

ABDEL GABBAR ADWAN

Palestine

The Shame of the West and the Arabs

Dedication

My sincere thanks and appreciation, filled with love, to my life partner, who shared with me more than half a century of building, giving, and support, and who supported me on my journey to distinguish between truth and imagination, urging me not to hesitate for fear of the consequences.

To my wife, Grace Adwan.

Table of Contents:

Introduction

A Land of Conflict

London, the origin of the plague

Deception and Betrayal

Divine Intervention

Racist Democracy

Between Ignorance and Fatalism

Eternal conflicts

"And you became like them"

The antithesis of democracy

"The genius" and the big stick

Hypotheses

Introduction

We all belong to the category *homo sapiens*, that is, an individual who uses his mind and thinks about what is going on around him, and is biased towards good because of benefits for himself, society and humanity and sees in evil a destruction that will befall everyone, even if it gradually.

The philosopher Hegel believes that the life of the first human being was based on violence and instability, which the philosopher Thomas Hobbes called "a state of war of all against all," characterized by infighting, brutality, and selfish and instinctive defense of interests. Philosophers and historians generally agree on the fact that man has not witnessed a long period of peace between nations, or even within geographical regions and countries.

Is war a rational act that serves humanity, or is it just a tool used by some to achieve material or moral gains? And can war break out without humans participating in it, purely due to the propaganda influence based on lies? The philosopher Hannah Arendt says that evil deeds may not necessarily originate from evil people, but may come from people who have no motive, or are unable to think or refuse to do so at all. She emphasizes that a person becomes evil when he refuses to think, noting that the main organizer of the Holocaust was a very ordinary man, who relied on intellectual clichés to justify his crimes against humanity, and was merely complying with the laws.

Is there a difference between the organizer of the Holocaust and the organizer of the genocide in Gaza? Or, in other words, between Hitler and his fascist supporters, and between Netanyahu and those who supported him, armed him, and participated in the war with him? And is there a difference between the governments and people who watched the Holocaust, and those who are now watching the genocide of the Palestinian people and the completion of the seizure of their land and its contents?

Whether you are Western, Arab, or from any spot on this planet, have you thought about your direct responsibility through your country's responsibility and your positions on issues of evil? Have you expressed your opinion and taken a position, however timid, other than watching and remaining silent, or have you contributed through your government to participating in the crime, whether by silence or perhaps also by paying money and sending weapons and political and diplomatic support? Have you thought

about your country's responsibility for the destruction and genocide of the Palestinian people?

This book identifies the responsibility of those who caused this ongoing crime for a century now, and from this standpoint, it addresses the dangers that threaten Western societies and their democracies, as well as Arab societies and their future. It also sheds light on the responsibility of those who are silent and negligent in their legal and human duties, and reviews the totalitarian regimes that succeed in convincing peoples of their ideology by destroying their ability to think.

Therefore, I invite you, dear reader, as a rational human being, to look at your responsibility and the responsibility of your country, and I hope that you are among those who bear the courage to determine their responsibilities and participate in a positive action against evil. To you, and to my wife, I dedicate this work.

A Land of Conflict

On October 9th, 2023, Israel launched a counterattack on the Gaza Strip, beginning with a series of airstrikes, concurrent with the mobilization of ground forces in preparation for a ground operation. The term "counterattack" is used here to refer to the alleged justification, namely the Hamas attack on October 7th, although Israeli escalation per se has been in planning since the late 19th century. From the earliest hours, and for more than two years on an ongoing daily basis, the Israeli attack has not distinguished between resistance fighters, members and supporters of Hamas, or unarmed civilians not affiliated with the Islamic movement, including children and the elderly. This Israeli attack, which quickly evolved on land and in the air to direct occupation, is a repetition and continuation of the war of genocide and displacement that the Zionist movement began implementing in the 1930s, as was clearly manifested in the massacres that occurred before and after the Deir Yassin massacre.

Reports circulating about the massacres, looting, and rape committed by Jews at that time were true, and the mutual tension and hatred between Jews and Arabs increased due to developments in previous decades. However, those massacres, no matter how horrific, were not enough to terrorize and completely displace the population. Zionists, Arabs, and the West contributed to psychological intimidation from different perspectives, but the result was the same: intimidation and then displacement. After the 1947 partition decision, Arab broadcasts from outside Palestine portrayed the brutality of Jewish crimes, further terrifying Palestinian Arabs. Although the goal of these broadcasts was to mobilize Arabs and Muslims and demonstrate Jewish brutality to the world, their initial impact was first and foremost to terrorize Palestinian residents. This Arab exaggeration complemented the Zionist psychological war, which employed the latest available methods, exploiting technical and scientific differences, as well as the Islamic religious factor.

By night, Jewish gangs rolled barrels filled with explosives into sleeping Arab villages, while loudspeakers on jeeps broadcast recorded sounds of moaning and screaming from Deir Yassin, followed by a hollow voice reminding the terrified residents of the Prophet's migration from Mecca. Many residents also heard Arab and British claims that leaving their homes would be temporary, just for a few days until the battles ended, and then they could return. Based on this, most residents

did not bother to take their valuable belongings, but only took their keys and left, expecting instructions to return in due course. Was their fear justified by the possibility of the Deir Yassin events being repeated in their villages and cities? The Deir Yassin massacre was not a unique or isolated event, but specific factors contributed to spreading its terror. Hundreds of Jews from the terrorist "Irgun" organization attacked the peaceful village of Deir Yassin on April 9th, 1948, although its residents had not participated in the military actions in Palestine for months. However, the village's location was within the proposed Arab partition area, so it was chosen to convince all Arab residents everywhere that there would be no mercy for any Arab, to instill terror into other villages that might consider resistance, thus considering them hostile, and demonstrating their inevitable fate. Jews also wanted to clear the Jerusalem area of its Arab residents, so they sought to terrorize the Arabs and force them to flee. They attacked the village from three sides, opened fire, and threw grenades. When some residents tried to resist, the terrorists escalated the attack with bloody acts, slaughtering everything that moved in the village. Children were cut to pieces, men were shot in the neck, and pregnant women's bellies were ripped open. Jews raped schoolgirls, looted women's jewelry and hanged them with it, or ripped their earrings from their ears, and blew up houses over the occupants' heads.

Reports say the Deir Yassin tragedy, described by British historian Toynbee as tantamount to an act of the German SS, was based on the testimony of a Swiss eyewitness working with the Red Cross in Jerusalem, named Jacque de Reynier. This witness was holding a child whose legs had been cut off by Jews, while watching a Jewish girl stab an elderly couple with a dagger at another house door. This is what Jacque de Reynier told the authors of "O Jerusalem", Larry Collins and Dominique Lapierre. Few Jews expressed opposition to these massacres; the Jewish leader of Jerusalem ordered the disarmament of the attackers and the dissolution of their organizations, but the order was not implemented, of course. The Council of Rabbis excommunicated the butchers from the Jewish faith, and Ben-Gurion sent a condolence message to King Abdullah regarding the victims. In contrast, Menachem Begin, the leader of the Irgun organization at the time and later Prime Minister of Israel, defended his men and the massacre, saying: "Without Deir Yassin, there would be no Israel."

