/76; same to the same, secret dispatch, 25.2.25, CO 733/89; same to the same, secret dispatch, 18.3.25, CO 733/90; Plumer to the same, secret dispatch, 28.8.25, CO 733/96.
4. HC to the Colonial Secretary, secret dispatch, 21.2.24, CO 733/65. AE circular, 19.5.24, ISA, AE, 3596.
5. F. Kisch, "The Political Development of the Arabs in Palestine", 6.6.25, ZA, S/25, 517. Sheikh 'Ali al-Khaṭīb to Kisch, 1.6.24, *ibid.*, 665.
6. *Al-Karmil*, 8.3.24, 21.5.24, 31.5.24.
7. *Ibid.*, 5.4.24, 21.5.24, 31.5.24. *Mir'āt al-Sharq*, 28.6.24.
8. See their letters of May 1924, ISA, AE, 3596. ZE Press Bureau communiqué, No. 427 (according *Lisān al-'Arab*, 16.7.24), 11.8.24, ZA, S/25, 517.
9. *Al-Karmil*, 23.7.24. AE circular, 7.7.24, ISA, AE, 3596.
10. *Al-Karmil*, 11.9.25. *Al-Ittiḥād al-'Arabī*, 13.12.25. See also Darwaza, *Ḥawla al-Ḥarakah . . .*, *op. cit.*, Part 3, pp. 51–3.
11. These memoranda are kept in ISA, CS, 174, 175, 176 and 177 and ISA, AE, 3076.
12. Jamāl al-Ḥusayni's circular to AE Members, 21.3.26, *ibid.*, 3098. See also *Mir'āt al-Sharq*, 14.7.27.
13. See protocol of AE session held on 2.3.31 ('Ādil Zu'aytir speech), ISA, AE, 3797. Memorandum on Liberal Arab Party, ZA, S/25, 517; F. Kisch, "The Current Developments in the Internal Arab Political Situation", 3.2.28, *ibid.*, 3004.
14. See, for example, *Mir'āt al-Sharq*, 26.6.26, 3.7.26. *Al-Karmil*, 31.10.26, 7.11.26, 9.1.27, 6.2.28, 19.8.28. *Ṣawt al-Sha'b*, 26.6.27.
15. *Filasṭīn*, 17.3.27 and 8.4.27.

16. *Şawt al-Sha'b*, 29.2.28.
17. See Ch. 3.
18. Kisch to the General Secretary of ZE in London, 7.11.24, ZA, Z/4, 1445IX.
19. H. M. Kalvarisky, "The Legislative Council", 10.5.29, ZA, S/25, 4164. HC to the Colonial Secretary, secret dispatch, 12.12.24, CO 733/76.
20. H. Samuel to the CS, 17.3.25, ISA, Samuel Papers.
21. *Ibid.* See draft declaration of the AE, ISA, AE, 3589; Sulaymān Naşif to Jamāl al-Ḥusayni, 17.3.25, *ibid.*
22. Note on the first meeting with Eric Mills, ISA, 'Awni 'Abd al-Hādi Papers, 161 (1926-34). A copy of a letter addressed to Kisch, No. K/8866, 4.8.26, ZA, S/25, 665.
23. All the memoranda exchanged during these talks can be found in previous note, first source. They were also reproduced in Darwaza, Part 3, pp. 266-76. Darwaza's version (unlike the documents reproduced) is distorted (see his book, *Ḥawla al-Ḥarakah . . .*, *op. cit.*, Part 3, p. 54).
24. Minute addressed to J. Shuckburgh, 7.5.28, CO 733/155, 57316. HC to the Colonial Secretary, secret dispatch No. 6022/29, 17.1.30, CO 733/182, 77050.
25. Report on a meeting between the Mufti of Jerusalem, the Mufti of Haifa and 'Abdāllah Dajāni (a member of the SMC) with Mr. Amery, 21.4.25, CO 733/102.
26. Frumkin, *op. cit.*, p. 287.

#### THE AGREEMENT WITH THE OPPOSITION

(pp. 247-257)

1. 'Umar Shākir to AE President, 12.12.23, ISA, AE, 2699.
2. *Al-Karmil*, 26.1.24.
3. *Şawt al-Sha'b*, 6.6.24.
4. *Al-Karmil*, 28.6.24, 22.10.24. *Mir'āt al-Sharq*, 28.6.24.
5. *Al-Karmil*, 22.10.24. Jamāl al-Ḥusayni to 'Ali al-Jawdah (the President of the Palestinian Committee in New York), 9.10.24, ISA, AE, 3520. For letters of November 1924, see *ibid.*, 1825.
6. Amin al-Tamimi, to AE, 24.11.24, *ibid.*; Sheikh Sulaymān al-Tāji al-Fārūqi to AE President, 3.1.25, *ibid.*; see also the protocol of Nāblus meeting, *ibid.* *Mir'āt al-Sharq*, 21.12.24.
7. First source in previous note; note on the AE session, 25.11.24, *ibid.*; Sulaymān al-Şalāḥ to AE President, 7.12.24, *ibid.*
8. For the text of the agreement see *ibid.*, and *Mir'āt al-Sharq*, 21.12.24.
9. AE circular, 12.12.24, ISA, AE, 1825.
10. The protocol of Nāblus meeting, 18.12.24, *ibid.* See also ZE Press Bureau communiqué, No. 452, 24.12.24, ZA, S/25, 517.
11. For the exchange of letters after the Nāblus meeting, Dec. 1924-Jan. 1925, see ISA, AE, 1825. See also *Mir'āt al-Sharq*, 31.12.24.
12. J. Jacobs to the Political Secretary of the ZE in London (and enclosures), 29.12.24, ZA, S/25, 665; Fāris al-Mas'ūd to Kalvarisky, 29.12.24, *ibid.*; same to same, 9.12.24, *ibid.*; Mūsā Hudayb to Kisch, 24.11.24, *ibid.*, 518.
13. Draft declaration of the AE and the confidential remark at the bottom, ISA, AE, 3589; Draft circular of AE Secretary, *ibid.*, 3605.
14. See *ibid.* See also Frumkin, *op. cit.*, p. 241 and Storrs, *op. cit.*, p. 449.

15. *Al-Karmil*, 25.3.25, 1.4.25.
16. Jamāl al-Ḥusayni to the President of the Palestinian Committee in New York [no date], ISA, AE, 3520; last to first, 5.7.25, *ibid.* Fāris al-Mas'ūd to Kisch, 5.6.25, ZA, S/25, 665. *Al-Karmil*, 27.5.25.
17. *Al-Karmil*, 16.5.26.
18. *Ibid.*, 8.8.26. For invitations, see ISA, AE, 3076; Jamāl al-Ḥusayni's circular, 22.8.26, *ibid.*, 3093. *Ṣawt al-Sha'b*, 17.8.26.
19. Jamāl al-Ḥusayni to the President of the National Political League (a pro-Arab British women's organization), 25.8.26, ISA, AE, 3356. *Mir'āt al-Sharq*, 29.5.26, 21.8.26.
20. *Ṣawt al-Sha'b*, 19.5.26, 17.8.26. *Mir'āt al-Sharq*, 21.8.26. *Al-Karmil*, 23.5.26, 22.8.26, 29.8.26, 5.9.26, 12.9.26. Ibrāhīm 'Abdīn to Kisch, 20.6.26, ZA, S/25, 501. Khalīl Bsayiso to AE President, 14.8.26, ISA, AE, 3076.
21. See issues of June 1927.
22. Jamāl al-Ḥusayni to President of National Political League in London, 23.6.27, ISA, AE, 3026; same to same, 1.9.27, *ibid.*, 3357. *Mir'āt al-Sharq*, 20.10.27. *Al-Karmil*, 8.1.28.
23. *Ṣawt al-Sha'b*, 14.3.28.
24. *Mir'āt al-Sharq*, 22.3.28, 24.5.28, 7.6.28. *Al-Karmil*, 1.4.28, 30.5.28. *Al-Jāmi'ah al-'Arabiyyah*, 7.6.28, 20.6.28.
25. *Mir'āt al-Sharq*, 24.5.28. It should be noted that in the 23.2.28 issue the proprietor and editor of this paper, Mr. Būlus Shihādah, announced that he had handed over the editing of the paper to Mr. Aḥmad al-Shuqayri, the son of Sheikh As'ad al-Shuqayri—the pillar of the Opposition in the northern part of the country.
26. *Ṣawt al-Sha'b*, 19.5.28.
27. *Mir'āt al-Sharq*, 7.6.28. *Al-Karmil*, 30.5.28, 10.6.28, 17.6.28. See also the series of articles by Emil al-Ghawri in *al-Jāmi'ah al-'Arabiyyah*, beginning with the 4.8.33 issue; see especially the 14.8.33 and 15.8.33 issues.
28. *Mir'āt al-Sharq*, 14.6.28. *Al-Karmil*, 17.6.28.
29. For a complete list of the Congress delegates, see *Ṣawt al-Sha'b*, 23.6.28.
30. *Mir'āt al-Sharq*, 21.6.28. *Ṣawt al-Sha'b*, 20.6.28. *Al-Jāmi'ah al-'Arabiyyah*, 7.5.28, 24.5.28.
31. *Ibid.*, 12.7.28. Darwza, *Ḥawla al-Ḥarakah . . .*, *op. cit.*, Part 3, p. 54.
32. *Ṣawt al-Sha'b*, 23.6.28. For a complete list of the resolutions see "Annex to the Political Report—The Arab Question", 22.6.28, ZA, S/25, 4210.
33. H. M. Kalvarisky, who had before the Congress maintained contacts with Arab leaders, wrote that this abstention had been promised to him as an indication of the Arabs' desire to have a rapprochement with the Jews (see *'Al Parashat Derakhenu*, Jerusalem, 1939, p. 34).
34. *Ṣawt al-Sha'b*, 23.6.28. Darwza, *Ḥawla al-Ḥarakah . . .*, *op. cit.*, Part 3, p. 54. Ḥamdi al-Ḥusayni, *op. cit.*, p. 15.
35. "Annex to the Political Report—The Arab Question", June 1928, ZA, S/25, 4210.
36. *Al-Jāmi'ah al-'Arabiyyah*, 21.6.28, 25.6.28. *Ṣawt al-Sha'b*, 23.6.28. Ḥamdi al-Ḥusayni, *op. cit.*, pp. 11–12.
37. *Ibid.*, *passim*. Darwza, *Ḥawla al-Ḥarakah . . .*, *op. cit.*, Part 3, p. 54.
38. *Al-Karmil*, 23.7.28.
39. *Ibid.*, 12.8.28, 3.9.28. Memorandum signed by F. Kisch, 15.8.28, ZA, S/25, 4161.
40. *Ṣawt al-Sha'b*, 6.3.29.

41. HC to the Colonial Secretary, Enclosure No. 2, 15.1.29, CO 733/167, 67015.
42. See the dispatch cited in Note 41.
43. Amery to the HC, 4.3.29, *ibid.*
44. HC to the Colonial Secretary, secret dispatch, 12.6.29, *ibid.*
45. HC to J. Shuckburgh (including H. Luke's memorandum on these talks), secret letter, 14.6.29, *ibid.*
46. *Ibid.*
47. HC to the Colonial Secretary, confidential dispatch A, Enclosure No. 1, 18.6.29, *ibid.*
48. See Note 45.

## CHAPTER SEVEN

(pp. 258-273)

1. See Wailing Wall Commission report, pp. 67 and 70. For the growth of the Jewish community of Jerusalem in the nineteenth century, see Ben-Zion Gat, *op. cit.*
2. Sokolow to Kisch (including Nisim Bachar's memorandum on the issue), 19.6.30, ZA, S/25, 2899. Druyanov, *op. cit.*, II, pp. 228-31. On a Jewish attempt in 1911 to acquire this place by means of exchange (*Istibdāl*), see ZA, S/25, 2911.
3. Asaf, p. 231, Note 953.
4. Stein, "The Question of the Western Wall up to 1928", ZA, S/25, 1625. A memorandum enclosed with HC to the Colonial Secretary, confidential dispatch, 17.1.30, CO 733/182, 77050, Part A. For an unreliable version, see B. Katinka, *Me'az ve-'ad Henah*, Jerusalem, 1961, pp. 262-3.
5. In 1921 Sir Alfred Mond (afterwards Lord Melchet) said that he would "concentrate the remainder of his energies on building a great edifice where once stood the Temple of Solomon" (see Minute No. 4248 of 1.7.21, CO 733/4). This statement got widespread currency among the Arab public and was cited as proof of the real aims of the Jews regarding the Temple Mountain.
6. Palin Report, pp. 34-6, FO 371/5121.
7. A note on the conversation held in the Carlton Hotel, London between Dr. Weizmann and Emir Fayṣal, 11.12.18, ZA, Z/4, 56; report No. 80, 4.6.20, *ibid.*, 2800II.
8. *L'Aurore* (a Jewish paper which was then published in Istanbul), 2.2.12. H. Sacher to the HC, 27.5.29, ZA, S/25, 2904.
9. Evidence on this can be found in *ibid.*, 2899 and 2917. Finn, *op. cit.*, pp. 118-19. The Wailing Wall Commission accepted this factual argument regarding prayer appurtenances but not regarding benches and screen (see the Commission Report, pp. 47-9). One should not think that a *waqf* property is necessarily sacred!
10. The Jewish claims were well summarized in the memorandum by Dr. M. Eli'ash (who represented the Jewish side before the Wailing Wall Committee), ZA, S/25, 2899.
11. Palin Report, p. 35, FO 371/5121. Storrs, *op. cit.*, pp. 349-50.
12. One should remember that Kāmil al-Ḥusayni, al-Ḥijj Amin al-Ḥusayni's older brother and predecessor, was moderate in his views and friendly in his attitude towards the British authorities and the Jews.
13. Deedes to the Colonial Secretary, secret dispatch, 8.6.22, CO 733/22; "Memorandum on the Wailing Wall", enclosed with HC to the Colonial Secretary, conf. dispatch, 17.1.30, CO 733/182, 77050, Part A.

- L. Stein, "The Question of the Wailing Wall up to 1928", 21.9.29, ZA, S/25, 1625; annex to this memorandum, 26.9.29, *ibid.*; interview with H. Samuel, *ibid.*, 748. Wailing Wall Commission Report, pp. 49-50.
14. Stein to Kisch, conf. letter, 15.10.25, S/25, 748.
  15. *Al-Yarmūk*, 18.10.25.
  16. 'Izzat Darwaza to the AE, 2.8.22, ISA, AE, 1072; Sab' al-'Aysh to the AE, 16.10.22, *ibid.*, 1541.
  17. 'Abd al-Qādir al-Muẓaffar to the AE, No. 6, 26.11.22, *ibid.*
  18. Report on Kāmil al-Budayri, ISA, CS, 168. Jamāl al-Ḥusayni to M. K. al-Ḥusayni, 27.8.23, ISA, AE, 2480.
  19. Proceedings of the Fourth Congress, ZA, Z/4, 4112.
  20. Protocol of AE sessions, 23-26.6.23, ISA, AE, 1058; AE Bureau, "The 40th Newsletter", 5.5.22, *ibid.*, 1722.
  21. Ḥāfiẓ Ṭawqān to AE (June 1922), *ibid.*, 1072; resolutions of AE in its sessions held on 23-26.6.22, *ibid.*, 1722. *Bayt al-Maqdis*, 21.6.22.
  22. 'Abd al-Qādir al-Muẓaffar and Adīb Abū Ḍabbah, "A General Appeal to the Honourable Arab Palestinian Nation", ISA, AE, 1721.
  23. 'Abd al-Qādir al-Muẓaffar to Jamāl al-Ḥusayni, No. 1, 1.7.22, *ibid.*
  24. "An Appeal to the Virtuous Egyptian Nation from their Palestinian Brethren and Neighbours", *ibid.*
  25. See Note 23 and same to same, No. 2, 3.7.22, *ibid.*
  26. The appeals can be found in *ibid.* See also British Consulate in Aleppo to Foreign Office, 17.7.22, CO 733/31.
  27. Adīb Abū-Ḍabbah to Jamāl al-Ḥusayni, No. 14, 18.7.22, ISA, AE, 1721; same to same, 30.7.22, *ibid.*; same to same, No. 17, 9.8.22, *ibid.*
  28. See first source in previous note.
  29. See last source in Note 27. See also Adīb Abū Ḍabbah's report to the Fifth Congress (in Cox to ACS(P), 26.8.22, ISA, CS, 168).
  30. 'Abd al-Qādir al-Muẓaffar to Jamāl al-Ḥusayni, 11.8.22, ISA, AE, 1721.
  31. See the exchange of letters between F. Kisch and N. Straus, ZA, S/25, 748 and Frumkin, *op. cit.*, pp. 276-9.
  32. On the incident and the details of the Aug. 1929 riots see Shaw Report and *STH*, *op. cit.*, Book 2, Part 1, pp. 301-403. See also the British Govt. remarks on the Zionist Organization memorandum of 19.12.28, CO 733/160, 575400.
  33. Darwaza, *Ḥawla al-Ḥarakah . . .*, *op. cit.*, Part 3, p. 86.
  34. *Al-Karmil*, 14.10.28. In autumn 1928 Lord Plumer, the previous HC, had already ended his office and Sir John Chancellor, the new HC, had not yet arrived, so the CS, Sir Harry Luke, administered the Govt.
  35. These protests are kept in CO 733/160, 57540. See also *al-Jāmi'ah al-'Arabiyah*, 1.10.28.
  36. *Ibid.*, 4.10.28 and September-December 1928 issues.
  37. This declaration was laid before Parliament as Cmd. 3229, 1928 and published in Palestine in a supplementary issue of the *Official Gazette*, 11.12.28.
  38. HC to the Colonial Secretary (including a note on a conversation with Amin al-Ḥusayni), conf. dispatch C, 10.5.29, CO 733/163, 67013/I; same to same, dispatch No. 937, 9.10.29, *ibid.*; same to same, conf. dispatch, 17.1.30, CO 733/182, 77050, Part A. Wailing Wall Commission Report, p. 52.
  39. These details were daily described and discussed in the Palestinian press, Hebrew and Arabic alike; see also ZA, S/25, 2939 and 2946. Memorandum on the Wailing Wall, enclosed with HC to Colonial