Since April 9th, 1948, and for 75 years, the one-sided killing has not stopped: Palestinians declare their desire to return by all means, but are unable to implement it, while Israel slaughters them on often flimsy excuses, and sets up traps and

ambushes at other times to complete the killing, expulsion, and seizure of land cleared of its inhabitants. The events since October 7th, 2023, must be viewed within this context. The Deir Yassin massacre occurred shortly after the Nazi atrocities against Jews, and some of the participants in these massacres were survivors of the Holocaust or had fled European persecution. In all subsequent wars, Jews have been characterized by brutal killings and terror, seeking to terrorize the Palestinian population to complete their expulsion from their land. This was evident in the current war of genocide of force, starvation, thirst, and deprivation of basic living necessities, and the destruction of all residential buildings, leaving people in the open. This included, of course, plans for forced displacement and 'voluntary' migration, and requests to neighboring countries to receive survivors of massacres described by international forums as genocide, which condemned Israeli leaders and officials, but failed to provide implementation mechanisms. This highlights again the Western conspiracy and direct participation of influential countries, and the silence of other Western countries on taking any practical steps for deterrence, whether political or economic. The continuation of brutality, accumulated hostility, and Israel's refusal to coexist, in addition to the failure of international decisions, are factors that have left the remaining refugees of the 1948 Nakba with no solution.

Given the extent of the comprehensive destruction inflicted on the Gaza Strip after 2023, a refugee movement outside the Strip may emerge, especially if the Arab and Western world does not intervene to provide rapid rescue for the population providing survival, health care, and housing. In my opinion, this intervention will not happen, given the course of events within a Zionist-Arab-Western plan, whether by coincidence or by agreement, as the result is the same, as proven over more than seventy years, and as proven in previous Israeli-Palestinian wars, such as the Nakba war, the Beirut and refugee camp wars, and the 2023 war, all of which events extend over more than a century.

Western desires have long dominated the Arab region. With the decline of European colonialism and the rise of American colonialism, which started as a colonial partner and then became dominant, Palestine became the focus of conflict with the West, which planted the Zionist movement in the midst of Arabs to implement its ambitions in cooperation with Israel, which was granted exclusive privileges denied to Arabs. It may be thought that Jews, represented by Zionism, were the first to seek to settle Palestine in modern times after the Crusader wars, but the reality is different. If we trace events since the outbreak of World War I, we

find that the Muslim Ottoman state, which ruled Palestine and the region, allied with Germany and thus joined the losing side, a loss which was not expected in 1914. Initially, the German Empire took over the sole Western representation in the Holy Land, Palestine, with Ottoman support, and the consulates and schools of the Entente countries were closed.

(The war was fought between two opposing alliances: the Allied Powers, consisting of the Triple Entente: the United Kingdom, the French Republic, and the Russian Empire, against the Central Powers: the German Empire, the Austro-Hungarian Empire, the Ottoman Empire, and the Kingdom of Bulgaria. These alliances were reorganized and expanded with the entry of other countries like Italy, Japan, and the United States on the Allied side.)

The history of Ottoman-Western relations predates World War I by a long time. As the Ottoman Empire was suffering from weakness and backwardness compared to European empires, it offered concessions in Palestine, such as protection and settlement rights, to countries that befriended and cooperated with it. For example, Henry Dunant, the founder of the Red Cross, established the "Society for the Renewal of the East" with the aim of "colonizing Palestine primarily by Jews," under the protection of Napoleon III, (who ruled France from 1848 to 1852, then became Emperor of the French from 1852 until his overthrow in 1870, and is considered the first President of France, the second Emperor and the last to rule the country as a monarch).

On the other hand, the Austrian Coleman strongly advocated for "German colonization" of the Holy Land, and the German scholar of Palestinian affairs, Tobler, declared: "The peaceful Crusade has begun. Jerusalem must be ours!"

The German pamphlet "The Holy Land" was convinced that "it would be easy to establish European settlements in Palestine; the peasants are willing to sell their lands to Europeans who promise them bread and protection in return. The colonists can use the native population as cheap agricultural labor."

Meanwhile, other potential colonizers of Palestine wanted to place the nomadic population in reservations similar to the American Indians.

Visits by leaders of countries and powers that wanted to colonize Palestine followed, as the Holy Land became a focus of attention for those seeking to control it. In 1859, the Grand Duke Constantine of Russia visited Jerusalem. Given the size of his entourage, which included at least 3,000 officers, soldiers, and sailors,

Palestinians suspected that this visit was a "Moscow invasion" of their country. In 1869, the Crown Prince of Prussia, Friedrich Wilhelm, stopped in Jaffa and Jerusalem on his way to open the Suez Canal, and visited the German settlers who were seeking to impose their civilization on Palestine and its inhabitants in their own way. (Note that Prussia was the driving and dominant force in the unification of Germany in 1871 under Bismarck, and formed the military and political core of the German Empire, and is considered the direct historical predecessor of modern Germany). In November 1872, the Grand Duke Nicholas of Russia held a prayer in the Church of the Holy Sepulcher in Jerusalem. In 1878, the former US President Ulysses S. Grant visited the holy sites, but the monks later cursed him for his stinginess and lack of donation. (The 18th President of the United States, 1869-1877, and commander of the Union forces that won the American Civil War. He is famous for his efforts in reconstruction, protecting the civil rights of African Americans, and fighting the remnants of the Confederacy.) In 1881, the Austrian Archduke Rudolf moved to Jerusalem. In the same year, three Russian grand dukes, Sergei, Paul, and Constantine, made a pilgrimage to Palestine. In 1882, Prince Heinrich of Prussia sneaked into the Holy Land disguised as "Count von Berg". All this was done to record positions and (rights) ostensibly on behalf of churches and monks, or as potential protectors of the Palestinian people who ignored them and didn't want anything from them in reality.

The saints of all stripes wanted to settle in the country and colonize it, a land that had always been inhabited and was the seat of civilizations, and had no need for mass migration in any way. But this did not deter the colonizers, and the Germans were among the first colonial settlers to arrive. In 1848, Christoph Hoffman, a deputy of the Templar Society in Frankfurt, said: "The only hope for the corrupt world and the prosperity of the new people of God lies only in Christians and a state in the Holy Land". He added: "The mind of the German nation must turn towards building the temple in Jerusalem and occupying Palestine". Since 1868, over 2,000 Templar members, mostly from the Kingdom of Württemberg, responded to the call to colonize the Holy Land. They first bought ten hectares of land on Mount Carmel in Haifa, followed by other colonies in Jaffa, Jerusalem, and elsewhere. The German settlers built a horse-drawn carriage road connecting the port of Jaffa to Jerusalem.

Documents from a German settler magazine, covering the period from 1853 to 1882, reveal the German settlers' assessment of their situation in the Promised Land, which was still under Ottoman control. An 1874 report stated: "One of the

special advantages we foreigners enjoy here in the East is the power of the consulates." The report spoke of Turkish conditions, saying: "There is no country in the world where consuls have such a position as in Turkey and Persia; they have exclusive authority to represent their interests to the extent that they are only responsible to their principles and not to the Turkish authorities." Accordingly, the German colonists: "form a small state within the Ottoman Empire, able to establish all its regulations according to its own concepts without being disturbed by the Turkish authorities." When settlers feared harassment, the German Reich immediately raised its flag to protect them. In 1877, when fears of Muslim unrest against Christians in Palestine arose due to the war in the Balkans, the Emperor, at the request of his consul and the Templars, sent warships to the Palestinian coast, and this became a common practice for other powers later, with European naval units almost always cruising off the Holy Land.

The German magazine recorded a description of Palestinians, stating that "the native Arab Muslim population, which forms the ruling population of the country, suffers from terrible corruption" and "moral decay" and "violence and brutality". For them, the East was simply "cowardly, arrogant by nature, a thief and a beggar who only bows to violence or money". It is not surprising that the Egyptian Al-Ahram newspaper described the German role as follows: "The German colonists came to Palestine to seize the land from the Arabs. They are nothing but bloodsuckers on the Arabs." The German magazine also noted concerns about the increasing number of Jews: "The number of local Jews has increased this summer by a few hundred new families, and it seems that these people are increasingly turning their eyes to the land of their fathers, which is still dear to them... certainly a sign of the times!"