- Secretary, conf. dispatch, 17.1.30, CO 733/182, 77050, Part A; HC to Lord Passfield (the new Colonial Secretary in the Labour Govt.) (including report on H. Luke's conversation with the Mufti held on 7.8.29), conf. dispatch, 22.8.29, CO 733/175, 67411/I. In order to perceive the full implication of the problem of this gate see the maps annexed to the Wailing Wall Commission report.
40. HC to the Colonial Secretary, conf. dispatch C (including report on his conversation with the Mufti held on 6.5.29), 10.5.29, CO 733/163, 67013/I.
  41. Same to same, conf. dispatch, 14.6.29, *ibid.*
  42. Draft dispatch by Sydney Webb (later Lord Passfield) to Acting HC, 25.6.29, *ibid.*; same to same, 14.8.29, *ibid.*
  43. HC's cable to the Colonial Secretary (transmitting the Mufti's cable to the Colonial Secretary), No. 94, 8.8.29, *ibid.*
  44. Same to same, conf. dispatch, 22.8.29, CO 733/175; Acting HC's cables to the same, Nos. 99 and 100, 17.8.29, CO 733/163, 67013.
  45. Darwaza, *Ḥawla al-Ḥarakah . . .*, *op. cit.*, Part 3, p. 86 (author's italics).
  46. Kisch, *op. cit.*, pp. 262-3. A biographical note on Farid Fakhr al-Dīn, ZA, S/25, 3045.
  47. Shaw Commission Report, pp. 70-8.
  48. A leaflet by "The Cenral Committee for the Support of the Victims in Palestine", ISA, AE, 3093. *Ṣawt al-Sha'b*, 4.9.29. AE announcement about the disturbances, *ibid.*, 21.9.29. Amin al-Ḥusayni's letter to *Near East and India*, 31.10.29.
  49. "Announcement to the Honourable Palestinian People", 26.7.30, ISA, AE, 1823.
  50. *Al-Jāmi'ah al-'Arabiyyah*, 17.9.31. Darwaza, *Ḥawla al-Ḥarakah . . .*, *op. cit.*, Part 3, pp. 57-8.
  51. Emīl al-Ghawri, "Thawrat Ab al-Ḥamrā'" (The Red Uprising of August), *al-Jāmi'ah al-'Arabiyyah*, 23.8.33.
  52. The details of this dispute can be found in ISA, AE, 1714, 1809, 3797 and 4127. For the amount collected see Darwaza, *Ḥawla al-Ḥarakah . . .*, *op. cit.*, Part 3, p. 58.
  53. On the election of the delegation see ISA, AE, 1724; protocol of AE session, 21.1.30, *ibid.*, 3797. *Al-Jāmi'ah al-'Arabiyyah*, 28.2.30. *Mir'āt al-Sharq*, 18.12.29. *Al-Karmil*, 21.1.30, 25.1.30 and 28.1.30.
  54. See *al-Jāmi'ah al-'Arabiyyah*, 6.2.30, 1.3.31, 2.3.31, 20.5.31, 19.6.31, 30.7.31, 27.8.31, 17.9.31, 30.10.31, 1.8.32, 5.10.32, 23.10.32, 24.10.32, 30.10.32, 5.10.33.
  55. C. Sykes, *Crossroads to Israel*, London, 1965, *op. cit.*, pp. 147-51. *STH*, Book 2, Part 1, p. 301. Marlowe, *op. cit.*, pp. 115-24.
  56. HC to the Colonial Secretary, conf. dispatch, 17.1.30, CO 733/182, 77050, Part A. On the influence of the Administration on Shaw Commission Report, see Marlowe, *op. cit.*, p. 118.

## CHAPTER EIGHT

### THE CRYSTALLIZATION OF THE ORGANIZATIONAL FRAMEWORK THROUGHOUT THE COUNTRY

(pp. 274-293)

1. See Ch. 2.
2. ISA, AE, 1773. 'Arif Pasha al-Da'ūdi [al-Dajāni] and Ya'qūb Farrāj to the Military Governor of Jerusalem, 9.2.19, ISA, CS, 156.

3. According to the material in *ibid.*, 30, 140 and 156; see also *BD*, IV, p. 362. Doc. of confirmation of the delegates of *al-Nahḍah al-Iqtisādiyyah al-'Arabiyyah* society in Beisan to the Sixth Congress, 14.6.23, *ISA*, *AE*, 3596. Letter of nomination of the delegates of the Greek-Orthodox community in Haifa to the Sixth Congress, 15.6.23, *ibid.*
4. HC to the Colonial Secretary, secret dispatch, 14.12.23, *CO* 733/52; Clayton to the same, secret dispatch, 17.7.24, *CO* 733/71. ZE Press Bureau, communiqué No. 427, 11.8.24, *ZA*, S/25, 517.
5. *Al-Karmil*, 5.6.27 and 19.6.27.
6. For details about MCA in those days see *ISA*, *AE*, 1787.
7. A. Karmel, *Toldot Haifa bi-Yimey Ha-Turkim*, Haifa, 1969, pp. 175-6, 181.
8. Aḥmad al-Imām to the *AE*, 1.10.22, *ISA*, *AE*, 1773.
9. A cable of protest by the Muslim and Christian Associations of Haifa to General Bols, March 1920, *ISA*, *CS*, 30.
10. Report on a meeting of a delegation of these two Associations with Lord Milner, *ISA*, *AE*, 1722; these two Associations to the *AE*, 28.2.22, *ibid.*, 3046; same to M. K. al-Ḥusayni, 22.3.21, *ibid.*, 1058; Aḥmad al-Imām to the *AE*, 14.8.30, *ibid.*, 1780.
11. See Nāblus petitions in *ISA*, *CS*, 140. On the activities of this Association and its position see *ISA*, *AE*, 1072.
12. Cable by *Lajnat al-Mu'tamar al-'Arabi* (Committee of Arab Congress) to *AE*, 7.10.29, *ibid.*, 1780; report of the Financial Committee, 27.1.30, *ibid.*, 1524; see also the mailing list of the *AE*, 11.6.31, *ibid.*, 3595.
13. *Al-Jāmi'ah al-'Arabiyyah*, 15.7.31.
14. Report on the Fifth Congress, *ISA*, *CS*, 168.
15. This convention is outside the scope of this discussion. For details see *al-Jāmi'ah al-'Arabiyyah*, 2.8.31. One and a half months after this convention another convention took place in Nāblus in which were stressed the trends which had been discerned in the first one (see *ibid.* and *Mir'āt al-Sharq*, 23.9.31 and *ZA*, S/25, 4108).
16. See a letter of 'Izzat Darwaza [of 1921], *ISA*, *AE*, 1773. In 1925 one of the appeals of Nāblus MCA to the *AE* was done on the official paper of *al-Nādi al-'Arabi* (see Ḥāfiẓ Ṭawqān to *AE*, No. 2, 6.6.25, *ibid.*, 1825; *Al-Nādi al-'Arabi*, cable to the *AE*, 25.3.25, *ibid.*, 3605).
17. 'Izzat Darwaza, Secretary of *al-Nādi al-'Arabi* in Nāblus, to Jamāl al-Ḥusayni, 23.12.27 and 10.1.28, *ibid.*, 2700.
18. CID report, 23.12.20, *ISA*, *CS*, 156. On the activities of the Association in 1921 see *ISA*, *AE*, 1058. On later periods see letter of nomination of the Gaza delegates to the Sixth Congress, 15.6.23, *ibid.*, 3596; Gaza MCA to the *AE*, 17.12.24, *ibid.*, 1825; cable of the same to same, 25.3.25, *ibid.*, 3605.
19. 'Isā Shaṭārah and 'Abdāllah al-Jawdah to the *AE* President, 15.6.22, *ibid.*, 1773.
20. See the financial reports for 1921, *ibid.*, 1713.
21. Jubrān Iskandar Kazmā to Jamāl al-Ḥusayni, 4.7.22, *ibid.*, 3785; letter of nomination of Nazareth delegates to the Sixth Congress, 14.6.23, *ibid.*, 3596.
22. Muslim Association to the *AE*, July 1922, *ibid.*, 1057. *Al-Karmil*, 1.11.22. Letter of nomination of Tiberias delegates to the Sixth Congress, 15.6.23, *ISA*, *AE*, 3596. On the financial aspect see Note 20.
23. See Note 20. HC to the Colonial Secretary, conf. dispatch, 6.10.22, *CO* 733/26.

24. 'Ilyān Abū Gharbiyyah, Secretary of Hebron MCA, to the AE, 11.10.22, ISA, AE, 1773.
25. Safed Protest, 12.3.20, ISA, CS, 30. See also the list of the Associations in March 1921, *ibid.*, AE, 1058.
26. As'ad al-Ḥājj Yūsuf (Qaddūrah) to AE, 21.3.23, *ibid.*, 1541; letter of nomination of Safed delegates to the Sixth Congress, *ibid.*, 3596; cable by Safed MCA to the HC, 29.11.23, ISA, CS, 172. As'ad al-Ḥājj Yūsuf to the AE President, 5.1.24, ISA, AE, 3589; cable by Safed MC to the AE, 23.3.25, *ibid.*, 3605; same to the same, 16.10.29, *ibid.*, 2482.
27. Yūsuf Zamariq to M. K. al-Ḥusayni, 19.12.24, *ibid.*, 1825; cable by Beisan MCA to the AE, 25.3.25, *ibid.*, 3605; same to the same, 20.9.29, *ibid.*, 1715.
28. For Rāmāllah see Salīm Salāmāh to the AE President, *ibid.*, 1716; for Ramleh cable by Ramleh MCA to the AE, 16.10.29, *ibid.*, 1780; protocol of the AE Bureau session, 11.2.30, *ibid.*, 3797; report of the Financial Committee, 27.1.20, *ibid.*, 1542; cable by Ramleh MCA, 12.11.30, *ibid.*, 1022. For Lydda see *ibid.*, 1782.
29. See 'Abdāllah Samārah to the AE, 11.10.22, *ibid.*, 1773. ZA, L/4, 276 IV. HA, Shneerson papers, Nos. 5 and 6. *Do'ar Ha-Yōm*, 9.12.19.
30. ISA, AE, 1059. Ṭul-Karm petition concerning the Mufti of Jerusalem, April 1921, ISA, CS, 245; Ṭul-Karm petition to the Foreign Secretary, May 1921, *ibid.*, 244. Salīm ['Abd al-Raḥmān] al-Ḥājj Ibrāhīm to [the AE], 23.6.21, ISA, AE, 1773.
31. 'Abdāllah Samārah to the AE, 30.5.22, *ibid.*, 1059; Muḥammad Kamāl al-Jayūsi to the AE, 26.2.22, *ibid.*; *Mukhtārs* of Ṭul-Karm sub-district to [the AE], 26.6.22, *ibid.* C. F. Reading [the Governor of Ṭul-Karm] to Ṭul-Karm Mayor, 19.6.22, ISA, CS, 158.
32. *Al-Karmil*, 29.8.23.
33. ISA, AE, 1061. *Al-Karmil*, 16.12.22.
34. Cable by 'Abd al-Qādir Yūsuf 'Abd al-Hādi and Nāfi' 'Abūshi to M. K. al-Ḥusayni, ISA, AE, 1058.
35. CID report, 23.12.20, ISA, CS, 156.
36. Jerusalem MCA to the Governor, 10.2.19, *ibid.*
37. *Al-Karmil*, 22.4.28.
38. Salīm al-Ḥājj Ibrāhīm to AE, 23.6.21, ISA, AE, 1773; Ḥumaydān Kātibah Badr to M. K. al-Ḥusayni, 13.10.25, *ibid.*, 3591; Salīm Ḥijāzi to the same, *ibid.*; Ṭālib Maraqaḥ to the same, 17.10.25, *ibid.*; Ḥasan Ṣidqī al-Dajāni to the delegates of the Sixth Congress, 20.6.23, *ibid.*, 1771.
39. See *ibid.*, 1057, 1058, 1059, 1061, 1072, 1525, 1722, 1773, 1782, 1787, 1810, 2482, 3591 and 3785.
40. See the various proposals in *ibid.*, 1771.
41. See *ibid.*, 1072 and the AE report to the Sixth Congress, 16.6.23, *ibid.*, 1026.
42. Memorandum to the League of Nations, 1922, *ibid.*, 1810; AE announcement regarding "The Palestinian Administration and the alleged establishment of Advisory Council", 15.8.23, *ibid.*, 2425.
43. The various notices of the societies on the election of their delegates in *ibid.*, 1072, 3596 and 3714.
44. Ḥasan Ṣidqī al-Dajāni to the Sixth Congress, 20.6.23, *ibid.*, 1771. Jamāl al-Ḥusayni's notice on the election of Jerusalem delegates to the Sixth Congress, *ibid.*, 3596. Report on the Sixth Congress, 25.6.23, ISA, CS, 171.
45. Ḥamdī al-Ḥusayni, *op. cit.*, p. 7ff. *Al-Karmil*, 11.3.28.

46. M. K. al-Ḥusayni to Deedes [end of 1920], ISA, CS, 244.
47. See *al-Karmil*, 19.12.20. Report on the Fourth Congress, 21.6.21, CO 733/13. Cox to ACS(P), 25.8.22, ISA, CS, 168. Letters of election of the AE members, ISA, AE, 3596. Ḥamdi al-Ḥusayni, *op. cit.*, p. 15.
48. See ISA, AE, 1058.
49. Jamāl al-Ḥusayni to the HC, 30.8.22, ISA, CS, 168.
50. *Ṣawt al-Sha'b*, 23.6.28.
51. On the reorganization of the AE, at the beginning of 1930, see ISA, AE, 3757.
52. The Passfield White Paper of October 1930 drastically jeopardized Dr. Weizmann's position in the Zionist Movement and brought about his resignation after nine months as President of the Zionist Organization.
53. These newsletters are kept in ISA, AE, 1722.
54. A number of newsletters of 1930 can be found in *ibid.*, 1823.
55. See report on the Fourth Congress, ZA, Z/4, 4112. *Al-Karmil*, 14.9.21.
56. Muḥammad Kāmīl al-Budayri to Jamāl al-Ḥusayni, 9.12.21, ISA, AE, 1713; Ḥāfiẓ Ṭawqān to the same, 27.10.21, *ibid.*, 1072; same to the same, 19.12.21, *ibid.*
57. Muḥammad Kamāl al-Jayūsī to Jamāl al-Ḥusayni, 26.6.22, *ibid.*, 1059. N. Malūl, in Tzifroni, *op. cit.*, p. 275.
58. For examples see ISA, AE, 1059, 1061, 1072 and 1541.
59. A case in point is the convention in December 1924 in which the delegates rejected the compromise reached by the AE and the Opposition (see, *ibid.*, 1825). On other such conventions, see the sources in the previous note and *ibid.*, 1058, 3589 and 3596.
60. See financial report of the AE, *ibid.*, 1713.
61. AE report, 30.4.21, *ibid.*, 1058; see also Jubrān Iskandar Kazmā to the AE President, 7.7.21, *ibid.*
62. See M. K. al-Ḥusayni's circular, 17.7.21, *ibid.*, 1713.
63. Many details on the collection campaigns and the ensuing difficulties can be found in *ibid.* 1059, 1061, 1072, 1722 (The 17th, 24th, 27th, 34th and 47th Newsletters), 1810 and 3785. Bramley's report, 5.5.22, ISA, CS, 158. *Bayt al-Maqdis*, 13.3.21, 16.3.21, 13.7.21. *Filasṣīn*, 23.8.21. Deedes to the Colonial Secretary, secret dispatch, 7.7.22, CO 733/23.
64. See last source in the previous note. Jamāl al-Ḥusayni to the PD President, 12.9.21, ISA, AE, 1722. For other examples see *ibid.*, 1058.
65. Ḥāfiẓ Ṭawqān to the AE, 20.4.23, *ibid.*, 1072; Jamāl al-Ḥusayni to the PD President, 3.8.23, *ibid.*, 2480.
66. *Al-Karmil*, 28.7.23. M. K. al-Ḥusayni to the AE, 25.7.23, ISA, AE, 1541. See also the correspondence of the Delegation, *ibid.*, 2480.
67. Jamāl al-Ḥusayni to the President of the Palestinian Committee in New York [1924], *ibid.*, 3520; Jamāl al-Ḥusayni to the AE members, 21.3.26, *ibid.*, 3098. *Al-Karmil*, 25.7.25.
68. On the relations with the Palestinian societies abroad and the rather unsuccessful attempts to collect money among them, see *ibid.*, 3520.
69. See the financial reports, *ibid.*, 1809.