The Ottoman state's leniency was not limited to German settlers; Jews continued their organized settlement activities under the umbrella of European powers like Britain, Germany, Russia, and other European powers that enjoyed consular rights and settlement rights in the weak Ottoman state.

The German settler magazine spoke of the visit of the British Jewish philanthropist Sir Moses Montefiore, mentioning that he promoted "the settlement of Jews in the Holy Land with his own money, and brought with him a large sum of money to advance the Jewish population in Palestine". The newspaper noted that the large sum was 12,000 pounds sterling, and that Sir Moses wished it to "bring lasting benefits to the land of his fathers and hopes to encourage his fellow

tribesmen (Jewish) to colonize it". However, local Jews, according to the newspaper, appear dirty, miserable, and idle, and they want abundant bread that Sir Moses does not distribute; as he wants them to work and eat from the sweat of their brows, and he does not distribute charity but passes it through charitable institutions, and for this, he is threatened with "Cherem" (curse of excommunication) from the synagogue.

Sir Moses was not the only Jewish philanthropist supporting Jewish settlement before Herzl; Rothschild sent his envoy, Mr. Cohen, for the same purpose, and a nobleman named Mitford announced his arrival the previous year, according to the German newspaper. Mitford wanted "to resettle the Arabs in Anatolia to make way for the Jews again in Palestine, where they planned to resettle the Promised Land with the chosen people". The most active support for such projects came from a French competitor, Baron Edmond de Rothschild, a Parisian banker. In the second half of the 19th century, Rothschild invested a total of 70 million francs, through the "Alliance Israélite Universelle", in settlement and development projects for new Jewish immigrants, mostly from Russia. Rothschild's colonists dug wells and canals in Palestine, built mills, and established a model agricultural school near Jaffa in 1870.

This situation raised concerns among the population, but did not frighten them due to their ignorance of the depth of the colonial plans being hatched for their country. Despite their supposed knowledge of international conflicts and the eagerness of everyone to exploit their neighbors through wars, alliances, or settlement creep, as a seed for colonization, the Ottoman authorities did not grasp the reality of what was happening. The number of German and Jewish settlements was small at the time, and the number of foreigners did not exceed five percent of Palestine's population, despite the increasing Jewish immigration from Russia due to the massacres they faced. However, Rothschild's settlement associations did not favor the arrival of Russian and Bulgarian Jews in Palestine due to the difficulty of buying arable land from its Arab owners, as mentioned by Karl Netter, Rothschild's delegate, in a letter sent from Palestine to the "Jewish Chronicle" in London in 1882.

All this was to change with the emergence of Theodor Herzl and the convening of the First Zionist Congress in 1897 in Basel, Switzerland, and the beginning of organized Zionist work, followed by rapprochement with Britain. Herzl tried to buy Palestine, and the Turkish Sultan refused to sell or give Palestine to the Jews

because the matter had become public with the spread of Zionist appeals, but the Sultan offered them other regions of the empire to establish a Jewish state in exchange for money, but not in Palestine.

The conflict in Palestine is at the heart of the Arab East, and can be described as either a religious conflict or a product of Western colonial vision infused with religious motives. In both cases, religion is used as a false and misleading factor. It is true that Christianity originated in Palestine, that Christ was of Palestinian origin, and that the Roman Empire adopted Christianity widely, and many Palestinians are still Christians today, but this does not give those who adopted Christianity later in the West any rights in Palestine beyond the right to visit holy sites, and does not justify the Crusades that led to the killing of all the inhabitants of Jerusalem, including Christians. The Ottoman Sultan granted all religions the right to visit, worship, and reside, which turned, as we saw, into settlement desires.

As for the Jewish claim of having a history in Palestine, it has not been historically proven, and no evidence of their existence has been found despite colonial research efforts starting from Napoleon's time, through the British, to the Israeli occupation. There is no evidence of their existence despite the abundance of evidence from Palestine's history for all nations. This is acknowledged by senior Israeli archaeologists themselves, who have questioned the stories of Jewish prophets and the reality of their existence. Delving into this area would take us beyond the scope of this book, but serious scientific studies are available, and the conclusive evidence is the lack of any archeological evidence of their existence. In general, whether the religious narratives are true or false, there is no logic or justification that negates the rights and existence of others who have been rooted in this land since ancient times, and are the owners of the land, builders of civilization, farmers, and craftsmen, and whose ancestors' dust forms the country's soil.

The religious backgrounds bear responsibility for the disasters of Palestine and the East, and of course, the Ottoman Sultan bears a role in this as the person responsible for the Muslim lands within his empire, who failed to protect Palestine and the empire from Western ambitions due to the backwardness, corruption, and injustice that spread in the system and foundations of the Ottoman Islamic Empire. In addition, the responsibility for failure lies with the Palestinians, specifically the leadership, most of whom were religious leaders and individuals with inherited religious backgrounds and beliefs that impose backwardness.

The beginning of World War I marked the end of the Ottoman Empire, and the West began to ally to divide its remains. Germany allied with Turkey to facilitate the transfer of the German Asian Corps through Palestine to Egypt, aiming to strike the lifeline of the British Empire by advancing towards the Suez Canal. To achieve this, the German engineer Meissner Pasha, director of the Baghdad Railway project, was tasked with building a supply line by rail connecting Haifa to Beersheba in the Negev. Germans residing in Palestine, whether Christians or Jews, were conscripted to serve the Reich, and the German garrison took control, with the Kaiser Wilhelm Church becoming a subsidiary church of the German garrison. However, the commander of the German Corps, Liman von Sanders, did not reach the Suez Canal, but was preceded by the British General Allenby, who moved from there to Palestine with forces led by English officers and soldiers who were Muslims from Egypt and India.

London, the Origin of the Plague

Great Britain began its presence in the Arab region gradually, relying on force and 'Gunboat Diplomacy', from the late 18th century (1799) onwards, with the occupation of Perim Island in Yemen (to protect the Indian route and Britain's interests and trade). This was followed by the occupation of Aden in 1839, then the expansion of influence through protection treaties in the Persian Gulf after battles with the Qawasim sheikhs (starting from 1820 onwards). Britain also sent spies to the Arabian Peninsula disguised as travelers, and exploited the conflict between sheikhs and tribes for the empire's benefit by supporting some sheikhs against others, then imposed its authority by force and cunning in the Gulf, and the region between the Gulf and the Red Sea, leading to the occupation of Egypt and Sudan in 1882.

(I discussed Britain's insidious infiltration into the Arabian Peninsula in my book 'Ahfad wa Aajdad', published by Dar Al-Farabi, 2019)

We don't need to prove that Britain is the cause of the plague that befell Palestine, the East, and many parts of the world, but what we need is to clarify the mechanisms and reasoning behind it. In the case of Palestine, the 'how' is the use of excessive force, extermination policy, spreading of lies or fabricating facts, such as destroying cities and villages and then claiming that the country was empty or a land without people, inviting settlement. As for the 'why', the reason for Britain's continuation of this, supported by new Western allies and enablers, the direct answer is greed for material gain without any moral restraint or respect for legal rights. Despite all this deception, violence, plundering, and greed, the British empire has shrunk to its island geography, which is now threatened with division.