THE CHRISTIAN COMMUNITIES AND THE NATIONAL  
MOVEMENT  
(pp. 293-303)

1. Ma'oz, *op. cit.*, p. 188ff. Finn, *op. cit.*, pp. 424-41.
2. *Filasṣīn*, 28.5.13.

3. E. Sapir, *op. cit.*, p. 112. M. Smilansky, *op. cit.*, p. 181. *Al-Qā'id al-'Amm*, *op. cit.*, p. 39.
4. *Al-Jāmi'ah al-'Arabiyyah*, 14.8.33. Jemal Pasha, *op. cit.*, pp. 200-4.
5. See, for example, the composition of the various committees of Haifa Chamber of Commerce (*al-Karmil*, 28.7.23 and 5.7.24).
6. See the illuminating description by Graves, *op. cit.*, p. 108-12.
7. It seems that according to this situation Frumkin reached the conclusion (p. 219) that the Christians were those who had established the MCA in order to prevent the formation of a Jewish-Muslim front directed against them. The source material about the establishment of the MCA (see Ch. 1) does not confirm this view, although it is clear that the Christians had a stronger position in it compared to their numerical strength, which did not then exceed 10% of the population.
8. Draft dispatch to the Colonial Secretary, ISA, Samuel papers. See also all the material in ISA, CS, 156.
9. On the struggle of the Arabic-speaking Greek-Orthodox members of *al-Nahḍah al-Urthuduxiyyah* against their Greek-speaking clergy, see Tibawi, *RCAJ*, 1966; Elie Kedourie, "Khalil al-Sakakini"; Bertram-Luke report, pp. 250-79; Bertram-Young report, pp. 25ff; D. Hopwood, *The Russian Presence in Syria and Palestine, 1843-1914*, London, 1969, p. 159ff; and Khalil al-Sakākini, *Al-Nahḍah al-Urthuduxiyyah . . . op. cit.*
10. Popham to OETA(S) Hq., 21.6.19, ISA, CS, 239.
11. Storrs, *op. cit.*, p. 428. *BD*, IV, p. 363.
12. *Ibid.* See also Report No. 35, 18.4.20, ZA, Z/4, 2800II. Bertram-Young report, pp. 37-8.
13. See 'Arif al-'Arif's illuminating words in a conversation held in 1941 with the Arabist Menahem [Kapeliuk]. 'Arif al-'Arif explicitly stated that his appeal in 1920 for unity with the Christians had been nothing but a device without any practical foundation. The Christians, he stated, had preferred to co-operate with the foreign, i.e. the British element, which was Christian like them. (See M. Kapeliuk, "Days with 'Arif al-'Arif", 30.4.41, ZA, S/25, 3405.)
14. *BD*, XIII, p. 242.
15. "Draft Dispatch to the Colonial Office", ISA, Samuel Papers.
16. Bertram-Young report, p. 102.
17. *Ibid.*, pp. 11-14, 24.
18. On this body see Bertram-Luke report, pp. 28, 226 and 269-71 and Bertram-Young report, Index.
19. "The First Arab Orthodox Congress", 15.7.23, ISA, AE, 2480. Bertram-Young report, pp. 273-8.
20. Al-Sifri, *op. cit.*, pp. 188-90.
21. *Filasṭin*, 16.10.31.
22. Resolution of the Sixth Congress (Article 17), ISA, AE, 1058. Report on the Sixth Congress, ISA, CS, 171.
23. On the positions of the Christian members of the First Delegation See Ch. 3.
24. See Cmd. 1889, 1923.
25. Kisch, *op. cit.*, p. 39. *Al-Karmil*, 28.3.23 and the annex to the 24.2.23 issue. *Do'ar Ha-Yōm*, 9.3.23.
26. Cox to Richmond, 19.5.23, ISA, CS, 129. HC to the Colonial Secretary, secret dispatch, 10.1.24, CO 733/63; same to the same, secret dispatch, 11.9.24, CO 733/73. *Mir'at al-Sharq*, 8.12.23.

27. *Filasṭīn*, 22.6.23.
28. See Ch. 6.
29. Luṭfi Abū Ṣuwān (*Al-Karmil*, 11.3.28).
30. A complete list of the delegates can be found in *Ṣawt al-Sha'b*, 23.6.28.
31. See Ch. 5, sub-chapter C. and *al-Jāmi'ah al-'Arabiyyah*, 28.9.34.
32. "Draft Dispatch to the Colonial Office", ISA, Samuel Papers.
33. *Ibid.* CID report, 7.11.22, ISA, CS, 168. [Deedes] to [Shuckburgh], 6.10.22, CO 733/38. *Al-Jāmi'ah al-'Arabiyyah*, 15.8.33.
34. Storrs to ACS(P), 23.9.22, ISA, CS, 168.
35. *Al-Karmil*, 16.12.25.
36. *Al-Jāmi'ah al-'Arabiyyah*, 15.8.33.
37. *Ibid.*, the series of articles which began to be published on 22.3.28. See also *ibid.*, 7.5.28, 21.7.32, 15.8.33. Protocol of AE session, 9.9.32, ISA, AE, 3797.
38. *Al-Jāmi'ah al-'Arabiyyah*, 26.4.28.
39. Frumkin noted (*op. cit.*, p. 324) that in 1918 when the Courts of Law were reopened no young Muslims who knew how to write English could be found.
40. *Al-Ittiḥād al-'Arabi*, 27.6.25. *Mir'āt al-Sharq*, 10.10.25.
41. *Al-Karmil*, 6.2.28, 13.2.28 and 1.4.28. *Al-Jāmi'ah al-'Arabiyyah*, 7.5.28.
42. 'Abd al-Qādir al-Muẓaffar to the AE, 27.12.30, ISA, AE, 2700.
43. *Al-Jāmi'ah al-'Arabiyyah*, 21.7.32.
44. Protocol of AE session, 9.9.32, ISA, AE, 3797.
45. Report on the Congress, 7.11.32, ZA, S/25, 4122.
46. Report from 4.11.32, *ibid.*
47. Protocol of AE session, 9.9.32, ISA, AE, 3797.
48. Protocol of the AE session, 28.10.32, *ibid.*
49. *Ibid.*
50. According to the Book of Protocols, *ibid.*
51. Farīd Fakhr al-Dīn to Jamāl al-Ḥusayni, 30.7.23, *ibid.*, 1057. HC to the Colonial Secretary, secret dispatch, 14.12.23, CO 733/52. Eder to the Secretary of the ZE in London, 17.7.22, ZA, Z/4, 1053.
52. Fu'ād Shaṭārah to M. K. al-Ḥusayni, 18.8.24, ISA, AE, 3520. Youngmen's Association of Bir-Zayt to the same, 18.8.24, *ibid.*; Da'ūd Majā'id to the same, 21.8.22, *ibid.* *Al-Karmil*, 15.6.21. D. Miller to Eder, 9.5.22, S/25, 4380.
53. *Al-Karmil*, 20.2.24.
54. Kisch, *op. cit.*, p. 273.
55. *Al-Karmil*, 10.8.30.
56. Protocol of AE session, 26.9.30, ISA, AE, 3797. Protocol of AE Bureau session, 9.9.30, *ibid.*
57. Reactions of Christians from various places in the country, who objected to these petitions, *ibid.*, 1052.
58. See, for example, *al-Jāmi'ah al-'Arabiyyah*, 4.9.32 and 13.8.33.
59. HC to the Colonial Secretary, conf. dispatch, 15.8.31, CO 733/202, 87105.
60. *Ibid.*
61. Protocol of AE Bureau session, 9.9.30, ISA, AE, 3797. Report dated 4.11.32, ZA, S/25, 4122. See also the reasonable words of *al-Jāmi'ah al-'Arabiyyah* (the mouthpiece of al-Ḥājj Amin al-Ḥusayni), 29.9.32, concerning the problem of discrimination against Muslims in the public service.
62. In the census taken in Palestine in 1931, 75,500 local Christians were counted of whom 73,281 described their nationality as Arab.



# Bibliography

## I ARCHIVES

Israel State Archives, Jerusalem (ISA)

- Chief Secretary of Palestine Government (CS)
- Arab Executive Committee (AE)
- Supreme Muslim Council (SMC)
- 'Awni 'Abd al-Hādi's Papers
- 'Ali Ekrem Papers
- Herbert Samuel Papers

Central Zionist Archives, Jerusalem (ZA)

- Zionist Commission, Jerusalem (L/3)
- Zionist Commission, Jaffa (L/4)
- Political Department of the Zionist Executive, Jerusalem (S/25)
- Zionist Executive, London (Z/4)

Hagana Archives, Tel-Aviv (HA)

Public Record Office, London

- Colonial Office (CO)
- Foreign Office (FO)
- Cabinet Papers (Cab.)

## II MANUSCRIPTS

- An Anonymous Arabic diary of a Jerusalemite youth for the years 1915-16 (National and University Library, Jerusalem, Ms. No. AP. Ar. 8° 46).
- Muḥammad Ṣāliḥ Ibn 'Abd al-Ghani al-Ḥusayni, *Al-Nafḥah al-Ḥabībah fī Ma'rīfat al-Awqāt al-Shar'iyyah* (The Beloved Breath in Knowing the Legal Times), (National and University Library, Jerusalem, Ms. No. AP. Ar. 8° 1).
- Collections of *Fatwās* (National and University Library, Jerusalem, Ms. No. AP. Ar. 8° 101).

## III OFFICIAL PUBLICATIONS

*Hebrew*

- Palestina, *Ḥalīfat Igrot 'im Hamishlahat Ha-'Arvit Ve'im Ha-Histadrut Ha-zīōnīt* (Exchange of Letters with the Arab Delegation and the Zionist Organization), (Cmd. 1700, 1922).
- Palestina, *Hatzā'ah bidvar Yisud Sokhnūt 'Arvit* (Proposal concerning the Establishment of Arab Agency), (Cmd. 1089, 1923).

*Arabic*

- Al-Qā'id al-'Āmm li-al-Jaysh al-Rabi', *Idāḥāt 'an-Masā'il al-Siyāsiyyah allati jarra Tadqīquha bi-Diwān al-Ḥarb al-'Urfi al-Mutashakkil*

*bi-'Aleih* (Clarifications on the Political Questions which were adjudicated in the Court-Martial Constituted in 'Aleih), (Istanbul, 1916) Al-Qā'id al-'Āmm.

#### Turkish

— *Düstūr, Tertīb-i Thāni* (Collection of Laws, Second Series), (Istanbul, 1332 H.).

#### English

- A. Bertram and H. C. Luke, *Report of the Commission . . . to inquire into the affairs of the Orthodox Patriarchate of Jerusalem* (London, 1921).
- A. Bertram and I. W. A. Young, *The Orthodox Patriarchate of Jerusalem; Report of The Commission of . . .* (London, 1926).
- Great Britain, *Report of the Commission on the Palestine Disturbances of August 1929* (Cmd. 3530, London, 1930).
- Great Britain, Foreign Office, *Correspondence between Sir Henry McMahon His Majesty's High Commissioner at Cairo and The Sharif Hussein of Mecca, July 1915–March 1916* (Cmd. 5957, London, 1939).
- E. L. Woodward and Rohan Butler, *Documents on British Foreign Policy, First Series, Volume IV, 1919* (London, 1952) (BD, IV).
- Rohan Butler and I. P. T. Bury, *Documents on British Foreign Policy, First Series, Volume XIII, The Near and Middle East—January 1920–March 1921* (London, 1963) (BD, XIII).
- E. Mills, *Census of Palestine, 1931—Summary* (London, 1932).
- E. Mills, *Census of Palestine, 1931—Report* (Vol. 1, London, 1932).
- E. Mills, *Census of Palestine, 1931—Tables* (Vol. 2, London, 1932).
- Palestine, *Disturbances in May, 1921; Reports of the Commission of Inquiry with Correspondence Relating thereto* (Cmd. 1540, 1921).
- Palestine, *Papers relating to the Elections for the Palestine Legislative Council, 1923* (Cmd. 1889, 1923).
- Palestine, Government of, *Official Gazette*.
- *Palestine Royal Commission—Memoranda submitted by the Government of Palestine, 1937*.
- *Palestine Royal Commission—Report* (Peel Report, Cmd. 5479, 1937).
- *Quarterly List of Senior Officials, Palestine Government, Showing Appointments and Positions on the 1st October, 1921*.
- *Report of the Commission Appointed . . . to determine the rights and claims of Moslems and Jews in connection with the Western or Wailing Wall at Jerusalem* (London, 1930).

#### IV BOOKS

##### Hebrew

- Z. Abramovitch and I. Goelfat, *Ha-Mesheq Ha-'Aravi* (The Arab Economy), (Tel-Aviv, 1944).
- *'Al Parashat Derakhenu* (On Our Cross-Roads), (Jerusalem, 1939).
- M. Asaf, *Hit'orerut Ha'arvim be-Eretz-Israel u-vrihatam* (The Awakening of the Arabs in Palestine and Their Flight), (Tel-Aviv, 1967).
- M. Asaf, *Ha-Yehasim Bein 'Aravim vi-Yehudim be-Eretz-Israel, 1860–1948* (The Relations between Arabs and Jews in Palestine), (Tel-Aviv, 1970).
- A. Bein, *Toldōt Ha-Hityashvūt Ha-Ziōnit* (The History of Zionist Settlement), (Tel-Aviv, 1954).

- I. Ben-Avi, *'Im Shaḥar 'Atzma'utenu* (At the Dawn of our Independence), (Tel-Aviv, 1961).
- I. Ben-Zvi, *Eretz Israel ve-Yishuva bi-Yimey Ha-Shilṭōn Ha-'Utmani* (Palestine and its Settlement during the Ottoman Rule), (Jerusalem, 1962).
- Aaharon Cohen, *Israel ve-Ha-'Olam Ha-'Arvi* (Israel and the Arab World), (Merḥavia, 1964).
- Amnon Cohen, *Eretz Israel ba-Me'ah Ha-Shmoneh-'Esreh—Defusey Ha-Shilṭōn ve-Ha-Minhal* (Palestine in the 18th Century—Patterns of Government and Administration), (Ph.D. Dissertation, Hebrew University, Jerusalem, 1969).
- A. Druyanov, *Ketavim le-Toldōt Ḥibbat Tziōn* (Writings for the History of the "Love of Zion"), (Vol. 1—Odessa, 1919; Vol. 2—Tel-Aviv, 1925).
- Eliyahu Elath, *Hājī Muḥammad Amin al-Ḥussayni—Mufti Yerushalayim Leshe'avar* (Hājī Muḥammad Amin al-Ḥusayni—The ex-Mufti of Jerusalem), (Tel-Aviv, 1968).
- G. Frumkin, *Derekh Shoḥeṭ bi-Yerushalayim* (The Path of a Judge in Jerusalem), (Tel-Aviv, 1954).
- Ben-Zion Gat, *Ha-Yehudim be-Eretz-Israel, 1840–1881* (The Jewish Community in Palestine, 1840–1881), (Jerusalem, 1962).
- A. Granovsky, *Ha-Mishṭar Ha-Qarq'a'i be-Eretz-Israel* (The Agrarian Regime in Palestine), (Tel-Aviv, 1949).
- B. Joseph, *Ha-Shilṭōn Ha-Briti be-Eretz-Israel* (The British Rule in Palestine), (Jerusalem, 1948).
- A. Karmel, *Toldot Haifa bi-Yimey Ha-Turkim* (The History of Haifa in the Times of the Turks), (Haifa, 1969).
- B. Katinka, *Me'az ve-'ad Henah* (From Then Until Now), (Jerusalem, 1961).
- A. Ruppın, *Pirkey Ḥayay* (Chapters of My Life), (Tel-Aviv, 1968).
- A. Sapir, *Aḥdūt 'O Ḥaluqah* (Unity or Partition), (Jerusalem, 1937).
- E. Sapir, *Kovetz Mikhtevei Eliyahu Sapir* (Collection of Eliyahu Sapir's Writings), (Jaffa, 1913).
- Z. Shāhin, *Sodot she'od ṭerem Nitgalu* (Unrevealed Secrets), (Tel-Aviv, 1930).
- S. Shamir, *Toldōt Ha-'Aravim ba-Mizrah Ha-Tikhōn ba-'Et Ha-Ḥad-ashah* (History of Arabs in the 19th century in the Middle East), (Tel-Aviv, 1965).
- M. Shareṭ [Shertok], *Yoman Medini*, 1936 (Political Diaries), (Tel-Aviv, 1968).
- Y. Shim'oni, *'Arvey Eretz-Israel* (The Arabs of Palestine), (Tel-Aviv, 1947).
- Y. Slutsky and other, *Sefer Toldōt Ha-Haganah* (The History Book of the "Haganah"), (Book 1—Tel-Aviv, 1956; Book 2—Tel-Aviv, 1959) (referred to as *STH*).