Years after the discovery and use of the steam engine, the steamer 'Savannah' crossed the Atlantic Ocean in 1819. This led some British naval leaders to decide to manufacture warships powered by coal to generate steam energy, carrying guns and soldiers, making ships independent of the unreliability of wind power. This development provided a unique advantage to the British navy, which it exploited, quickly and brutally, to destabilize the world. At that time, the British sailing fleet was the strongest globally, engaging in opportunistic wars and trade, such as the slave trade, extermination, and terror policies, or what can be summarized as the principle of "might is right", even if completely unjust. The United States imbibed

this Anglo-Saxon principle, and under President Trump, Washington has abandoned diplomacy and cunning, returning to the British style.

After the conversion of their fleet to steam, the initial act was the destruction of Acre by the most violent means, then heading to Gaza port, and ultimately threatening Ibrahim Pasha with the destruction of Alexandria as had happened to Acre, unless he succumbed to British terms and agreed a free trade treaty between Britain and Turkey.

Briefly, though in some detail, the Arab national state founded by Muhammad Ali within the Ottoman framework had geographically reached the borders of Europe through Palestine, Lebanon, Syria, and Alexandretta (in present-day Turkey).

After the discovery of coal and steam energy, British textile production expanded, demanding foreign markets; Britain concluded a trade agreement with the Ottoman Sultan, but Muhammad Ali refused it, so British goods could not enter the Arab East. Then, armed steam warships moved to the shores of Beirut, Syria, and Palestine, and began destroying cities, while the army of Ibrahim Pasha, Muhammad Ali's son, withdrew under the pressure of the destruction of cities and Arab forces and his ships suffered heavy losses.

Lord Palmerston, the Foreign Secretary and the First Engineer of the British Empire in the mid-19th century, harbored a hatred for Muhammad Ali because he was obstructing British trade and threatening its outlets, and hindering the freedom of exchange that dominated the Ottoman Empire. This Briton was quoted as saying angrily: "The best thing Muhammad can do is destroy his factories and throw his machines into the Nile". The British ministry saw Muhammad Ali's refusal to recognize the trade agreement with Turkey as a hostile act against Britain, and considered imposing free trade on Muhammad Ali and the Arab lands he ruled as necessary to protect British industry from strangulation. Foreign Secretary Palmerston did not hide the principles of his foreign policy, stating: "My highest goal, all over the world, is to open new channels for the trade of this country and it is the government's duty to support that". He added: "I hate Muhammad Ali, whom I consider a conceited barbarian, no more".

Palmerston also wrote in 1839: "I see that his civilization, which he boasts of in Egypt, is mere nonsense". The British Consul General in Alexandria warned the Pasha, saying: "You should be aware that the power of England will crush you".

In Istanbul, Lord Ponsonby, the British ambassador, advised his government in London, saying: "We must strike quickly and strongly; the crumbling edifice called Arab nationalism will fall and crumble".

Accordingly, Lord Palmerston ordered the Royal Navy to assemble its best steamships. In late summer 1840, a naval force, considered the most advanced in the world at the time, under the command of Napier, moved towards Beirut. Napier's favorite ship was called "The Gorgon", with a 350-horsepower steam engine, capable of storing 380 tons of coal, accommodating 1,600 soldiers, and carrying six guns... It was described as "the first true steam-powered warship". The Gorgon scouted the area around Beirut, sailing north and south along the coast, remarkably ignoring the weather and wind conditions. On September 9th, it began bombarding Beirut. The Gorgon and three other steamships led the attack, followed by 15 sailing ships. The ships began maneuvering, advancing and retreating to harass the Egyptian defenders led by Ibrahim Pasha, Muhammad Ali's son.

After September 11th, in the aftermath of the intense bombardment, the commander of the Arab forces sent a letter of reproach to the British fleet, saying: "To kill five of my soldiers, you have brought grief and destruction to entire families. You killed women, a small baby and his mother, an old man, and two peasants whose bad luck brought them here, and many others whose names I have not yet received (...) Your fire is becoming more powerful and destructive to the miserable peasants, than it is to my soldiers. It seems that you have decided to become the masters of this country". But some sources from within Beirut reported that about 1,000 people were killed in the bombardment, and their bodies filled the streets, and the crew of a passing American merchant ship reported that "all buildings, public and private, have become heaps of rubble, and the British fleet is firing on the few remaining buildings, determined to leave no stone unturned, and the entire town is a scene of destruction and devastation".

After this massacre, the steamships chased Ibrahim Pasha's forces along the coast, from Latakia in the north through Tripoli and Tyre to Haifa in the south, and the defenders withdrew under the pressure of sudden attacks that rained down on them relentlessly. The fleet commander, Napier, said triumphantly: "The steamships give us great superiority, and we will chase them and not give them a chance to rest. Ibrahim must move quickly if he wants to outrun the speed of steam".

Lord Palmerston was following the news coming via steamships to London with pleasure, and wrote in response to the developments to the fleet commander, saying: "The more power you can muster in Syria, the better". He ordered an attack on the Palestinian city of Acre, where the awaited battle was militarily and psychologically decisive; Acre had previously withstood six months against Napoleon in 1799, and then withstood another six months in 1831 when Ibrahim Pasha besieged and occupied it, repaired its walls, armed its towers with heavy guns, and fortified it with thousands of soldiers, strengthening Acre's position as one of the most fortified strongholds on the eastern coast. The city had a huge warehouse full of weapons and ammunition, and Acre was a thriving city with a large number of civilian residents not involved in military affairs. But after Acre's destruction by the fleet, the saying spread that Palestine was empty of inhabitants and only inhabited by some nomadic Bedouins!

In early November 1840, the "Gorgon" and three other steamships approached the coast of Acre. These four steamships were alone, as the accompanying sailing ships were delayed. Napier demanded the Egyptians surrender, and when they refused, the bombardment began. One report described the scene: "Thus, the power of steamships in war was revealed: the allied steamship squadron arrived at the bay, and soon began bombarding and striking the town, which greatly disturbed the garrison. Although the garrison responded strongly, the steamships kept changing their positions, so they were not harmed. On the evening of November 3rd, the steamships resumed bombarding Acre, and the other ships joined them, forming what Napier described as "fire, tremendous fire". The defenders responded with cannon fire. After two and a half hours, a loud sound like thunder shook the battlefield. What happened inside Acre was described by one source: "Suddenly, flames and smoke rose like a volcano erupting into the sky, followed by a shower of various materials thrown by the force of the explosion. The smoke settled for a few seconds, forming a huge black dome that blocked the view of everything. After the terrible explosion, mixed with the noise of battle, a sudden and frightening silence fell. The bombardment stopped suddenly from both sides, and this deafening silence was only broken by the echo of the sound that the mountains returned like distant thunder, and in the midst of this calm, our ears picked up the sound of buildings collapsing inside the city".

The Palestinian city of Acre was reduced to a mass of rubble and debris. A report sent to London stated: "Two enemy army divisions were completely destroyed, and no living creature remained within an area of 60,000 square yards. Casualties

ranged between 1,200 and 2,000 people". When the night of November 3rd fell, the surviving Arab soldiers left their positions in the city. When British forces entered the town the next day, they were met with total destruction, and the scene was as follows: "The bodies of men, women, and children, blackened and horribly disfigured by the explosion of the arsenal and cannon fire, were scattered everywhere, half-buried under the rubble of homes and fortifications; women were searching for their husbands, and children for their fathers".

In a letter to his wife, Fleet Commander Napier expressed the distress and tension he felt, saying: "I went to the shore of Acre and saw the destruction we had caused, and witnessed a scene that will never leave my memory... a scene that makes me shudder whenever I remember it. The shore, for half a mile on either side, was covered with bodies". After days, "the bodies emitted a terrible stench in the air". In his official report, included in a book titled "The War in Syria", Napier acknowledged that "nothing could be more shocking than seeing these wretched, sick, and injured people throughout the town that had been utterly destroyed".

This event, which has been buried in the depths of oblivion these days, involving atrocities and the establishment of wars and principles of extermination, attracted a huge amount of admiration in Britain, which has been accustomed to profiting from the dirtiest types of trade and wars. The fort that withstood Napoleon fell in less than three days under the blows of steamships. In the popular narrative of the event, it fell in less than three hours of concentrated bombardment on November 3rd. This fall was a stunning and amazing embodiment of Britain's power in general, and the power of steam in particular, and was depicted in a series of illustrations and artworks that are equivalent to the power of images and videos in our era.

Despite all this destruction and bloodshed, no Briton was killed or injured in these battles, which would inevitably impose military, psychological, and strategic consequences. The English exploited this superior force to target populations and cities, bypassing Ibrahim Pasha's forces; their primary goal was to achieve their demands, which were not necessarily achieved by weakening the opponent's power, but by terrorizing civilians and destroying infrastructure in an effort to force them to surrender. Muhammad Ali and his son Ibrahim were forced to accept all English conditions, including withdrawing their forces from the Arabian Peninsula, to achieve a victory without an actual military presence there.

Recent reviews of those attacks reveal that: "The bombardment targeted the city itself. In fact, the goal was to force the garrison to surrender, not by harming it, but by killing and destroying the non-combatant civilian population". This type of strategic thinking, which was previously used with available weapons and equipment, was later repeated in Palestine and Gaza in a more brutal form, commensurate with the growing capabilities of lethal weapons. When the naval bombardment ended at that time, the ships' coal supply was enough for only one more day of work, but the Arab forces had already been morally defeated.

In the 2023 Gaza extermination war, Israeli forces were not short of ammunition, thanks to solidarity and support from Western powers, including Britain. All indicators, daily events, and official Israeli and Western statements confirm that the most important goal of this cooperation in extermination is primarily material, represented in securing profits at the expense of lives.

Fortunately, the US President has dispelled all doubts about the background and reasons for the Western alliance with Israel; it is a vassal state exploited to achieve their interests, whether through control of land, resources, or minerals, or imposing submission through intimidation, as well as reassuring those who submit and cooperate with them. President Trump was clear in his statements and actions, that the goal is material gain with a religious cover.

When Muhammad Ali accepted Britain's terms, he tried to keep Palestine with British approval, but the fleet commander threatened to turn Alexandria into dust like Acre if he reneged on any of the terms.

We should also note that even the attack on Acre was not driven by Jewish or Christian demands to settle Jews in Palestine. But after the battle and the Arab defeat, voices rose demanding the establishment of Western and Jewish settlements in Palestine to preserve it as a strategic geographical location protecting trade routes, and to settle Jews to occupy the Arabs and keep them under pressure. After that, the idea of Jewish settlement emerged, followed by Herzl's organization of the Zionist idea to exchange benefits with the West, specifically Britain.

It is useful to recall how the British Empire was established and the sources of its wealth, which clarifies its absolute adherence to capitalism and its disregard for any human or religious values, not to mention its disregard for law. Britain competed with other European powers through its fleets to occupy areas in the African continent; it plundered its resources and engaged in the slave trade. Africans were forcibly transported by ship to the newly discovered American

continent, where they were sold, while their ships carried crops resulting from slave labor, such as sugar and cotton, to Britain. In return, at British ports ships were loaded with weapons and some other materials and headed to Africa to facilitate the process of bringing more slaves, repeating this cycle. This activity enriched British cities with ports and contributed to the expansion of the war fleet. After that, Britain began establishing colonies in the American continent to achieve wider control over crops and secure enslaved labor for the lands. Tens of millions of Africans were forcibly transported as slaves through various routes, most notably the transatlantic slave trade (which transported between 11 and 20 million people), and the trans-Saharan slave trade (which transported millions more across the Sahara, the Red Sea, and the Indian Ocean). The vast majority headed to South America and the Caribbean, more than to North America, and this forced migration was the largest in history, significantly affecting the demographic composition of the African continent. The mortality rate during transportation exceeded 20%, later decreasing to around 10%. Millions more died either before shipping or after arrival, in poor waiting conditions, and overall, approximately 12.5 million Africans were captured and shipped. The cruelty, tyranny, injustice, plundering, and killing for capital gain was not limited to Palestine, the East, and the African continent; it extended to Asia.

The British Empire began by establishing the East India Company, which quickly transformed from a commercial project into a dominant imperial power. The company was founded in 1600 under a royal charter, aiming to be a monopolistic trading company controlling Britain's trade with the East, especially the East Indies (Asia). Its activities included the spice, cotton, and tea trade, as well as seeking land and political influence. As a result, the company became a major military and political power until the late 19th century, despite the establishment of similar companies (Dutch, French, Danish) in close succession. The company fought wars and imposed its control over vast areas of South Asia, paving the way for Britain's rise as a global power. Through its monopoly on trade in India and China, Britain strengthened its economic and military influence, laying the foundations for an empire that spanned continents. Rapidly, as a result of political and military dominance, economic and trade dominance and monopoly were imposed.

Modern studies confirm that the mortality rate after British rule in India accelerated to 100 million people who died prematurely at the peak of British colonialism. This crisis is considered one of the largest mortality crises caused by policies in human history, surpassing the total deaths that occurred during all

famines in the Soviet Union, Maoist China, North Korea, Cambodia under Pol Pot, and Ethiopia under Mengistu.

How did British rule cause such massive loss of life? There are several factors. First, Britain effectively destroyed India's industrial sector. Before colonization, India was one of the largest industrial producers in the world, exporting high-quality textiles to various parts of the world. English-made fabrics could not compete with these textiles. However, this situation began to change when the British East India Company took control of Bengal in 1757. According to historian Madhusree Mukherjee, the colonial system virtually abolished Indian customs duties, allowing British goods to flood the local market, but created a system of high taxes and internal fees that prevented Indians from selling fabrics within their own country, let alone exporting them. This unequal trade system crushed Indian manufacturers, effectively causing the country's industry to decline. As the chairman of the East India and China Association boasted to the English Parliament in 1840: "This company has succeeded in converting India from an industrial country to an exporter of raw materials"

While English manufacturers reaped huge profits, India sank into poverty, and its people became vulnerable to hunger and disease. To make matters worse, British colonizers established a system of legal plundering, known to their contemporaries as "a drain on wealth". Britain imposed taxes on the Indian population, then used the revenue to buy Indian products - such as indigo, grains, cotton, and opium - quasi getting these goods for free, and then these goods were either consumed in Britain or re-exported abroad, where the British state seized the proceeds and used them to finance the industrial development of Britain and its settler colonies - the United States, Canada, and Australia.

International law professors confirm that this is a clear case that warrants compensation, and it is supported by strong precedents in modern international law; after World War II, Germany signed agreements to compensate Holocaust victims, and recently agreed to pay compensation to Namibia for colonial crimes committed there in the early 20th century, and similarly, South Africa paid compensation to people who suffered from the white minority government's terror in the aftermath of apartheid.