#### Arabic

- Aḥad Fuḍalā' al-Muslimin, *Bayān wa-Radd 'alā Bayān al-Majlis al-Islāmi al-A'lā . . .* (Statement and Answer to the Statement of the Supreme Muslim Council), (Jerusalem, 1924).
- Tawfīq 'Alī al-Barū, *Al-'Arab wa al-Turk fī al-'Ahd al-Dustūri al-'Uthmāni, 1908–1914* (The Arabs and the Turks during the Ottoman Constitutional Period), (Cairo, 1960).

- *Bayān min al-Majlis al-Islāmi al-A'lā* (Statement by the Supreme Muslim Council), (Jerusalem, 1924).
- Wadi' al-Bustāni, *Al-Intidāb al-Filasṭīni Baṭil wa-Muḥāl* (The Palestine Mandate is Null and Void), (Beirut, 1936).
- Muḥammad 'Izzat Darwaza, *Ḥawla al-Ḥarakah al-'Arabiyyah al-Ḥadithah* (On the Modern Arab Movement), (Saida, 1950).
- M. 'I. Darwaza, *Al-'Arab wa-al-'Urūbah min al-Qarn al-Thālith ḥattā al-Qarn al-Rābi'-Aṣhar al-Hijri* (The Arabs and Arabdom from the 3rd century till the 14th century), (Damascus, 1959).
- *Al-Fatwā al-Khaṭīrah allati Aṣdarahā al-Muftūn . . . bi-Sha'n Bay' al-Arāḍi li-al-Ṣahyūniyyīn* (The Grave Fatwā Issued by the Muftis . . . regarding Land Sales to the Zionists), (Jerusalem, 1935).
- Emil al-Ghawri, *Filasṭīn 'Ibra Sittin 'Āman* (Palestine through Sixty Years), (Beirut, 1972).
- Yūsuf al-Ḥakīm, *Dhikriyyāt al-Ḥakim 1: Sūriya wa-al-'Ahd al-'Uthmāni* (The Memoirs of al-Ḥakīm 1: Syria and the Ottoman Period), (Beirut, 1968).
- Yūsuf al-Ḥakīm, *Dhikriyyāt al-Ḥakim 3: Sūriya wa-al-'Ahd al-Fayṣali* (The Memoirs of al-Ḥakīm 3: Syria and King Fayṣal's period), (Beirut, 1968).
- Amin al-Ḥusayni, *Ḥaqāiq 'an Qaḍiyyat Filasṭīn* (Truths regarding the Palestine Problem), (Cairo, 1954).
- Amin al-Ḥusayni, *Fatwā Samāḥat al-Mufti al-Akbar be-Sha'n Bay' al-Arāḍi li-al-Ṣahyūniyyīn* (The Grand Mufti's Fatwā regarding Land Sales to the Zionists), (Jerusalem, 1935).
- Ḥamdi al-Ḥusayni, *Kalimah ilā al-Sha'b al-'Arabi al-Filasṭīni ḥawla al-Mu'tamar al-'Arabi al-Filasṭīni al-Sābi'*, (A Word to the Palestinian-Arab People regarding the 7th Palestinian-Arab Congress).
- 'Abd al-Raḥmān al-Jabarti, *'Ajā'ib al-'Athār fi al-Tarājim wa-al-Akḥbār* (The Marvels of the Traces in the Biographies and News), (Būlāq, 1297 H.).
- Aḥmad Sāmīh al-Khālidi, *Ahl al-'Ilm bayn Sūriya wa-Filasṭīn* (People of Learning in Syria and Palestine), (Jerusalem, n.d.).
- Maktab al-Lajnah al-Tanfidhiyyah al-'Arabiyyah, *Bayān 'ala al-Kitāb al-Abyaḍ al-Ṣādir fi Oktober 1930* (Statement concerning the October 1930 White Paper), (Jerusalem, 1930).
- Ibrāhīm al-Sayyid 'Isā al-Miṣri, *Majma' al-'Athār al-'Arabiyyah* (Collection of Arab Traces), (Damascus, 1936).
- Muḥammad Khalīl al-Murādi, *Silk al-Durar fi A'yān al-Qarn al-Thāni 'Aṣhar* (The Line of Pearls in the Notables of the Twelfth Century), (Būlāq, 1301 H.).
- Mujir al-Dīn, *Kitāb al-'Uns al-Jalīl bi-Ta'rikh al-Quds wa-al-Khalīl* (The Book of the Honourable Friendship in the History of Jerusalem and Hebron).
- *Al-Mu'tamar al-'Arabi al-Awwal* (The First Arab Congress), (Cairo, 1913).
- Iḥsān al-Nimr, *Ta'rikh Jabal Nāblus wa-al-Balqā'*; II—*Akhwāl 'Ahd al-Iqṭā'* (The History of Nāblus Mountain and Balqā'; II—The Conditions of the Feudal Period), (Nāblus, 1961).
- Amin Sa'id, *Al-Thawrah al-'Arabiyyah al-Kubrā* (The Greater Arab Revolt), (Cairo, 1934).
- Anīs Ṣā'igh, *Al-Hāshimiyyūn wa-al-Thawrah al-'Arabiyyah al-Kubrā* (The Hashemites and the Greater Arab Revolt), (Beirut, 1966).

- Hālah al-Sakākini (ed.), *Kadhā Anā Yā Dunyā; Yawmiyyāt Khalīl al-Sakākini* (Such Am I, O World), (Jerusalem, 1955).
- Khalīl al-Sakākini, *Al-Nahḍah al-Urthuduxiyyah fī Filasṭin* (The Orthodox Awakening in Palestine), (Jerusalem, 1913).
- K. al-Sakākini, *Filasṭin ba'da al-Ḥarb al-Kubrā* (Palestine after the Great War), (Jerusalem, 1925).
- 'Isā al-Sifri, *Filasṭin al-'Arabiyyah bayna al-Intidāb wa-al-Ṣahyūniyyah* (Arab Palestine between the Mandate and Zionism), (Jaffa, 1937).
- As'ad al-Shuqayri, *Al-Risālah al-Marfū'ah ilā Aṣḥāb al-Jalālah wa-al-Sumuww Mulūk al-Muslimin . . .* (Letter sent to the Muslim Kings and Princes), (Acre, 1936).
- Akram Zu'aytir, *Al-Qaḍiyyah al-Filasṭiniyyah* (The Palestine Question), (Cairo, 1955).

#### *English and French*

- G. Antonius, *The Arab Awakening*, (London, 1961).
- N. Azouri, *Le réveil de la Nation Arabe dans l'Asie Turque*, (Paris, 1905).
- Henry H. Cumming, *Franco-British Rivalry in the Post-War Near East; The Decline of French Influence, 1914–1923*, (London, 1938).
- P. David, *Un Gouvernement Arabe à Damas, Le Congrès Syrien*, (Paris, 1923).
- Jemal Pasha, *Memoirs of a Turkish Statesman, 1913–1919*, (New York, 1922).
- J. Finn, *Stirring Times* (London, 1878).
- Geoffrey Furlonge, *Palestine is My Country—The Story of Musa Alami*, (London, 1969).
- S. D. Goitein, *Jews and Arabs—Their Contacts Through the Ages*, (New York, 1955).
- Philip Graves, *Palestine, the Land of Three Faiths*, (London, 1923).
- Y. Harkabi, *Arab Attitudes to Israel*, (Jerusalem, 1972).
- Uriel Heyd, *Ottoman Documents on Palestine 1552–1615*, (London, 1960).
- Derek Hopwood, *The Russian Presence in Syria and Palestine, 1843–1914*, (London, 1969).
- A. Hourani, *Arabic Thought in the Liberal Age*, (London, 1962).
- Harry N. Howard, *The King-Crane Commission*, (Beirut, 1963).
- J. C. Hurewitz, *Diplomacy in the Near and Middle East*, (Princeton, 1956).
- Elie Kedourie, *England and the Middle East*, (London, 1956).
- Elie Kedourie, *Nationalism*, (New York, 1962).
- George E. Kirk, *A Short History of the Middle East*, (New York, 1959).
- F. H. Kisch, *Palestine Diary*, (London, 1938).
- Guy Le Strange, *Palestine under the Moslems*, (rep. ed., Beirut, 1965).
- Harry C. Luke and E. Keith-Roach, *The Handbook of Palestine*, (London, 1922).
- Moshe Ma'oz, *Ottoman Reform in Syria and Palestine 1840–1861*, (London, 1968).
- John Marlowe, *Seat of Pilate*, (London, 1959).
- R. Meinertzhagen, *Middle East Diaries, 1917 to 1956*, (London, 1959).
- Matiel E. I. Mogannam, *The Arab Woman and the Palestine Question*, (London, 1937).
- Jukka Nevakivi, *Britain, France and the Arab Middle East, 1914–1920*, (London, 1969).

- L. M. Rotenberg, *Collections of Judgements of the Courts of Palestine*, (Tel-Aviv, 1935).
- E. Sivan, *L'Islam et la Croisade*, (Paris, 1968).
- Leonard Stein, *The Balfour Declaration*, (London, 1961).
- L. Stein, *The Truth about Palestine*, (London, 1922).
- Ronald Storrs, *The Memoirs of Sir Ronald Storrs*, (New York, 1937).
- C. Sykes, *Cross Roads to Israel*, (London, 1965).
- A. L. Tibawi, *Arab Education in Mandatory Palestine* (London, 1956).
- A. L. Tibawi, *British Interests in Palestine, 1800-1901*, (London, 1961).
- A. L. Tibawi, *A Modern History of Syria, Including Lebanon and Palestine*, (London, 1969).
- Z. N. Zeine, *The Struggle for Arab Independence*, (Beirut, 1960).

## V ARTICLES

### Hebrew

- F. Alsberg, "Ha-She'elah Ha-'Arvit bi-Medinyūt Ha-Hanhalah Ha-Tziōnit lifney Milhemet Ha-'Olam Ha-Rishonah" (The Arab Question in the Policy of the Zionist Executive before the First World War), *Shivat-Tziōn*, Vol. 4 (1955).
- E. Ashtor, "Sefer 'Arvi 'al Shivhey Yerushalayim" (Arabic Book regarding the Eulogies of Jerusalem), *Tarbitz*, Vol. 30 (1961).
- Y. Ben-Ḥananyah, "Sifrut 'Arvit Anti-Tziōnit" (Anti-Zionist Arabic Literature), *Ha-Shiloah*, Vol. 43 (1925).
- A. Ḥermōni, "Ha-Tenu'ah Ha-'Arvit u-Megamoteha" (The Arab Movement and its Trends), *Ha-Shiloah*, Vol. 15 (1905).
- U. Heyd, "Yehudey Eretz-Israel be-Sof Ha-Me'ah Ha-Yod-Zayin" (The Jews of Palestine at the End of the 17th Century), *Yerushalayim*, Vol. 4 (1953).
- H. Z. Hirschberg, "Meqomah shel Yerushalayim ba-'Olam Ha-Muslemi" (The Place of Jerusalem in the Muslim World), *Yerushalayim*, Vol. 2 (1949).
- H. M. Kalvarisky, "Ha-Yeḥasim Ben Ha-Yehudim ve-Ha-'Aravim lifney Ha-Milhamah" (The Relations between the Jews and the Arabs before the War), *She'ifotenu*, Vol. 2 (1931).
- A. Layish, "Ha-Waqf Ha-Muslemi bi-Israel" (The Muslim *Waqf* in Israel), *Ha-Mizrah He-Ḥadash*, Vol. 15 (1965).
- B. Lewis, "Eretz-Israel ba-Yovel Ha-Rishōn la-Shilṭōn Ha-'Othmani 'al-pi Pinqesey Ha-Qaraq'ot Ha-'Othmaniyyim" (Palestine after the First Fifty years of Ottoman Rule According to the Ottoman Land Registries), *Eretz-Israel*, Vol. 4, (1956).
- N. Malūl, "Ha-'Itōnūt Ha-'Arvit" (The Arabic Press), *Ha-Shiloah*, Vol. 31 1914-15, pp. 439-50.
- N. Malūl, "Le-Toldōt Ha-Tenu'ah Ha-'Arvit" (On the History of the Arab Movement), *Sefer Ha-Shanah shel Eretz-Israel*, Vol. 1 (1923).
- N. Malūl, "Ha-'Itōnūt Ha-'Arvit be-Eretz-Israel", (The Arabic Press in Palestine), *ibid.*
- M. Smilansky, "Moshvotenu be-Eretz-Israel" (Our Colonies in Palestine), *Ha-Shiloah*, Vol. 26 (1912).
- M. Vereté, "Ha-Masa u-Matan Ha-Tziōni-'Arvi be-Aviv 1919 ve-Ha-Medinyūt Ha-Anglit" (The Zionist-Arab Negotiations in Spring 1919 and the English Policy), *Tziōn*, Vol. 32 (1967).

- Y. Yehoshu'a, "Tel-Aviv bi-Re'i Ha-'Itōnūt Ha-'Arvit be-Hamesh Ha-Shanim Ha-Rishōnōt le-Hivasdah, 1909-1914" (Tel-Aviv in its First Five Years as Reflected by the Arabic Press), *Ha-Mizrah He-Ḥadash*, Vol. 19 (1969).

*English and French*

- Gabriel Baer, "The Evolution of Private Landownership in Egypt and the Fertile Crescent", in C. Issawi (ed.), *The Economic History of the Middle East, 1800-1914, A Book of Readings*, (Chicago, 1966), pp. 79-90.
- Y. Ben-Aryeh, "The Population of the Large Towns in Palestine during the First Eighty Years of the Nineteenth Century, According to Western Sources" (paper submitted to the *International Seminar on the History of Palestine and its Jewish Settlement during the Ottoman Period*, Jerusalem, July 1970).
- Omar es-Saleh el-Barguthy, "Traces of the Feudal System in Palestine", *Journal of Palestine Oriental Society*, Vol. 9 (1929), pp. 70-9.
- S. Bergheim, "Land Tenure in Palestine", *Palestine Exploration Fund—Quarterly Statement*, 1894, pp. 191-9.
- T. Canaan, "Mohammedan Saints and Sanctuaries in Palestine", *JPOS*, Vol. 6 (1926), pp. 117-63.
- C. Ernest Dawn, "The Rise of Arabism in Syria", *Middle East Journal*, Vol. 16 (1962), pp. 145-68.
- Mrs. Finn, "The Fellaheen of Palestine", *Palestine Exploration Fund—Quarterly Statement*, 1879, pp. 33-48.
- I. Friedman, "The McMahon-Hussein Correspondence and the Question of Palestine", *Journal of Contemporary History*, Vol. 5, No. 2 (1970), pp. 83-122.
- Dan Gillon, "Were the British Wrong about Palestinian Nationalism?", *The New Middle East*, January 1969, pp. 33-7.
- S. D. Goitein, "The Sanctity of Jerusalem and Palestine in Early Islam", in his *Studies in Islamic History and Institutions*, (Leiden, 1966), pp. 135-48.
- A. Hourani, "The Fertile Crescent in the Eighteenth Century", in his *A Vision of History*, (Beirut, 1961), pp. 35-70.
- Elie Kedourie, "Religion and Politics: The Diaries of Khalil Sakakini", in A. Hourani (ed.), *St. Antony's Papers—Middle Eastern Affairs*, No. 1 (London, 1958), pp. 77-94.
- Elie Kedourie, "Sir Herbert Samuel and the Government of Palestine", *Middle Eastern Studies*, Vol. 5, No. 1 (January 1969), pp. 44-68.
- M. J. Kister, "'You Shall Only Set Out For Three Mosques'—A Study of An Early Tradition", *Le Muséon*, Vol. 82 (1969), pp. 173-96.
- Paul J. Klat, "The Origins of Land Ownership in Syria", *Middle East Economic Papers*, 1958, pp. 51-66.
- R. A. Stewart Macalister and E. W. G. Masterman, "Occasional Papers on the Modern Inhabitants of Palestine", *PEFQS*, 1905, pp. 343-56; 1906, pp. 33-50.
- Neville Mandel, "Turks, Arabs and Jewish Immigration into Palestine, 1882-1914", in A. Hourani (ed.), *St. Antony's Papers*, No. 17—*Middle Eastern Affairs*, No. 4 (London, 1965), pp. 77-108.
- Y. Porath, "The Palestinians and the Negotiations for the British-Hijazi Treaty, 1920-1925", *Asian and African Studies*, Vol. 8 (1972), pp. 20-48.

- George E. Post, "Essays on the Sects and Nationalities of Syria and Palestine", *PEFQS*, 1891, pp. 99–151.
- E. Sivan, "Le Caractère sacré de Jerusalem dans l'Islam au XII-XIII Siècles", *Studia Islamica*, 27 (1967), pp. 149–82.
- Shimon Shamir, "The Modernization of Syria: Problems and Solutions in the Early Period of 'Abdülhamid", in W. R. Polk and R. L. Chambers (eds), *Beginnings of Modernization in the Middle East—The Nineteenth Century*, (Chicago, 1968), pp. 351–82.
- A. L. Tibawi, "Russian Cultural Penetration of Syria—Palestine in the Nineteenth Century", *Royal Central Asian Journal*, Vol. 53 (1966), pp. 166–82, 309–23.
- T. Z. Tunaya, "Elections in Turkish History", *Middle Eastern Affairs*, Vol. 5 (1954), pp. 116–19.