Compensation cannot change history or erase the crimes of the British Empire, but compensation contributes to addressing the legacy of deprivation and injustice left by colonialism, and most importantly, it is a crucial step towards justice and

recovery, and acknowledging the principle of compensation for colonialism and oppressive powers and extermination processes is in itself a deterrent to their repetition. Let's imagine if Britain had been fined for its early crimes, it would not have been able to repeat atrocities throughout history and across continents, and similarly, if the United States had compensated Vietnam, Washington would not have later plunged into destroying other countries like Iraq and causing the deaths of millions, and the same applies to Israel and those who supply it with weapons of destruction and systematic killing, contrary to UN resolutions and decisions that no one pays attention to enforcing. (U.S. military aid to Israel amounted to \$22 billion during the two years of the Gaza genocide war.)

Ignoring the principle of compensation is the basis for all disasters where there is no material deterrence, and thus a waste of values and ethics, and unleashing brutal violence as we see these days in Gaza, Palestine, and other countries across continents, and most recently the events in Venezuela and what may develop from a potential American seizure of Greenland and perhaps Canada, not excluding direct domination through force over Iran.

All this injustice was committed and established by British colonialism, which caused famines in Ireland, the worst of which was the Great Famine. Britain annexed Ireland by force in 1801, confiscated the rights of Catholic residents, settled Protestants on the island, and granted them privileges and land, and enacted laws for each group, causing agricultural land to fall into Protestant hands, even those who lived in England and relied on agents to rent land and collect profits and wages mercilessly. When the main crop (potatoes) was hit by disease and production declined, landowners did not stop exporting the grain crop, and Britain banned food imports to Ireland, so that a great famine occurred between 1845 and 1852, causing the death of one million people and the emigration of another million from Ireland, reducing the population by about 20-25%. The human losses escalated, and this famine changed the demographic, political, and cultural landscape in Ireland forever, becoming a turning point in its history.

Deception and Betrayal

Britain established its empire through policies that relied on excessive military force, deception, misinformation, and cunning. With the defeat of Muhammad Ali and his son Ibrahim at the hands of the West, and the decline of the Ottoman Empire's power, accompanied by Western plans to impound it, Britain exploited policies of corruption, lies, and cunning to incite the Arabs against the Ottomans.

To achieve this, the British High Commissioner for Egypt and Sudan, Sir Arthur Henry McMahon, sent a total of eight letters to Sharif Hussein bin Ali, who had great influence as the custodian of Mecca and the two holy cities, and who was vying for influence in the peninsula with Prince Abdul Aziz and the princes of the Shamar tribe. Sharif Hussein aspired to establish an Arab Islamic caliphate to replace the Ottoman caliphate, which meant weakening the Ottoman caliphate and not repeating Muhammad Ali's experience, who had clashed with Britain. In his letters, McMahon promised the Sharif British recognition and support for Arab independence, and promised to support the Sharif's claim to the caliphate if the Arabs rose against the Turks, thus supporting and backing the British campaign in the East. London sent one of its officers to spy in the region and spread lies and corruption, paving the way for the revolution against Turkey and an alliance with Britain. The desert dwellers completely succumbed to the charm of the young officer who mastered their language and adapted to their customs, T.E. Lawrence, who was later glorified with the title "Lawrence of Arabia" to become a British romantic hero, despite the rumors of perversion that swirled around him.

During the correspondence, the British did not actually control the areas they offered to Sharif Hussein, yet they excluded the direct coastal areas overlooking the Mediterranean from any future Arab caliphate, claiming that they were "not purely Arab". In reality, they were secretly negotiating this with their French allies. The result of those secret negotiations was the "Sykes-Picot Agreement", named after the negotiators, which gave France the northeastern Mediterranean coast (the area of today's Lebanon), and gave the British the southern region (Palestine and its surroundings). Based on this, the spheres of influence were determined for the Arab regions behind them; in other words, Syria for France (Paris) and Iraq for Britain (London).

Sharif Hussein, who insisted that the coastal regions were mostly purely Arab, later heard about the secret agreements, but Lawrence lied to him to reassure him. Although Lawrence knew about the Franco-British agreement, as he later wrote in his book "Seven Pillars of Wisdom", where he admitted: "In the East, people trust individuals more than institutions. So, the Arabs asked me to confirm the promises made by the English government. I didn't have precise knowledge of McMahon's guarantees and the Sykes-Picot Agreement, but I wasn't stupid; I easily realized that if we won, the promises made to the Arabs would be nothing but ink on paper. If I had been an honest advisor, I should have asked people to return to their homes and stop risking their lives for such a deception. But the Arab movement was one of our main tools to win the Eastern War. So, I gave them assurances that England would keep its promise. The Arabs achieved their great accomplishments relying on that."

In all Anglo-Arab communications, the fate of Jerusalem, which everyone considered the center of the Holy Land, was not addressed. Of course, the British had their own plans; they initially wanted to internationalize it to satisfy their French and Russian allies. When the Russians withdrew from the Sykes-Picot plot after the Bolshevik Revolution and revealed the secret plot they participated in to divide the Ottoman Empire's territories, the British changed their plans, especially with France busy in North Africa. So, the British found new allies in Washington by enlisting the Jewish lobby. To mobilize this lobby in favor of Britain, British Foreign Secretary Arthur James Balfour wrote a letter to the London Zionist Lord Walter Rothschild in 1917, a letter that entered history through its worst doors:

"Dear Lord Rothschild, I am pleased to convey to you, on behalf of His Majesty's Government, the following declaration of sympathy with Jewish Zionist aspirations, which has been submitted to the Cabinet and approved."

His Majesty's Government view with favour the establishment of a national home for the Jewish people in Palestine, and will use their best endeavours to facilitate the achievement of this object, it being clearly understood that nothing shall be done which may prejudice the civil and religious rights of existing non-Jewish communities in Palestine, or the rights and political status enjoyed by Jews in any other country". I would be grateful if you would bring this declaration to the knowledge of the Zionist Federation.

Yours sincerely,

Arthur James Balfour."

The "Balfour Declaration" sparked enthusiastic jubilation among Zionists, as a great power confirmed for the first time their right to a homeland, a promise that was immediately interpreted as an exclusive homeland. Jewish writer Arthur Koestler described the Balfour Declaration in blunt terms: "One nation gave another nation's land to a third nation". A British expert dissected London's machinations in the Middle East in more detail, saying: "The Irishman McMahon promised the Arab Hussein that the Arabian Peninsula, Mesopotamia, and Syria would become Arab. The Englishman Sykes promised the Frenchman Picot that northern Syria would become French. The Scotsman Balfour promised the Jew Rothschild that there would be a national home for Jews in southern Syria!". According to Balfour's saying, that "Zionism is far more important than the desires and concepts of 700,000 Arabs", both the British and Zionists aspired to mutual gains from their cooperation at the expense of the Arab majority, and they expressed this clearly.

In 1920, Winston Churchill had great hopes for the Israeli future, saying: "If a Jewish state is established in our lifetime on the banks of the Jordan, under the British crown, inhabited by three or four million Jews, it will be an historical event and beneficial in every way, and particularly consistent with British imperial interests".

For his part, Chaim Weizmann offered that the Jewish state would be a stronghold for the British, saying: "If England promotes Jewish settlement as a British colony, Palestine will be inhabited by a million Jews or more within 20 or 30 years. They will restore the country to a civilized state that can effectively protect the Suez Canal".

The British gained the Arabs through McMahon's false promises to Sharif Hussein, and gained the Jews through the Balfour Declaration to support their colonial cause and protect their interests; as a result, the Great Arab Revolt broke out against the Ottoman caliphate. In return, the Jews formed the "Zion Mule Corps" led by Jabotinsky, which developed into a "Jewish Legion" of 5,000 soldiers who fought alongside Britain, and this legion later formed the nucleus of the Haganah, the future Jewish military force. The difference between the Jewish and Arab contributions is that the Jews voluntarily helped the British, hoping that they would support their future plans in Palestine, while the Arabs fell into the trap because of the promises made by the British... dishonest promises, granting the

occupied Arab lands to their Arab owners, in exchange for them killing Arabs and Muslims and dismantling the caliphate to establish another caliphate. To complete this farce, the British did not keep their promises, but did the opposite, granting the Arab lands to the Jews and occupying them. Ironically, they exiled Sharif Hussein to the Cyprus colony!!

The Arabs eventually succumbed to illusions. Sharif Hussein declared himself King of Hejaz, while the French took Syria. The Sharif's sons got Iraq, and Abdullah got a state created by Churchill, as he boasted, "with a stroke of a pen on a Sunday in Cairo": the Emirate of Transjordan. To ensure the Sharif's continued support, British General Hogarth assured him that "the Arabs of Palestine, who went beyond the agreements, would not be economically or politically deprived by the Jews in their homeland".

The Arab reactions to these developments were verbally violent, but lacked any concrete practical steps, such as arming and building organized and independent forces. The best the Arab parties did, besides verbal protest and holding conferences, was to form small military groups subject to British supervision, training, and command. In exchange for giving the Arabs false hope, London, through the Balfour Declaration, granted the Jews only the western part of the Jordan River, while Transjordan was allocated to Prince Abdullah, son of Sharif Hussein. This led to the disappointment of the Zionists, who had already presented a map of the land they aspired to at the Paris Peace Conference, a land stretching from Aqaba on the Red Sea to Sidon south of Beirut, and from Rafah in the Sinai Peninsula to Amman and Damascus. As a result, Sharif Hussein's sons gained control of Iraq and Transjordan, but were deprived of Syria by force. Sharif Hussein himself lost his position in Mecca to King Abdul Aziz with British support, and was exiled to the island of Cyprus. He was prevented from visiting Transjordan during his deportation.

As planned, the British occupied Palestine and then took over the mandate, which was also approved by the League of Nations. Accordingly, the Jews saw themselves as having theoretically possessed Palestine thanks to the mandate and the Balfour Declaration, and it was up to them to take the necessary steps to realize their vision. On the other hand, World War I cost Turkey the loss and abandonment of all its Arab possessions, and the Allies dissolved the caliphate, cut off its European territories, and turned Turkey into a secular state.

The Arabs did not gain their independence or hoped-for unity under an Arab caliphate; despite fighting against the Ottoman caliphate alongside Britain, the victorious European powers moved to the Middle East as dominant colonial powers. The forces of the Great Arab Revolt took Syria from Turkish forces and handed it over to British forces, which in turn handed it over to French forces in the fall of 1919, beginning French rule over Syria and Lebanon under an international mandate decision. The Arab Revolt had declared the establishment of the Arab Kingdom of Syria, and King Faisal appointed a government that included members from Jordan, Iraq, Aleppo, Palestine, Lebanon, and Damascus, confirming that it was a future government encompassing the entire Levant region.

Despite the many details, the events can be summarized as follows: Sectarian clashes occurred between Christians and Muslims in Lebanese regions, and King Faisal's government rejected the mandate decision, and matters escalated into conflicts with French forces, ending with General Gouraud issuing an ultimatum demanding the implementation of four conditions within four days: acceptance of the French mandate, dealing with the paper currency issued by the Bank of Syria and Lebanon in Paris, approval of the occupation by French forces of railway stations in Damascus, Homs, Aleppo, and Hama, dissolution of the Syrian army and cessation of conscription and attempts to arm, and punishment of those involved in any hostile actions against France. King Faisal gathered his ministers to discuss the matter, and many saw the need to respond to General Gouraud's demands and accept his ultimatum. Here, Youssef al-Azmeh's position emerged, opposing the acceptance of the ultimatum and trying by all means to dissuade King Faisal from responding to the French threat to dissolve the Arab Syrian Army. After despairing of changing the king's mind, he recited the famous line of poetry by al-Mutanabbi: "The noble honor will not be safe from harm until blood is spilled on its sides".

Despite the Syrian government's acceptance of the ultimatum and abandonment of the idea of resistance and acceptance of General Gouraud's demands, and the order to dissolve the Syrian army and withdraw soldiers from the hills of Majdal Anjar village, contrary to the decision of the Syrian General Congress and the people's opinion represented by demonstrations denouncing the ultimatum and those who accepted it, and King Faisal sending a letter to General Gouraud accepting the conditions and dissolving the army, French forces began to advance under the command of General Goubiah (on instructions from General Gouraud) towards Damascus on July 24th, 1920, while the Syrian army stationed on the

border was retreating in disarray. When General Gouraud was asked about this, he replied that Faisal's telegram accepting the ultimatum's terms had reached him after the four-day deadline had expired. Youssef al-Azmeh stood firm and resisted until he was martyred, refusing to withdraw despite the army's retreat and the superiority of the attackers in numbers and equipment.

It is worth noting that General Gouraud's forces consisted of an infantry brigade, the 2nd Algerian Rifles Brigade, a Senegalese brigade of African riflemen, and a brigade of Moroccan soldiers, in addition to specialized units in desert and mountain warfare. Thus, the total French forces amounted to nine thousand soldiers, supported by aircraft, tanks, and abundant machine guns, while the Syrian army did not exceed three thousand soldiers, most of whom were volunteers. After unequal resistance and clashes, the Arabs were defeated, and some leaders headed to Transjordan to contribute to Prince Abdullah's government. After the Battle of Maysalun and the fall of Syria to the French, King Faisal I was exiled from Syria in July 1920, and went to Europe, where Britain arranged for him to become the King of Iraq in 1921, ruling until his death in Switzerland in 1933 after a medical trip.

Returning to the root of the plague, we find the British, who helped themselves to Palestine, Jordan, and Iraq, granting Palestine, which their Foreign Secretary Balfour had promised would be a settlement area and national home for the Jews, despite the fact that nine-tenths of it was still inhabited by Arabs. Despite the ongoing problems, revolutions, resistance, and attempts to dissuade Britain from implementing its vision, its leaders persisted in their error and betrayal of the Arabs and moral principles. In fact, as history has proven, they did not benefit from their policy, nor did Israel serve them later, and perhaps their situation would have been much better if they had balanced their actions earlier.

Balfour responded to attempts to demand fairness, saying that the British had given the Arabs a lot (meaning Hejaz to Sharif Hussein and the rest of the peninsula to Prince Abdul Aziz) to the extent that they would not be affected by losing this small place (Palestine). Like all colonizers, the English viewed the entire geography as subordinate to them, and they were the ones who distributed the land to its owners and to other people, and they should be thanked for this 'fairness'.

For his part, Winston Churchill brutally rejected the Palestinian request to cancel the Balfour Declaration. He was the Colonial Secretary at the time, and said, during a visit to Jerusalem: "This is not in my power, nor is it my desire".

Divine Intervention

We've observed from the previous narrative and documentation of historical facts that the English, who constitute the majority rule in Britain, at no point encouraged British settlement in Palestine, despite their active settlement activities in Ireland and in colonies in North America and Australia. However, they proactively encouraged Jews to immigrate to Palestine even before the emergence of the Zionist movement, and practically adopted the establishment of a Jewish state in Palestine specifically, rather than in any other British colony. In contrast, the Germans sought to settle in Palestine and did so before the Jews. So, what's the reason behind this? benefits,

Christianity has diverse doctrines, and the most influential religious groups in both Germany and Britain converge. The roots of the relationship between German (Evangelical) and British (Protestant) Protestantism go back to the Protestant Reformation; the German church was heavily influenced by Martin Luther, while Britain saw the emergence of Lutheranism, Calvinism (Reformed), and then the Anglican Church (influenced by the Reformation), which share common currents like focus on the Bible and personal piety (this being the crux of the matter), despite differences in church structures. German Protestantism leans towards Lutheranism and unified Calvinism, while British Protestantism includes Anglicanism and modern Evangelical currents, with historical overlap in supporting Christian Zionism later.