## VI JOURNALS

### Hebrew

*Do'ar Ha-Yôm*

*Ha-Ahdût*

*Ha-Ĥerût*

*Ha-'Or*

*Ha-'Aretz*

*Ha-Po'el Ha-Tza'ir*

*Ha-Shilohaḥ*

*Kuntres*

### Arabic

*Bayt al-Maqdis*

*Filasṭin*

*Al-Ĥayāh*

*Al-Ittiḥād al-'Arabi*

*Al-Jāmi'ah al-'Arabiyyah*

*Al-Karmil*

*Mir'āt al-Sharq*

*Al-Quds al-Sharīf*

*Ṣawt al-Haqq*

*Ṣawt al-Sha'b*

APPENDIX A: THE ARAB EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE, 1920-1934

	<i>Elected at the 3rd Congress</i>	<i>Elected at the 4th Congress'</i>	<i>Elected at the 5th Congress</i>	<i>Elected at the 6th Congress</i>	<i>Elected at the 7th Congress</i>
Jerusalem	Mūsā Kāzīm Pāshā al-Ḥusayni 'Ārif Pāshā al-Dajāni Ibrāhīm Shammās (Orthodox)	'Ārif Pāshā al-Dajāni	Mūsā Kāzīm Pāshā al-Ḥusayni' Sheikh 'Abd al-Qādir al-Muẓaffar' Ibrāhīm Shammās'	Mūsā Kāzīm Pāshā al-Ḥusayni' 'Abd al-Qādir al-Muẓaffar Ishāq Darwish' Jamāl al-Ḥusayni' Jawdat al-Nashāshibi (for Jericho)'	Mūsā Kāzīm Pāshā al-Ḥusayni 'Abd al-Qādir al-Muẓaffar (for Safed) Ishāq Darwish" Jamāl al-Ḥusayni (for Bethlehem) Zaki Nusaybah
Jaffa	Dr. Ya'qūb Burtqūsh	'Umar al-Bayṭār	'Umar al-Bayṭār Shibli al-Jamal (Protestant)'	'Umar al-Bayṭār	'Umar al-Bayṭār Yūsuf al-Dajāni
Gaza		Shukri al-Ḥusayni	Muḥammad al-Ṣūrāni	Muḥammad al-Ṣūrāni	'Abd al-'Azīm Ghuṣayn Khalil Bsayyiso
Ṭul-Karm	Sheikh 'Abd al-Laṭīf al-Ḥajj Ibrāhīm	Salīm 'Abd al-Raḥmān al-Ḥajj Ibrāhīm	'Abd al-Laṭīf al-Ḥajj Ibrāhīm	Salīm 'Abd al-Raḥmān al-Ḥajj Ibrāhīm	Salīm 'Abd al-Raḥmān al-Ḥajj Ibrāhīm Hāshim al-Jayūsi
Genin		Ḥaydar 'Abd al-Ḥādi	'Awni 'Abd al-Hādi	'Awni 'Abd al-Hādi'	'Awni 'Abd al-Hādi (for Beisan) Fahmi al-'Abūshi Fu'ād al-Qāsīm 'Abd al-Hādi

	<i>Elected at the 3rd Congress</i>	<i>Elected at the 4th Congress<sup>1</sup></i>	<i>Elected at the 5th Congress</i>	<i>Elected at the 6th Congress</i>	<i>Elected at the 7th Congress<sup>1</sup></i>
Nāblus	Al-Ḥājj Tawfiq Ḥammād	'Izzat Darwaza (Ḥāfiẓ Agha Ṭawqān) <sup>2</sup> Dr. Muṣṭafā Bushnāq	Al-Ḥājj Tawfiq Ḥammād <sup>3</sup>  Amin al-Tamimi <sup>4</sup>	Al-Ḥājj Tawfiq Ḥammād <sup>5</sup> Ḥāfiẓ Aghā Ṭawqān <sup>6</sup> Amin al-Tamimi <sup>7</sup> Rafiq al-Tamimi (for Jamā'in sub-district) <sup>8</sup>	'Izzat Darwaza Ahmad al-Shak'ah 'Abd al-Karim Ṣawfān (for Jamā'in) 'Adil Zu'aytir
Safed		Nā'if al-Ṣubḥ	As'ad al-Ḥājj Yūsuf Qaddūrah	As'ad al-Ḥājj Yūsuf Qaddūrah	(As'ad al-Ḥājj Yūsuf Qaddūrah) <sup>15</sup> (Ṣubḥi al-Khaḍrā) <sup>16</sup> (‘Abd al-Qādir al-Muzaffar) <sup>17</sup> Dr. Jamāl 'Izz al-Dīn <sup>18</sup>
Tiberias		Sheikh Ṭāhir al-Ṭabari	Sheikh Ṭāhir al-Ṭabari	Sheikh Ṭāhir al-Ṭabari	Ṣidqi al-Ṭabari Fā'iz al-Ṭabari
Nazareth			Ḥusayn al-'Ubayd al-Zu'bi	Ḥusayn al-'Ubayd al-Zu'bi	Sālih al-Ṣafadi ('Abbās al-Fāhūm) <sup>19</sup> Muḥammad Taqī al-Dīn al-Fāhūm <sup>20</sup>
Acre	'Abd al-Fattāḥ al-Sa'di	Ḥasan Badr			Tawfiq Ḥaqqi al-'Abdāllah 'Abd al-Qādir al-Shibl
Beisan		Jubrān Iskandar Kazmā (Orthodox)	'Abdāllah al-Ḥusayn Sheikh Bashīr al-Ḥasan	Farīd Fakhr al-Dīn <sup>20</sup> Sheikh Bashīr al-Ḥasan <sup>20</sup>	Yūsuf Zamāriq ('Awni 'Abd al-Ḥādī)

	<i>Elected at the 3rd Congress</i>	<i>Elected at the 4th Congress<sup>1</sup></i>	<i>Elected at the 5th Congress</i>	<i>Elected at the 6th Congress</i>	<i>Elected at the 7th Congress</i>
Haifa	Mu'in al-Māḍi	Sheikh Muḥammad Murād Tiyoḥfīl Būtāji (Christian)	Fu'ād Sa'd (Greek-Catholic) Mu'in al-Māḍi <sup>3</sup>	Sheikh Muḥammad Murād <sup>21</sup> 'Uqāb al-Yaḥyā <sup>21</sup> Wadi' al-Bustāni (Maronite) <sup>3</sup>	(Sheikh Muḥammad Murād) <sup>20</sup> Rashīd al-Ḥājj Ibrāhīm <sup>20</sup> Mu'in al-Māḍi
Lydda					Aḥmad Sayf al-Dīn al-Ḥusayni
Ramleh	Sulaymān al-Tāji al-Fārūqi		Sulaymān al-Tāji al-Fārūqi <sup>5</sup>	Shukri al-Tāji [al-Fārūqi]	Shukri al-Tāji [al-Fārūqi]
Hebron		Salīm Shnaytir Ḥijāzi	'Alyān Abū Gharbiyyah	Sheikh Ṭālib Maraqaḥ <sup>22</sup> 'Alyān Abū Gharbiyyah <sup>22</sup>	Sheikh Ṭālib Maraqaḥ <sup>21</sup> (Sheikh 'Abdāllah Ṭahbūb) <sup>22</sup> Nāṣir al-Dīn Nāṣir al-Dīn
Bethlehem			Ibrāhīm Jāsir (Christian)	'Isā Bandak (Orthodox)	Sa'id Darwish (from Māliḥah) (Jamāl al-Ḥusayni)
Ramāllah				'Isā Shaṭārah (Orthodox)	'Umar Ṣālih al-Barghūthy Sa'id 'Abdāllah Ḥasan
Beer-Sheba (Bedouin Tribes)			Sheikh Jadū' al-Ṣūfi	Sheikh Jadū' al-Ṣūfi <sup>10</sup> Sheikh Ibrāhīm Abū Ruqayyiq	Sheikh Ibrāhīm al-Ṣāni' Sheikh Ḥamad al-Ṣāni'

	<i>Elected at the 3rd Congress</i>	<i>Elected at the 4th Congress<sup>1</sup></i>	<i>Elected at the 5th Congress</i>	<i>Elected at the 6th Congress</i>	<i>Elected at the 7th Congress</i>
<b>Representatives of the Christian communities elected on communal basis</b>				Khalil al-Sakākini (Orthodox from Jerusalem) <sup>23</sup>	Ya'qūb Farrāj (Jerusalem-Orthodox) Emil al-Ghawri (Jerusalem-Orthodox) <sup>22</sup> Mughannam Ilyās Mughannam (Jerusalem-Protestant) 'Isā Bandak (Beth.-Orthodox) Khalil Qazaqyā (Beth.-Orthodox) Bandali al-Jawzi (didn't participate) Būlus Shiḥādah (Ramāllah-Orth.) Ya'qūb Burtqūsh (didn't part.) 'Isā al-'Isā (Jaffa-Orth.) Alfred Roq (Jaffa-Greek-Cath.) <sup>23</sup> Iskandar Burghush (Haifa-Orth.) Wadī' Ṣanubar (Haifa-G.-Cath.) Ilyās Khammār (Acre-Orth.)
				Michel Beirūti (Jaffa) <sup>10, 23</sup>	

	<i>Elected at the 3rd Congress</i>	<i>Elected at the 4th Congress<sup>1</sup></i>	<i>Elected at the 5th Congress</i>	<i>Elected at the 6th Congress</i>	<i>Elected at the 7th Congress</i>
Secretary	Ishāq Darwīsh (for a short while) Jamāl al-Ḥusayni <sup>1</sup>	Jamāl al-Ḥusayni	Jamāl al-Ḥusayni	Jamāl al-Ḥusayni (Khalīl al-Sakākīni served as a caretaker secretary when Jamāl al-Ḥusayni left for India as a member of the SMC delegation)	Jamāl al-Ḥusayni 'Awni 'Abd al-Ḥādī Mughannam Ilyās Mughannam ('Umar al-Ṣālih al-Barghūthy) <sup>24</sup> (‘Izzat Darwaza’) <sup>24</sup>
Secretary of the Office (after the 7th Congress)					Subḥi al-Khadrā' (1929–1930) Ṣafwat Yūnis al-Ḥusayni (1931–1934)
President	Mūsā Kāzīm Pāshā al-Ḥusayni	'Arif Pāshā al-Dajāni (When M. K. al-Ḥusayni was in London as the Head of the Palestinian Delegation)	Mūsā Kāzīm Pāshā al-Ḥusayni	Mūsā Kāzīm al-Ḥusayni	Mūsā Kāzīm Pāshā al-Ḥusayni
Vice-President	'Arif Pāshā al-Dajāni				Ya'qūb Farrāj Tawfiq Ḥaqqi al-'Abdāllah

## NOTES TO APPENDIX A

1. This Executive was elected to organize the activities in Palestine while the Delegation was at work in London; therefore the Delegation's members were not included.
2. Participated as substitute for the Nāblus members.
3. One of the "natural" members by virtue of his election to the Delegation.
4. Elected by virtue of his being the head of the Delegation to Hejaz.
5. Was elected, but did not participate in the meetings and activities.
6. Beginning with 1925.
7. Elected as member along with being Secretary.
8. Shortly after his election ceased participating.
9. The representatives of Jenin and Nāblus reported on their choice only after the Congress had ended its sessions, since the representatives of Jenin didn't participate in the Congress, while the representatives of Nāblus rejected the idea that besides the members of the Delegation the election of the Executive members would be done on a regional basis (every town would elect its representatives to the Executive).
10. At the end of 1924 stopped participating, which might serve as an indication of the growing strength of the opposition.
11. Stopped participating at the end of 1924.
12. 'Alyān Abū Gharbiyyah joined the opposition in autumn 1923 and ceased to attend the Executive meetings. Sheikh Ṭālib Maraqaḥ was elected in his stead.
13. These people were elected rather as special representatives of the Christians than as representatives of their regions. It is possible that this was done in order to strengthen the weight of the Christians in the Executive.
14. In March 1931 he was appointed as Tiberias representative in the Executive in place of Ṣidqī al-Ṭabari, who had resigned for health reasons. But Ṣidqī al-Ṭabari continued virtually to serve as a member of the Executive; therefore Ishāq Darwish became an additional member from Jerusalem.
15. Resigned at the end of 1930.
16. Resigned in September 1930.
17. Appointed by the Safed MCA instead of Ṣubḥī al-Khadrā'.
18. Appointed by the Safed MCA instead of As'ad al-Ḥājj Yūsuf Qaddūrah.
19. Muḥammad Taqqī al-Dīn al-Fāhūm was appointed in March 1931 instead of 'Abbās al-Fāhūm.
20. Sheikh Muḥammad Murād died in April 1929; after the August 1929 riots Rashīd al-Ḥājj Ibrāhīm was appointed in his stead.
21. Sheikh Ṭālib Maraqaḥ was arrested and convicted for his role in the Hebron riots in August 1929. While he was serving his jail sentence (until April 1932) Sheikh 'Abdāllah Ṭahbūb was his substitute in the Executive.
22. Appointed as member in April 1934.
23. It seems that he was appointed instead of Dr. Ya'qūb Burtqūsh. In any case, he began to participate in the Executive meetings only in early 1930.
24. Came instead of Jamāl al-Ḥusayni and 'Awnī 'Abd al-Hādi when the latter two left for London as members of the Delegation in spring 1930 and for some months thereafter.

APPENDIX B: THE COMPOSITION OF THE SUPREME MUSLIM COUNCIL; 1922-37

<i>District'</i>	<i>1922</i>	<i>1926'</i>	<i>1929</i>	<i>1930</i>
<i>Acre</i>	Muḥammad Murād <sup>2</sup>	Muḥammad Murād <sup>4</sup>	Amīn 'Abd al-Hādi <sup>5</sup>	Amīn 'Abd al-Hādi
<i>Nāblus</i>	'Abd al-Laṭīf Salāḥ	Amīn al-Tamīmī	Amīn al-Tamīmī	Amīn al-Tamīmī
<i>Jerusalem:</i> Gaza	Sa'īd Sawā	Sa'īd Shawā	Sa'īd Shawā <sup>6</sup>	Muḥī al-Dīn 'Abd al-Shāfi'
Jaffa	'Abdallah al-Dajāni	'Abd al-Raḥmān al-Tāji	'Abd al-Raḥmān al-Tāji	'Abd al-Raḥmān al-Tāji
President	Al-Ḥājj Muḥammad Amīn al-Ḥusayni	Al-Ḥājj Muḥammad Amīn al-Ḥusayni	Al-Ḥājj Muḥammad Amīn al-Ḥusayni	Al-Ḥājj Muḥammad Amīn al-Ḥusayni

NOTES

1. According to the Ottoman division.
2. Mufti of Haifa.
3. Appointed by the Government after the annulment of the elections by the High Court of Justice.
4. Deceased in April 1929.
5. From Haifa; appointed by the Government instead of Muḥammad Murād.
6. Deceased in 1930.
7. Appointed by the Government instead of Sa'īd Shawā.

## APPENDIX C: CHRONOLOGICAL TABLE

- 1891—The first Palestinian anti-Zionist protest.
- 1904—The publication of N. Azouri's *Le réveil de la nation arabe*.
- 1909—The publication of the newspaper *Al-Karmil*.
- 1911—The publication of the newspaper *Filastīn*.
- November 1917—The Balfour Declaration.
- December 1917—Occupation of Jerusalem by the British forces.
- Autumn 1918—The emergence of the Muslim-Christian Association in Jaffa and Jerusalem.
- October 1918—The establishment of Fayṣal's administration in Damascus.
- November 1918—The first organized protest against the Balfour Declaration.
- January–February 1919—First Palestinian Congress (of the MCA).
- July 1919—First All-Syrian Congress.
- February–March 1920—Series of anti-Zionist demonstrations.
- March 1920—The coronation of Fayṣal in Damascus.
- April 1920—First anti-Jewish riots in Jerusalem; partition of the Fertile Crescent into various mandates at the San Remo Conference.
- July 1920—Establishment of the civil administration under Sir Herbert Samuel as High Commissioner; French forces capture Damascus and drive Fayṣal out.
- December 1920—The Third Palestinian Congress in Haifa and the establishment of the Palestinian-Arab Executive Committee.
- May 1921—Anti-Jewish riots in Jaffa and the coastal area; al-Ḥājj Muḥammad Amīn al-Ḥusayni appointed Mufti of Jerusalem.
- May–June 1921—The Fourth Palestinian Congress in Jerusalem; the First Delegation to Britain appointed.
- July 1921—The first Delegation departs for London.
- August–September 1921—The Syrian-Palestinian Congress in Geneva.
- November 1921—Anti-Jewish riots in Jerusalem.
- January 1922—The establishment of the Supreme Muslim Council.
- June 1922—Churchill's White Paper (Cmd. 1700).
- July 1922—Ratification of the Mandate by the League of Nations; the First Delegation departs for Jerusalem.
- August 1922—Palestine Order-in-Council published; the Fifth Palestinian Congress in Nāblus.
- October 1922—Second Delegation to Geneva and London; Lloyd George's coalition collapses; first census.
- February 1923—Abortive elections to the Legislative Council.
- May–June 1923—Abortive attempt to establish an Advisory Council.
- June 1923—Sixth Palestinian Congress in Jaffa; Third Delegation appointed.
- July 1923—The Third Delegation departs for London; Palestine Cabinet Committee begins work.
- October 1923—Abortive British proposal to establish an Arab Agency.
- November 1923—First Congress of the opposition's Palestinian-Arab National Party.
- December 1924—Abortive attempt to settle the dispute between the Ḥusaynis and the Nashāshibis.
- June 1925—Lord Plumer appointed HC in place of Sir Herbert Samuel.
- January 1926—Elections to the SMC.

February 1926—Cancellation of the elections to the SMC by the High Court of Justice.

April 1926—Appointment of a provisional SMC by the Government.

March–April 1927—Municipal elections.

April 1928—Establishment of the Young Men's Muslim Associations.

June 1928—The Seventh Palestinian Congress.

September 1928—Police remove a dividing curtain from the Wailing Wall pavement during Jewish prayers on the Day of Atonement.

November 1928—Muslim conference for the defence of al-Burāq al-Sharīf (the Wailing Wall); Colonial Secretary's statement regarding the Wailing Wall.

December 1928—Sir John Chancellor appointed HC.

August 1929—The Wailing Wall anti-Jewish riots.

## APPENDIX D: GLOSSARY

- Alāy*—regiment in the Ottoman Army.  
*Alāy Beyi*—regiment commander.  
*'Alim*; pl. *'Ulamā*—a scholar of the Islamic sciences of the Koran, theology, and jurisprudence.  
*Al-Ard al-Muqaddasah*—the Holy Land.  
*A'shār* (*'Ushr* in the singular)—tithes.  
*A'yān*—notables.  
*Bid'ah*—illegal innovation.  
*Al-Burāq al-Sharīf*—the noble *Burāq* (the Arabic name for the Wailing Wall in Jerusalem).  
*Dhikr*—*Ṣūfī* ceremony the main feature of which is the incessant repetition of certain words or formulas in praise of God.  
*Faḍā'il al-Quds*—the Eulogies of Jerusalem.  
*Faḍā'il al-Shām*—the Eulogies of Syria.  
*Al-Fidā'iyyah*—those who sacrifice themselves.  
*Ḥadīth*—a tradition of an alleged saying or practice of the Prophet or of his Friends.  
*Al-Ḥaram al-Sharīf*—the noble sanctuary (the Arabic name for the Temple Mount in Jerusalem).  
*Ḥizb*—party.  
*Ittizām*—the farming of taxes on state-lands.  
*Imām*—the leader of a group of Muslims in prayer.  
*Iṣlāḥ*—reform, revision.  
*Istiqlāl*—independence.  
*Ittiḥād*—unity, federation.  
*Jam'iyyah*—association.  
*Jihād*—Holy War against the infidels.  
*Jund*—military-territorial unit; army.  
*Khaṭṭ-i Sherīf* of Gülhané—the Noble Rescript of Gülhané.  
*Khaṭīb*—preacher.  
*Majlis al-Idārah*—a district administrative council in the Ottoman Empire.  
*Majlis Niyābi*—representative council.  
*Majlis 'Umūmi*—a provincial general council in the Ottoman Empire.  
*Mu'adhdhin*—an announcer of the hour of prayer.  
*Mudawwarah* lands—lands returning to the possession of the state.  
*Mufti*—a Muslim jurisconsult who issues authoritative responses (*fatwā*; pl. *fatāwā*) in religious questions.  
*Al-Mufti al-Akbar*—the Grand *Mufti*.  
*Multazim*; pl. *Multazimūn*—tax-farmer.  
*Muntadā*—club.  
*Mu'tamar*—congress, conference.  
*Müteserriḥ*—district-governor.  
*Nādi*—club.  
*Nahḍah*—awakening, rising, renaissance.  
*Nāḥiyah*; pl. *Nawāḥi*—sub-district.  
*Nā'ib*—deputy, representative.  
*Naqīb al-ashrāf*—head of the *Ashrāf*.  
*Qaḍā*—administration of law, jurisdiction.

*Qādi*—a judge in a *Shar'i* court.

*Qawmi*—national, nationalist.

*Qawmiyyah*—nationalism.

*Qays*—the northern faction of the Arab tribes.

*Qiblah*—the direction in which the Muslims turn in prayer.

*Rā'is al-'Ulamā'*—head of the '*Ulamā'*.

*Sanjaq*—district in the Ottoman Empire.

*Shabībah*—youth.

*Sharī'ah*—the revealed holy law of Islam.

*Sharif*; pl. *Ashrāf*—a descendant of the Prophet.

*Sheikh ül-Islam* (in Arabic: *Shaykh al-Islām*)—the head of the hierarchy of '*Ulamā'* in the Ottoman Empire.

*Sipāhi*—in the Ottoman Empire, a cavalryman maintained by the grant of a "feudal" fief.

*Şūfī*—a Muslim mystic, who is usually a member of a religious order.

*Tanzīmāt*—arrangements (lit.); the reformed institutions of the Ottoman Empire beginning with the *Khatt-i Sherif* of Gülkhané in 1839.

*Vāli*—governor of a *Vilāyet*.

*Vilāyet*—a province of the Ottoman Empire.

*Waqf*; pl. *Awqāf*—an endowment established for pious purposes or for the benefit of the donor's family.

*Waṭani*—native, patriotic, national.

*Wataniyyah*—patriotism.

*Yaman*—the southern faction of the Arab tribes.

*Zāwiyah*—a *şūfī* convent.

## Index

- 'Abdāllah, Emir, 114, 149, 179, 180, 190  
'Abdul-Ḥamīd the Second, 22-3  
al-'Abdāllah, Tawfiq Ḥaqqi, 254, 289  
Abramson, A., 232  
Abu Ghaush family, 81, 83, 227-8  
Abu Hanṭash family, 130, 217, 229  
Acre, 19, 187, 216, 226, 236  
    nationalist activity, 282  
    opposition centre, 217  
advisory council, 140, 169-72, 245, 255  
    abandonment, 175-6  
    nationalist rejection, 171-2  
Agricultural Bank, 109  
agricultural parties, 227-8  
agricultural settlements,  
    Jewish, 17  
al-'Alami, Fayḍī, 97  
al-'Alami, Sheikh Yūsuf, 162  
Allenby, Lord, 95  
All-Syria unity, *see* Syrian unity  
Amery, L., 255  
American Commission, *see* King-Crane Commission  
Amin al-Ḥusayni, al-Ḥājj, *see* al-Ḥusayni  
Anatolia, 158  
Anglo-French Declaration, 42, 71-2  
Anglo-Hejazi Treaty, 111, 174-5, 178, 180, 182, 183, 205, 225, 242  
Anglo-Palestine Corporation, 28  
al-Anṣāri, Ibrāhīm, 205  
anti-Semitism,  
    Arab, 58-9, 60-2  
    Eastern Europe, 17  
anti-Zionism, 26-30, 81, 94-5, 117, 308  
    British support, 107  
    centres, 104-5  
    Christian support, 295  
    fostered by French, 73-4  
    1920 demonstrations, 96ff.  
April 1920 disturbances, 37, 62, 96  
al-Aqṣā mosque, 1, 4, 154, 200, 203, 205, 258, 263, 265, 308  
    Jewish threat to, 263  
    propaganda campaign, 266  
    restoration, 206  
"Arab Agency", 175  
    recommendation, 176-7  
Arab association, 182  
Arab Congress of 1913, 20-22, 24, 25  
Arab Delegation, *see* Palestinian Delegation  
Arab Executive Committee (AE), 50, 66, 68, 110, 118, 162-3, 225-6, 248, 271, 285, 291, 306  
    and advisory council, 171-2  
    agreement with opposition, 247-57  
    British attitude, 125-8  
    campaign against 1922 election, 152-3  
    Christian opposition, 298-9  
    collapse, 290  
    decline, 241, 243  
    elections, 288  
    fund raising, 291-3  
    management structure, 289  
    memorandum of 1921, 115  
    and Muslim-Christian differences, 302  
    and 1921 riots, 131-2, 133  
    opposition, 210  
    quorums, 288-9  
    request for representative government, 254-5  
    representation decisions at Seventh Congress, 243-4  
    weekly circulars, 290  
Arab nationalism,  
    emergence, 20ff., 62-3, 160  
    distinction between Jews and Zionists, 60-2  
    1920 split, 100-104  
    opposition, 213  
    Palestinian participation, 20, 24

- Arab population, 19-20  
 political trends on eve of First World War, 20-30
- Arab revolt, 70-1
- Arabs,  
 claim to Palestine, 40ff.
- al-ʿArif, ʿArif, editor, 76, 78, 88, 98, 99, 100, 106, 130, 131, 192, 339
- ʿArif Pasha, *see* al-Dajāni
- aristocracy,  
 representative claims, 286-7
- Arslān, Emir Shakīb, 113, 121, 122, 130-1
- al-ʿAsali, Shukri, Syrian nationalist, 30
- Ashkenazim Jews, 16, 61
- al-Asīl, Dr. Nāji, 174, 179, 181
- Asir, 178
- Association of Catholic Youth, 295
- "Association for Muslim Solidarity" (*Jam'iyyat al-Tadāmun al-Islāmi*), 265
- Association of Muslim Youth, 289
- Association for Village Cooperation (*Jam'iyyat Ta'āwun al-Qurā*), 228
- awqāf*, 199, 231-2, 353
- administration, 195  
 and AE, 293  
 administration by SMC, 361
- al-ʿAwri, Muhammad Abū Sa'ūd, 189, 190, 196
- a'yān*, urban notables, 11  
 position in Ottoman Empire, 12-13
- Ayyūbides, 4
- al-Azhar, Sheikh, 264
- Azouri, Nejjib, 22
- Al-Nādi al-ʿArabi*, 101
- Bahrain, 206
- al-Bahri, Jamil, 303
- Baldwin, Stanley, 169, 172
- Balfour, Lord, 166  
 demonstrations against, 243, 249-50, 291
- Balfour Declaration, 31, 34-5, 47, 50, 102, 108, 109-10, 120, 125, 128, 137, 139, 141, 143, 150, 151, 225, 242, 246, 253, 303, 304  
 acceptance by Turkey, 165  
 Arab refutations, 52-3, 64, 222  
 British decision to uphold, 168-9, 176  
 demonstrations against, 96-7  
 interpretations, 66-7, 140-1  
 and League of Nations Covenant, 43
- Bandak, ʿIsā, 180, 302
- al-Bāqī, Aḥmad Hilmi Pasha ʿAbd, 87
- al-Barghūthy, ʿUmar Sālih, 218, 222, 245
- Barlassina, Latin Patriarch, 295
- Barū, Tawfiq ʿAli, 24
- Bayt al-Maqdis*, newspaper, 105
- al-Bayṭār, ʿUmar, 180, 210, 233, 276
- Bedouins, 9  
 and nationalist movement, 279
- Beersheba, 236
- Beilis trial, 29
- Beirut Reform Society, 25
- Beisan, 216, 217  
 land grants to Bedouins, 126, 135  
 nationalist activity, 280
- Ben-Avi, Itamar, 112
- Ben-Zvi, Itzhak, 58
- Bentwich, Norman, 140, 191, 195, 198
- Betar* movement, 269
- al-Bīrah, 278
- "Black Hand", (*al-Kaff al-Sawdā*), 129, 296
- "Black Paper", *see* "MacDonald letter"
- Bols, Major-General L., 34, 95, 96
- Bolshevism,  
 and Jewish immigration, 57-8
- Bonar-Law, Andrew, 169
- Bonar-Law government, 157, 166-7
- Britain, 108-9, 165  
 Arab support, 102  
 pro-Arab group, 134-5, 175  
 attitude to Palestine, 44-6  
 Committee in support of Palestinian Arabs, 137  
 1926 constitutional discussions with Arabs, 245-6  
 rivalry with France, 72-4  
 policy statements, 143, 144-5, 168  
 pressure for Protectorate, 91, 94  
 pro-Zionist policy, 140-1, 158, 168-9  
 (*see also* Balfour Declaration, Mandatory Government, Palestinian Delegations)
- British Army,  
 Palestinian attitude towards, 123-4  
 (*see also* Military Administration)

- British Commission of Inquiry, 95  
 British-Hejazi Treaty, *see* Anglo-Hejazi Treaty  
 British Military Administration, *see* Military Administration  
 Brunton, Captain, 32  
 al-Budayri, Kāmil, editor, 76, 134, 263  
 al-Burāq al-Sharīf, *see* Wailing Wall  
 al-Bustāni, Wadī', 180, 181, 297
- Cabinet Committee,  
 Palestine Policy review, 174-5, 176  
 Caliphate Conference meeting, 206  
 Carmel, 287  
 Catholic Association, 75  
 Catholics, 19  
 and national movement, 295, 297  
 census, 151  
 Central Committee, *see* "Arab Executive Committee"  
 Chancellor, Sir John, High Commissioner, 136, 158, 255, 256, 267, 273  
 Christian communities,  
 Arab predominance, 19, 303, 373  
 attitude to Britain, 299  
 attitude to Muslims, 296  
 and MCA, 372  
 Muslim bitterness towards, 216, 294  
 role in nationalist movement, 138, 253, 288, 293-303  
 standing under British administration, 301  
 support for opposition parties, 299  
 (*see also* Muslim-Christian Association (MCA))  
 Christian missionaries,  
 Jerusalem congress, 300  
 Christian religion,  
 anti-Zionist use, 42  
 Churchill, Winston, 64, 110, 115, 128, 141, 166, 167  
 concessions to First Delegation, 144-5  
 Cilicia, 164  
 Clayton, Sir Gilbert, 35, 38, 72, 173, 175, 176, 201, 233  
 attempt to reach compromise, 173-4  
 Clemenceau, Georges, 95  
 collective punishments, 132  
 Commission of Inquiry, *see* British Commission of Inquiry, King-Crane Commission  
 "Committee of the Arab Congress" (*Lajnat al-Mu'tamar al-'Arabi*), 277  
 "Committee for Assistance of Victims of Riots", 293  
 "Committee for the Defence of al-Burāq al-Sharīf and the Islamic Holy Places", 266  
 Committee of Jerusalem Jews, 97  
 "Committee of Young Educated Muslims", 301  
 Conservative Party,  
 pro-Arab element, 175  
 constitution, 110, 139, 225  
 British intentions, 140  
 1926 Arab demands, 246  
 rejection by First Delegation, 144  
 Cox, C. H. J., 232  
 courts,  
 Christian and Jewish, 195  
 (*see also* Shar'i courts)  
 Crusaders, 2-3, 4  
 Curzon, Lord, 45, 95
- Dabbāgh, Maḥmūd, 129  
 Ḍabbah, Adīb Abū, 115, 263  
*Daily Mail*, 167  
 Dajāni, Sheikh 'Abdāllah, 197, 237  
 al-Dajāni, 'Ārif Pāshā, 34, 83, 84, 97, 102, 106, 110, 211, 213, 218, 222, 223, 238, 263, 275, 284, 285  
 al-Dajāni, Fā'iq, 218  
 al-Dajāni, Sheikh Rāghib Abū Sa'ūd, 82, 84, 91  
 al-Dajāni, Shukri, 211, 218  
 Dajāni family, 34, 218, 276  
 al-Dajāni, Ḥasan Sidqī, 74  
 Damascus, 71, 103-4, 304  
 extremist activity, 86-7  
 MCA delegation to, 82  
 pro-French party, 90-1  
 Second Palestinian Congress, 330-1  
 Dar al-Bey faction, 15  
 Dar al-Maṣri faction, 15  
 Darwaza, 'Izzat, 34, 49, 60, 77, 82, 88, 89, 100, 103, 149, 155, 191, 204, 234, 245, 269, 270, 277, 302  
 Darwish, Ishāq, 275  
 al-Da'ūdi, *see* al-Dajāni, 'Ārif Pāshā  
 Decentralization Party, 23-4

- Deedes, Sir Wyndham, 32, 136, 149, 152, 173, 191, 199  
resignation, 201
- Devonshire, Duke of, 167, 168
- al-Dīn, Farid Fakhr, 269
- Do'ar Ha-Yōm*, 112
- Dome of the Rock, 2, 200, 203, 205, 258, 308  
appeals to Muslims for defence, 263-4  
Jewish threat, 262-3  
restoration, 206
- Druzes, 19
- economy,  
and Jewish immigration, 55-6
- Eder, Dr. D., 98, 112, 113
- education,  
Arabs, 20, 21, 204  
Jerusalem, 4
- Egypt, 263  
Syrian exile movement, 104
- Ekrem Bey, 'Ali, 23
- Electoral Committee,  
rigging, 235
- electoral boycott,  
wisdom, 156-8
- electoral system,  
Ottoman empire, 286-7, 294
- "Eulogies of Jerusalem" literature,  
3, 4
- "Executive Committee of the Palestinian Arab Congress", *see* Arab Executive Committee
- extremists, 133-4  
arguments, 150  
organizations, 289-90
- al-Fāhūm family, 217, 229, 278
- al-Falāh*, Arab newspaper, 247
- family networks,  
Ottoman Palestine, 13-14
- "Farmers Party", 231
- Farrāj, Ya'qūb, 81, 83, 97, 213, 240, 253, 289, 296
- al-Fārūqi, Sheikh Sulaymān al-Tāji, 29, 108, 131, 138, 214, 222, 223, 248, 251  
opposition to AE, 210-11
- al-Fatāh* Party, 77, 78, 116
- Fayṣal, King, 47, 48, 50, 71, 95, 123, 124, 190, 209  
wish for British protection, 90-1  
Christian attitude towards, 296  
collapse of Damascus regime, 100, 103-5  
at Peace Conference, 86  
and Zionism, 88-9, 103, 112, 322-3
- Federation of Labour, 19
- Fidā'iyyah* movement, *see* "Black Hand"
- Filasṭīn*,  
as a Muslim administrative unit, 4-20
- Filasṭīn*, newspaper, 24-5, 26-7, 29, 30, 234, 244, 276, 299
- First General Syrian Congress,  
Palestinian delegates, 88
- France,  
and *al-Muntadā al-Adabi*, 74-5  
opposition to Jewish National Home, 107  
rivalry with Britain in Palestine and Syria, 72-4  
split with Arab nationalism, 101  
support for Palestine-Syrian Unity, 80-1, 82, 91, 295  
(*see also* Anglo-French Declaration)
- Franco-Turkish Treaty, 164
- Fu'ād, King, 206
- Galilee, 108, 134, 226, 227, 287
- Gaza, 15, 227, 240  
MCA, 278
- "general councils" (*Majālis 'Um-ūmiyyah*), 294
- general elections,  
proposed for Seventh Palestinian Congress, 242
- "General Palestinian Association", 84
- Germany,  
and the Jews, 58-9
- Ghaush, 'Abd al-Ḥamid Abū, 81, 83
- al-Ghūri, Amīl, 270
- "Grand Mufti", 188
- Greek-Orthodox community, and nationalist movement, 295-8
- Greek Orthodox Congress, 297-8
- Greek-Turkish War, 299-300
- Ḥaddad, General Gabriel Bey, 80
- Ḥadera, 132
- al-Hādi, Amīn 'Abd, 175

- al-Hādi, 'Awni 'Abd, 68, 87, 254, 289, 331
- al-Hādi, Haydar 'Abd, 82
- al-Hādi, Ḥusni 'Abd, 214
- al-Hādi, Ibrāhīm 'Abd, 111
- al-Hādi, Ibrāhīm al-Qāsim 'Abd, 82
- al-Hādī, Muḥammad Ḥusni 'Abd, 105
- al-Hādi, Rūhi 'Abd, 138
- ḥadīth* literature, 1-2
- Hague Treaty, 52
- Haifa, 96, 108, 134, 216, 217, 218, 226
- meeting of nationalist associations, 94
- nationalist organizations, 276-7
- Haifa Muslim Association, 283
- Ḥājjar, Bishop, 138, 295
- al-Ḥakīm, Najīb, 180
- Ḥamād, al-Ḥājī Tawfiq, 82, 117, 138, 145, 146, 148, 153, 211, 234, 277
- Hantash, 'Abd al-Laṭīf Abū, 130, 229
- Hanūn family, 227
- al-Ḥaram al-Sharīf*, 226, 258, 261
- Hashemite regime, 105  
(see also Fayṣal, Ḥusayn)
- Haycraft Commission, 129
- Hebrew, 54, 109
- status, 36, 255
- Hebrew University, 19
- Hebron, 217-18, 226-7, 269
- opposition centre, 234, 279
- pogrom, 62
- Hefer, Valley of, 19
- Hejaz, 182, 206
- delegation to, 87, 205, 275  
(see also Anglo-Hejazi Treaty)
- Ḥibbat Tzion* movement, 17
- Ḥizb al-Ahālī*, 234
- al-Ḥizb al-Waṭani* (Palestinian Arab national party), 78, 215, 222, 224, 225, 229, 248, 249, 328
- al-Ḥizb al-Zirā'i*, 230, 248, 249
- Ḥizb al-Zurrā'*, 229
- "Holy Land",
- geographical area, 4-5
- holy places,
- Arab claims, 41-2, 272  
(see also al-Aqṣa mosque, Dome of the Rock, Jerusalem mosques, Wailing Wall)
- Hope-Simpson Report, 272
- Hudayb family, 218, 230
- Hudayb, Mūsā, 229
- Ḥuṣām al-Dīn, see Jārallah
- Ḥusayn, *Sharīf*, 47-8, 72, 159, 180, 205, 225
- and Arab revolt, 70-1
- acceptance of Mandates, 111-12, 178-9
- fall, 182  
(see also McMahan letter)
- al-Ḥusayni family, 13, 101, 184-6, 209, 253
- differences within, 155
- and *al-Nādi al-'Arabi*, 76
- al-Ḥusayni, 'Abd al-Qādir, 302
- al-Ḥusayni, Al-Ḥājī Amīn, ch. 4  
*passim*, 54, 76, 78, 88, 96, 100, 106, 126, 129, 131, 135, 151, 155, 189, 231, 233-4, 247, 257, 266, 269, 270, 290, 307, 339
- appointment as Mufti, 189-93
- compromise offer to Jews over municipal elections, 239
- description, 191-2
- family background, 184-6
- elected *Ra'is al-'Ulamā'*, 197
- major Arab-Palestinian leader, 271-2
- official representative of Palestinian population, 201
- political manipulation, 203-4
- special claims, 193-4
- term as SMC president extended, 237
- al-Ḥusayni, Hamda, 234
- al-Ḥusayni, Hamdi, 254
- al-Ḥusayni, Ishāq, 275
- al-Ḥusayni, Ismā'il, 83, 84, 97, 175
- al-Ḥusayni, Jamāl, 112, 114, 150, 180, 200, 205, 243, 246, 254, 275, 289, 292-3
- suggests compromise over legislative council, 244-5
- al-Ḥusayni, Jamīl Bey, 98, 99, 107
- al-Ḥusayni, Kāmil, 31, 32, 39, 76, 185, 187-8
- al-Ḥusayni, Muḥammad Tāhir, 259
- al-Ḥusayni, Mūsā Kāzim, Mayor of Jerusalem, 32, 33, 54, 61, 64, 66, 67, 68, 69, 76, 97, 101, 106, 107, 110, 120, 125, 132, 138, 148, 149, 163, 165, 170, 177, 179, 180, 181, 209-10, 211, 213, 253, 255, 256, 257, 286, 289, 308, 334

- death, 271–2, 290  
 dismissal, 209  
 independence, 238  
 al-Ḥusayni, Şafwat Yūnis, 275  
 al-Ḥusayni, Sa'ūd, 27, 30, 87  
 al-Ḥusayni, Shukri, 24
- Ibn Sa'ūd, King 'Abd al-'Aziz, 264  
 Ibrāhīm, Rashid al-Ḥājj, 83, 245  
 Ibrāhīm, Salīm 'Abd al-Raḥmān al-Ḥājj, 77, 97, 130, 149, 180, 281  
 Ijzim-Haifa area, 236  
*al-'Ikhā' al-'Arabi*, 316  
*iltizāms*, 12  
 al-Imām, Rāghib, 180  
 immigration, *see* Jewish immigration  
 Immigration Committee, 144, 150, 176, 245  
 India,  
   SMC delegation, 205–6  
 Indian pilgrims, 264  
 Iraq, 51, 178, 182, 206  
 al-'Īsā brothers, 7–8, 29  
 al-'Īsā, 'Īsā, 111, 114, 130, 180, 296, 302  
 al-'Īsā, Wahbah, 117  
 al-'Īsā, Yūsuf, 296  
 Islam,  
   and pan-Arabism, 87  
   *al-'Iṣlāḥ* (reform societies), 23  
   Islington, Lord, 167  
   Ismet Pasha (Inönü), 165, 166  
   *al-'Istiqlāl al-'Arabi* party, 78, 88, 117
- al-Jābiri, Ihsān Bey, 113  
 Jaffa, 15, 23, 57, 75, 90, 96, 132, 218, 294  
   May Day (1921) riots, 60, 129, 130, 131  
 Jaffa MCA, 233, 274, 275–6  
   split, 230  
 Jaffa YMMA, 302  
 Jallād, Antūn, 175  
 al-Jamal, Shībli, 117, 138, 145, 146, 163, 174  
*Al-Jāmi'ah al-'Arabiyyah*, newspaper, 226, 266  
*al-Jam'iyyah al-'Arabiyyah al-Waṭaniyyah*, 277  
*al-Jam'iyyah al-'Arabiyyah al-Filastīniyyah*, 88
- al-Jam'iyyah al-Khayriyyah*, 275  
*Jam'iyyat al-'Ikhā' wa-al-'Afāf* (Association of Brotherhood and Purity), 79  
*Jam'iyyat al-Taḍamūn al-Islāmi*, *see* "Association for Muslim Solidarity"  
 Jārāllah, Sheikh Ḥusam al-Dīn, 189, 193, 203  
 al-Jarrār family, 217, 282  
 al-Jayūsi family, 227  
 al-Jayūsi Ḥāshim, 302  
 al-Jayūsi Muḥammad Kamāl, 281  
 al-Jazīrah Congress, 264–5  
 Jenin, 23, 217  
   nationalist activity, 281–2  
 Jerusalem, 27, 83–4, 96, 123, 156, 218, 226, 236, 252–3, 309  
   Crusader conquests, 2–3, 4  
   domination by local families, 13–14  
   Nashashibi victory, 239–40  
   opposition to dominant role, 208ff., 216–17  
   riots, 62, 131, 134  
   religious status in Islam, 1–4  
   status, 205, 206–7  
   under Ottoman empire, 15–16, 24, 186–7  
   (*see also* "Eulogies of Jerusalem" literature)  
 Jerusalem MCA, 84–6, 94, 102, 274, 275, 284  
 Jerusalem mosques, 206–7, 265, 308, 355  
   (*see also* al-Aqṣā mosque, Dome of the Rock)  
 Jewish Agency, 158, 199  
   Arab opposition, 177–8  
 Jewish immigration, 16–18, 132, 141, 143, 152, 158, 176, 243, 250, 255, 273, 290, 317, 340  
   Arab attitudes, 54, 90, 150–1, 218–19  
   1926 crisis, 243–4  
   and Palestine's economic status, 55  
   and Palestinian Delegations, 65–6, 144–5  
   in Passfield White Paper, 273  
 Jewish Labour Federation, 57  
 Jewish Legion, 53  
 Jewish National Council (*Va'ad Le'umi*), 61, 171, 172

- Jewish National Home, 94, 121, 126, 128, 133, 137, 141, 247, 328, 340  
 attempt to negotiate with Arabs, 112  
 British reconsideration, 136, 137-8  
 Fayṣal's attitude, 86  
 French opposition, 107  
 "National" dropped, 132  
*see also* Balfour Declaration  
 Jewish nationality, 54-5  
 Jews (Jewish community), 25-6  
 attitude of Palestinian Arabs, 54, 226  
 draft agreement with Arabs, 113  
 as foreign agents, 56-7  
 origins, 16-18  
 and representative legislative body, 253  
*Jewish Peril, The*, 58-9  
 Jezreel valley, 19  
 Judea, 134, 227, 287  
 judicial system,  
 Jerusalem under Islam, 6  
 Ottoman empire, 186-7  
*see also* Shar'i courts
- Kalvarisky, H. M., 67, 68, 149, 213, 215, 216, 218, 220, 224, 229, 245  
 al-Kārmi, Shukri, 83  
*al-Karmil*, newspaper, 24, 26, 27, 29-30, 131, 137, 138, 212-13, 226, 238, 251, 299  
 Kazmā, Jubrān Iskandar, 82, 280  
 Kemal, Mustafa, 151, 158-9, 161, 168  
 Khaḍrā', Maḥmūd Abū, 171, 175  
 al-Khaḍrā', Subhi Bey, 77  
 al-Khālidi family, 13-14, 209  
 al-Khālidi, Sheikh Khalil, 188  
 al-Khālidi, Maḥmūd 'Aziz, 84  
 al-Khālidi, Rūḥi, 30  
 Khalil, Qaysar, 65  
 al-Khaṭīb, Sheikh Sa'id, 79, 287  
 al-Khaṭīb, Sheikh Yūnis, 217  
 al-Khaṭīb, Yūsuf, 74  
 al-Khawājā family, 218  
 "Khilafat Committee", 163  
*kibbutzim*, 19  
 Arab criticisms, 59  
 King-Crane Commission, 34, 42, 89-90, 91, 296  
 conclusions, 92, 93  
 Kirkbride, A., 233
- Kisch, Colonel F. H., 113, 220, 229  
 Kook, Rabbi, 260  
 Kuwait, 206
- "La lique de la Patrie Arabe", 22  
 Labour Governments, 242, 256, 268  
*Lajnah see* "Supreme Committee"  
*Lajnat al Mu'tamar al-'Arabi*, 277  
 land grants,  
 to Bedouins, 135  
 land legislation,  
 Ottoman Palestine, 12  
 land sales to Jews, 25-6, 27-8, 29, 205, 273, 297, 306  
 Lausanne Conference, 43, 120, 151  
 Law of the *Vilāyets*, 294  
 Lawrence, T. E., 322, 323  
 League of Nations, 117, 145, 177  
 and Arab self-determination, 42  
 and Balfour Declaration, 53  
 mandate ratification, 305  
 and Wailing Wall, 272
- Lebanon, 118, 120  
 Mandate, 51  
 legislative council, 144, 169, 172, 224-5, 247, 308-9, 342  
 electoral boycott, 147-58, 305-6  
 Christian attitude, 298  
 election, 219-22  
 and 1929 riots, 272-3  
 proposals, 140, 244-5, 256  
 Zionist opposition, 136-7
- Lemington, Lord, 137  
 "Liberty and Agreement Party"  
 (*Hürriyyet ve-I'tilāf*), 24  
*Lisān al-'Arab*, newspaper, 162, 299  
 literacy, 20, 44  
 Lloyd George, David, 166  
 local government,  
 Ottoman Palestine, 14-15  
 "Lovers of Zion", 16  
 Luke, H., 198, 256, 273  
 Luṭfāllah, Emir Ḥabīb, 113  
 Luṭfāllah, Emir Michel, 116, 122  
 Lydda MCA, 280
- MacDonald, Ramsay, 256  
 "MacDonald Letter", 273, 277  
 effect on AE, 289  
 McMahon letter, 44-9, 322  
 and Balfour Declaration, 52-3  
 al-Māḍi family, 228-9

- al-Māḍī, Mu'īn, 87, 114, 138, 145, 163, 174, 221, 223, 228-9, 245, 251
- Madyan, Sheikh Frayih Abū, 171, 175
- Majdal, 240
- Mamelukes, 4, 5
- Mandatory Government, and Arab aspirations, 95, 199-200  
guarantees from Husayn, 182  
and MCA "unity" resolution, 85  
and National Muslim Association, 220-1  
and representative institutions, 169ff.  
attitude to representative government, 255-6  
support for SMC, 201-2
- Mandate, 63, 66, 133, 150, 151, 264  
Arab attitude, 43-4, 246, 255  
acceptance condition for political recognition, 126-7  
favoured by Arab opposition, 219  
modified after 1929 disturbances, 136  
Palestinian pressure for amendment, 125  
ratification, 145, 147-8  
Turkey's acceptance, 165  
and pro-Zionism, 168
- Mansūr, Asad, 62
- Maraqah, Sheikh Tālib, 269
- al-Mas'ūd, Fāris, 229, 250
- Mecca, 263, 264
- Menasā, Iskandar, 83
- Menashe, Felix, 112
- Midhat, Ahmed Shefiq, 12
- Military Administration, 70, 132  
attitudes, 36-8, 99, 123-5  
military forces,  
Jewish, 53  
military system,  
Jerusalem under Islam, 6
- Mills, Eric, 246, 250
- Milner, Lord, 95, 137
- Mir'āt al-Sharq*, newspaper, 218, 219, 223-4, 226, 234, 238, 251, 252, 299
- Mond, Sir Alfred, 366
- Money, General, 36, 91
- Morning Post*, 167
- Mosques,  
restoration, 203  
use for propandizing, 154-5
- (see also al-Aqṣa mosque, Jerusalem mosques)
- Mosul, 164
- Mufti of Jerusalem, 184, 185, 186  
status, 200-1  
*muftis*,  
election procedure, 188-9  
role in electoral boycott, 153-4
- Mughannam, Mughannam Ilyās, 254, 289
- Muḥammad,  
attitude to Jerusalem, 1
- Mukhlis, 'Abdāllah, 212, 214
- municipal elections,  
of 1927, 238-40  
as basis for self-government, 246-7
- al-Muntadā al-Adabi*, 74, 75-77, 93, 94, 100-1, 129, 209, 274, 295  
decline, 105-7  
exclusion from Fifth Congress, 214  
unity campaign, 90
- al-Muntadā al-Dajāni*, 275
- Muqataf al-Durūs*, see *al-Muntadā al-Adabi*
- Murād, Muḥammad, 197, 205, 237, 287
- mūshir*, 315
- Muslim affairs,  
arrangements under British mandate, 107-8
- Muslim Association of Haifa, 93, 94, 102
- Muslim community,  
alleged discrimination against, 301  
tensions with Christian communities, 299-300
- Muslim-Christian Association, 38, 90, 93, 96, 102, 153, 179, 203, 233, 243, 278, 285-6  
attacked as Christian instrument, 216  
branches, 277-83  
and British Administration, 124, 126  
composition, 283  
dominant nationalist force, 105-7  
First Congress, 34, 79-85, 274  
formation, 32-3  
internal dissensions, 103  
organization, 274-5, 283-5
- Muslim religious establishment,  
role in electoral boycott, 153

- Muslim religious organization,  
Palestine, 187-9  
(*see also* Muslim Supreme Council)
- al-Mustaqīm, 'Alī, 32
- al-Muwaqqa', Abū al-Khayr, 263
- al-Muẓaffar (Muzghar), Sheikh 'Abd al-Qādir, 77, 78, 87, 90, 97, 149, 162, 163, 165, 179, 180, 225, 263, 265, 276  
and electoral boycott, 154  
talk with Turks, 164
- mysticism,  
Jewish influence on Islam, 2
- Nāblus, 5, 6, 14-15, 19, 23-4, 29, 84, 110, 148, 187, 227, 236, 330  
centre of Pan-Arab movement, 86-7  
and electoral boycott, 153  
family rivalry, 211  
proposed congress, 102
- Nāblus MCA, 93, 119-20, 200, 233, 277, 284-5  
split, 230, 233-4
- al-Nādi al-'Arabi* (nationalist movement), 39, 74, 75-8, 87, 90, 93, 94, 102, 129, 153, 184, 209, 211, 274, 281  
centres, 277-8, 279  
decline, 105-7, 134
- al-Nafir*, newspaper, 299
- al-Nahḍah al-Filasṭiniyyah*, 87
- al-Nahḍah al-Urthūdūxiyyah* (Orthodox Revival), 7, 8, 296, 298
- al-Najāh* school, 204
- Najd, 178
- Naqīb al-Ashraf*, 184, 185
- al-Nashāshībi family, 14, 74, 100, 101, 189, 193  
background, 209-10  
political role, ch. 5 *passim*
- al-Nashāshībi, 'Arif Hikmat, 33
- Nashāshībi, Jawdat, 214
- Nashāshībi, Fakhri, 224
- al-Nashāshībi, Kakhri, 101-2
- al-Nashāshībi, Rāghib, 27, 97, 101, 102, 175-6, 193, 196, 209, 213, 214, 223, 226, 235, 238, 256, 257, 308  
in Jerusalem municipal elections, 240
- Nāsif, Sulaymān, 190, 221, 222, 223
- Naṣṣār, Najīb, editor, 27, 28-9, 103, 138
- National Council, *see* Jewish National Council
- nationalist organizations,  
membership, 283
- "National Muslim Association" (*Al-Jam'iyyah al-Islāmiyyah al-Wataniyyah*), 211, 214, 219-20, 277, 302  
centres, 216-18  
Zionist support, 215-16
- National Party, *see* Palestinian Arab National Party
- Nazareth, 62, 94, 216, 217, 226, 227, 303  
dispute over metropolitan, 297, 298
- Nazareth MCA, 278
- al-Nebi Mūsā celebration, 6, 98, 99, 192, 202, 206, 234
- Nehad Bey, Reshad, 165, 166
- newspapers,  
Arab, 30, 76, 115, 289, 290, 298-9  
Hebrew, 64-5  
opposition, 216
- Northern Region,  
conditions for participating in Seventh Congress, 252
- Nūr al-Dīn, 3
- Nūrallah, Amīn, 263
- Nusaybah, Zaki, 240
- occupational distribution,  
Arab population, 19
- opposition, ch. 5 *passim* 236-7, 242  
Ottoman loyalties, 212  
platforms, 229  
relations with AE and SMC, 247-57
- Orthodox Church, 19
- Ordinance for the Prevention of Crime, 132
- Organization of Muslim Youth, 226
- "Ottoman Decentralization Party", 116
- Ottoman Land Law of 1858, 12
- Ottomans,  
administration of Palestine, 5-6, 9-11, 186-7  
Arab attitudes, 22, 24, 160-1, 212-13  
treatment of Christians, 293-4  
anti-Zionism, 27

- Palaestina,  
administrative units, 4-5
- Palestine,  
ambiguous position, 44-8  
and Anglo-French Declaration,  
71-2  
Arab claims, 40ff.  
British conquest, 123  
British mandate, 51-2, 102  
Commission of Inquiry, 89-90  
economy and immigration, 55,  
132-3  
independence request, 118  
limited national consciousness,  
306-7  
MCA proposals, 81-2, 90  
self-determination claim, 46-8  
self-government movement, 84,  
109  
religious claims, 2, 41-2  
strategic value, 176  
sub-districts under Mamelukes,  
312  
and Treaty of Sèvres, 159  
(*see also* Filastīn)
- Palestinian-Arab ideology, 39-63
- Palestinian Arab National Party,  
215  
founding, 222  
Zionist links, 224
- "Palestinian Association", 117
- Palestine nationalism, 205  
attitude of Military Administra-  
tion, 124-5  
attitude to violence, 133-6
- Palestinian Congresses, 11, 278-9  
Christian representation, 298, 299  
election of executive, 288  
elections, 285-6  
opposition, 214  
First, 61, 77, 79ff.  
Second, 84, 94  
Third, 46-7, 49, 108-10, 335  
Fourth, 110, 132, 137, 214  
Fifth, 110-11, 119, 148-50, 214  
Sixth, 111-12, 121, 174, 178, 179,  
180, 214-15  
Seventh, 67, 114-15, 121, 128,  
242, 247, 248-9, 250, 251-4,  
265
- Palestinian Delegation to East,  
205, 263
- Palestinian Delegations to London,  
210, 211
- First, 40, 64, 112, 115, 116-17,  
137-47, 218, 221, 292  
Second, 67, 119, 158-69  
Third, 174, 175, 180-2
- Palestinians,  
and Arab Agency, 177  
and British rule, 125, 160  
constitutional discussions with  
government, 245-6  
and Hashemites, 182  
loss from political activity, 135-6  
priorities, 183  
reject "Southern Syria", 120,  
121-2  
enthusiasm for Turks, 158-9  
underground organizations, 129-  
30
- Palin Commission, 47, 95, 98, 99
- Pan-Arabism, 93  
emergence, 49-50, 62-3
- Fifth Palestinian Congress, 110-  
11  
Seventh Palestinian Congress, 114,  
254
- Pan-Syrian organisations, 74-9
- Paris,  
MCA delegation, 82  
parliament,  
bicameral proposal, 245, 246  
"Party of the Farmers", *see Hizb  
al-Zurrā'*
- "Party of Syrian Unity" (*Hizb al-  
Ittihad al-Sūri*), 113, 115-16, 117,  
263  
Executive Committee, 119
- Passfield White Paper, 272-3
- Patriarchate of Jerusalem, 7-8  
jurisdiction under Ottomans, 313  
land sales to Jews, 297
- "Patriotic Arab Association" (*al-  
Jam'iyyah al-'Arabiyyah al-  
Waṭaniyyah*), 277
- "Patriotic Ottoman Party" (*al-  
Ḥizb al-Waṭani al-Uthmāni*), 29
- Peace Conference, 85-6, 102-3, 120  
appeal to Turks, 162
- Petaḥ-Tikvah, 132
- Pichon, M., French Foreign Minis-  
ter, 82
- Plumer, Lord, 246, 255
- pogroms of 1929, 269
- Poland,  
anti-Jewish legislation, 18

- political representation,  
proposals to First Delegation, 140,  
141-2
- Pope Benedict,  
meeting with First Palestinian  
Delegation, 140
- population structure,  
Palestine, 16-20
- "Preparatory Committee of Young  
Educated Muslims", 301, 302
- press, Arab, 26-7  
(see also newspapers)
- "Protocols of the Elders of Zion",  
58-9
- Qaddūrah, Sheikh As'ad Muḥam-  
mad al-Ḥājj Yūsuf, 280
- qādi, office, 186
- al-Qaṣṣāb, Sheikh Kāmil, 113
- al-Qaṣām, Sheikh 'Izz al-Dīn, 289
- Qays-Yaman* split, 7
- Qays*, 15
- Qiblahs*,  
and Arab claims, 42
- Al-Quds Sāḥil, 5
- Rafat Pasha, 163-4
- al-Raḥmān, Salīm 'Abd, 88, 131
- Ra'is al-'Ulamā'*, 197-8
- Ramallah, 280
- Ramleh area, 218  
Zionist support, 227
- Ramleh MCA, 280
- Ra'ūf Pāshā, 259
- Rawdat al-Ma'ārif* school, 204
- representative government,  
and Seventh Congress, 253, 254-5
- Riāḍ al-Ṣulḥ, 65
- Richmond, E. T., 137, 152, 191, 193,  
200-1, 347, 354  
anti-Zionist line, 170, 202
- Ridā, Sheikh Muḥammad Rashīd,  
113, 116, 264
- riots of August 1929, 268-71, 289,  
290, 303, 308-9
- Roq, Alfred, 302
- Rothschild, Baron Edmond de, 17
- Rutenberg electric project, 233,  
275-6
- al-Ṣabāh*, 291
- Sa'd, Fu'ād, 138
- Safed, 236, 269  
pogrom, 62
- Safed MCA, 279-80
- al-Sa'id, 'Aṣim Bey, 276
- al-Sakākini, Khalīl, 7, 8, 28, 275, 296
- Salah, 'Abd al-Latīf, 88, 197, 233-4,  
236, 237, 269-70
- Ṣalaḥ al-Dīn (Saladin), 3
- Salīm 'Abd al-Raḥmān, see Ibrāhīm
- Samārah, 'Abdāllah, 130, 281
- Samaria, 287
- Samuel, Herbert, High Commis-  
sioner, 35, 50, 52, 89, 104, 126,  
127, 136, 137, 149, 158, 174, 176,  
192, 195, 201, 205, 214, 233, 245,  
297, 340
- San Remo Conference, 52, 100, 102,  
296-7
- sanjaqs*, 5-6
- Sapir, Asher, 112, 113
- Ṣawt al-Sha'b*, 244
- schools, see education
- Second General Syrian Congress, 88
- Sefardim*, 16
- self-determination, 40-3  
Turkish support, 159, 164
- self-governing institutions,  
boycott, 305-6
- "Self-Sacrificers" (*al-Fidā'iyyah*), 129
- Sephardic Jews, 61
- Sèvres, Treaty of, 43, 125, 151, 157,  
159
- Shammās, Ibrāhīm, 108, 138, 145,  
149-50
- Shākir, 'Umar, 247
- al-Shanṭi, Aḥmad, 129
- Shar'i courts, 194-5, 198, 200, 231-2,  
355  
Presidency of Appeal Court, 187,  
188
- Sharifi* lineage, 185, 351
- Shaw Commission, 128  
report, 270, 272
- Shawā, al-Ḥājj Sa'id, 83, 197
- sheikhs,  
Ottoman Palestine, 9-10  
(see also village sheikhs)
- Shihādah, Bülüs, 108, 218, 222, 245
- Shuckburgh, Sir John, 65-6, 142,  
201
- Shukri, Ḥasan, Major of Haifa, 39
- Shuqayri, Sheikh As'ad, 24, 212,  
217, 226, 251
- Sipāhi* system, 6, 11
- Snell, Harold, 270
- "Society of Unity and Progress", 25

- Sokolow, Nahum, 64  
 "Southern Syria", *see* Syrian unity  
 Stein, L., 112  
 Storrs, Ronald, 33, 38, 71, 101, 210,  
 232-3, 259  
 Šūfi monasteries, 4  
 al-Šulḥ, Ri'ād, 112, 113, 114, 116  
 "Supreme Committee of the Pales-  
 tinian Associations" (*Al-Lajnah*  
*al-'Ulyā lil-Jam'iyyāt al-Filasṭiniy-*  
*yah*), 94  
 Supreme Muslim Council, 107, 126,  
 135, 151, 154, 155, 178, 198-9,  
 205, 232-3, 262, 265, 307-8, 361  
 and al-Ḥājj Amin, 194-207, 234-5  
 British policy towards, 154, 201-2  
 delegations to Hejaz and India,  
 205  
 1925 elections, 235-7, 243, 250  
 funds, 202-3  
 and opposition, 230-1, 237, 247-  
 57  
 and Wailing Wall, 261-2, 267-8  
 al-Šūrāni, Aḥmad, 83  
*Suriya al-Janūbiyyah*, nationalist  
 newspaper, 76  
 Sydenham, Lord, 137, 167  
 Sykes-Picot Agreement, 37, 73  
 Symes, S., 232  
 Syria, 44, 45, 90, 118  
 exile movement, 104  
 French mandate, 51, 113  
 geographical area, 73  
 representative council, 250  
 revolt of 1925, 300  
 and Zionism, 112-14, 305  
 Syrian-Palestinian Delegations, 113,  
 116-17, 120  
 Syrian-Palestinian Congresses, 77,  
 116, 117-18, 119-20, 121  
 Syrian unity (Greater Syria), 50-1,  
 70-4, 79-92, 100-103, 110, 115,  
 295-6, 304, 326-7  
 al-Ṭāhir, Muḥammad 'Ali, 117  
 Ṭālib, Sayyid, 25  
 al-Tamimi, Sheikh 'Abd al-Ḥājj al-  
 Khatīb, 226-7, 279  
 al-Tamimi, Amin, 87, 117, 138, 163,  
 165, 179, 180, 181, 221, 225, 234  
 al-Tamimi, Muḥammad 'Ali Bey,  
 77, 88  
 al-Tamimi, Rafiq, 88, 245, 263  
 al-Tamimi, Zaki, 88  
 Tannūs, Dr. 'Izzat, 214  
 Ṭawqān, Ḥāfiẓ, 234  
 Ṭawqān, Ḥaydar Bey, 211, 212, 214  
 Ṭawqān, Sulaymān 'Abd al-Razzāq,  
 175, 235  
 taxation, 201  
 Islamic Palestine, 9-10  
 al-Ṭayyibi, Salīm Bey, 87  
 Tel-Aviv, 18, 132  
 al-Tha'ālibi, 'Abd al-'Aziz, 248  
 Tiberias, 216, 218  
 Tiberias Muslim Association, 278-9  
 Tiberias MCA, 94  
*(The) Times*, 145  
 Transjordan, 51, 148-9, 178, 182  
 Tul-Karm, 23, 129, 130, 217, 227  
 nationalist activity, 280-1  
 Turkey, 125  
 encourages anti-Zionism, 37  
 Palestinian appeal, 158-69  
 Turkish-Greek War, 158  
 Turkish National Pact, 159  
 underground organizations, 129-30  
 unemployment,  
 Jewish, 18, 243-4  
 United States,  
 Jewish immigration, 18-19  
 Syrian request for protection, 88  
 (*see also* King-Crane Commission)  
 vālis, local governors, 11, 12  
 Versailles Peace Conference, *see*  
 Peace Conference  
 village sheikhs, 287  
 political attitudes, 227-8  
 role in MCA framework, 284  
 Wailing Wall, 42, 258-60, 261-2,  
 265-6, 267, 272, 308  
*Waqf*, 188, 202-3 (*see also* *Awqāf*)  
 Waters-Taylor, Colonel, 95  
 and 1920 demonstrations, 99  
 Watson, Major-General H. D., 33,  
 38  
 Webb, Sydney (Lord Passfield), 256,  
 268  
 Weizmann, Dr. Chaim, 31, 35, 39,  
 64, 66, 89, 112, 113, 143, 176,  
 371  
 White Paper of 1930, 136, 289  
 women,  
 status, 28, 59  
 World Islamic Conference, 206

- Yaman*, 15  
 (see also *Qays*)  
 al-Yāsīn, Yūsuf, 180  
 Young Men's Muslim Associations,  
 300, 301  
 Young Turks, 23  
 youth organisations, 278, 289
- Zaki Pāshā, Aḥmad, 250  
 Zebelun, Valley of, 19  
 Zemach incident, 100  
 Zengi, ruler of Mosul-Aleppo, 3  
 Zionism, 8-9, 51-2, 58, 91-2, 135,  
 136-7, 143, 227, 239, 241, 247  
 Arab attitudes, 31ff., 34-5, 39,  
 48ff., 63, 64-9, 112, 114, 213,  
 218-19, 222, 225, 227-8, 304,  
 306  
 British attitude, 124, 126, 324  
 Christian reaction against, 294-5  
 and Fayṣal, 88-9, 103, 112, 322-3  
 and immigration, 16-18, 26-8,  
 132-3  
 moderation after 1926 crisis,  
 243-4  
 Jewish opposition, 60-2  
 and Syrian national movement,  
 305  
 (see also anti-Zionism)  
 Zionist Bank, 28  
 Zionist Commission, 31, 36-7, 38-9,  
 52, 94, 97, 98, 124  
 Zionist Executive, 215-16, 224, 229  
 Zionist flag, 110  
 Zionist Organization, 64, 66, 109,  
 112-14, 133, 136-7, 147, 150, 220,  
 249  
 financial resources, 158  
 Zu'aytir, 'Adil, 37  
 Zu'aytir, Akram, 204