What is Christian Zionism, to which much of the American and Western support for Israel is attributed? It's a fundamentalist Protestant movement (mainly non-Catholic) that believes Christ's return requires the return of Jews and their gathering in the land of Israel and rebuilding the Temple, with the establishment of Israel in 1948 considered a sign of the approaching end phase. Christian Zionism has supported Jewish settlement since the colonial era, driven by purely religious motivations; they believe gathering Jews in Palestine fulfills biblical prophecies and is a precursor to Christ's second coming. Based on this, this movement sees it as its duty to support settlement and then Israel politically and religiously, believing this supports God's plan for the end times, which includes Christ's return to rule the earth for a thousand years. Many texts (like Psalms 79:1-13; 80:1-19;

Isaiah 19:1-19) indicate that Jews will then convert and believe in Christ. In short, it's a movement that combines Christian faith with biblical prophecies and political and ideological support for Israel, aiming to achieve a religious vision for the end times. These people began gathering in America with English settlement and spread their beliefs; suffice it to say that most American presidents were of Protestant origin, except Kennedy, who was of Irish Catholic origin and was assassinated.

Most English Protestant immigrants to America were from stricter religious groups like the Puritans. However, not all settlers were of this type; Britain forcibly sent some convicts to North America between the late 17th century and the American Revolution; but they formed a parallel migration wave to the religious settlers. The total number of convicts sent between 1717 and 1775 is estimated at around 300,000 people, and they formed a significant part of the population in some colonies like Virginia and Maryland.

The influence of Christian Zionism has become a powerful political force in the United States, especially among Republican voters, directing American foreign policy towards supporting Israel. This movement has established huge institutions to support Israel, like the "Christian Israel Public Affairs Committee", and has a wide media presence through hundreds of radio and TV stations. This alliance seems beneficial to both parties; Jewish Zionists welcome this political support despite differences in their theological motivations and goals. Christian Zionists see this support as achieving their salvation and a step towards the end times, while Israeli Zionism exploits this opportunity to maximize gains and ensure Israel's security and continuity. Both parties also agree on supporting wars, killing, and extermination, seeing all this as fulfilling their prophecies.

This raises a fundamental question about the extent to which religious visions dominate our lives in the East and West. Generally, does the Western world adopt modern, civilized systems based on political secularism? In contrast, we in the East live according to a religious perspective, whether governments are religious or not; systems and legislations are often religious, and the public is deeply religious, both in worship and in customs and habits. Even the idea of the return of Christ has deep roots in Islam and is very widespread among Muslims, although it differs from the views of Protestants and Catholics. Muslims believe that the gathering of Jews will be followed by a decisive battle that will eliminate them, and the Muslim stone will alert to the presence of a Jew

hiding behind it. This indicates that the mythical religious element is deeply rooted in the conflicting parties, and it is, as we see daily, a very active and influential element.

The situation in European countries is slightly different; secularism does not prevent people from being religious and worshiping, but it only prevents religion from turning to political rule and adopting holy books as a political reference. Other than that, religious people have the right to influence politics and society through lobbies and associations, and therefore we see the political system influenced by the desire of the public, specifically by the desire of the voter, whether the majority is influenced by religion or by moral and humanitarian factors. For this reason, we see sympathy and understanding from the less religious Western nations against the genocide, or from countries with non-Protestant majorities, or countries with Catholic religious majorities such as Ireland, Spain, Italy, and Latin American countries that embraced Catholicism due to Spanish colonialism.

The situation in the United States is considered between the Arab East and the European West, thanks to the power of the lobby in general, and the Christian Zionist lobby and the purely Jewish one, as they are based on ideological foundations and seek to influence secular rule. The latest and clearest example of this is the statement by the US Ambassador to Israel, Mike Huckabee, who said on Monday, February 22nd, 2026, that he sees no objection to Israel taking over the entire Middle East, which came in response to a question from journalist Carlson about the text in the Torah, referring to "the land of Israel from the Nile to the Euphrates," as Huckabee replied: "It would be good if they took it all"... and said that "the basic point is that this area we are talking about now (Israel), is land that the Lord gave through Abraham to a people he chose." When the media personality Tucker Carlson asked the US Ambassador: "If science proves that these people (the Palestinians) have a genetic connection to the land older than the European immigrants, how do you respond?" The US Ambassador Huckabee rejected the logic of "DNA" and said that the strongest argument is "archeology" and religious connection. The area that the ambassador wants Israel to occupy includes all of natural Palestine, Jordan, Lebanon, Syria, Iraq, and large parts of Egypt and Saudi Arabia! For clarification, Huckabee is described as "one of the strongest supporters of Israel in the Evangelical Christian community," according to the "Times of Israel" newspaper. What we want to say here is that the religious vision is deeply rooted in the open American political action and has an electoral audience, as is clear from the ambassador's background: an American politician, a Zionist Baptist Christian pastor, a former governor of Arkansas, and one of the candidates to run in the 2008 US presidential elections on behalf of the Republican Party.

The religious influence in the Palestinian conflict extends from the Crusades to this day, stemming from motivations that mix commercial and economic interests with religious visions that vary in intensity between appearance and concealment, but remain latent as a tool exploitable by commercial economic greed controlling political direction. This pattern is not new in principle, and it's not limited to Christianity; all religions have followed this path. In the name of religion and serving it, profits are made through plundering, exploitation, or occupation. This inevitably represents a breach of tolerant religious visions and adherence to utilitarian views, going beyond acquired humanitarian and moral laws, or neglecting international laws and agreements put in place in the aftermath of major wars, specifically World Wars I and II.

After addressing the British betrayal and historical responsibility, and before moving to the more influential American role, it's essential to mention the German role in supporting Israel and the direct military, political, and economic bias that founded the Jewish state's continuity, growth, and tremendous progress; a German role accompanied by total neglect of Palestinians and actual hostility towards them. The racist mentality, as seen in Adolf Hitler, born in Austria, can be partially understood from a religious perspective; some Christian sects harbor hostility and hatred towards Jews, believing they killed Christ. In contrast, Hitler's hatred of Jews was material, racist, and populist. Hitler was born to a devout Catholic mother and was baptized in the Roman Catholic Church. Later, during his political career and attempt to gain the support of the German masses, Hitler sometimes declared his support for religion to fight atheism, linking atheism to communism and materialism. Jews were hated in Germany and the rest of Europe, especially Eastern Europe, based on religious myths propagated by Christian leaders and rulers to distract people. Jews were accused of all vices, from deception and theft to killing Christian children and using their blood in Jewish rituals, making them an easy target for political gain. These campaigns led to increased attacks and killings, followed by waves of migration to Palestine.

Adolf Hitler took power in Germany as Chancellor on January 30th, 1933, after the Nazi party won the elections. Hitler began transforming the country into a totalitarian dictatorship during his first months in power, ending democratic rule. After that, Hitler directed his anger at Jews, and the German masses followed him in this direction, and he began persecuting Jews and opponents in the countries he occupied or dominated later. During his rule and before and during World War II, Hitler concluded agreements with Zionist leaders to deport Jews to Palestine. At

the same time, dominant powers like Britain and the United States refused to receive German Jewish refugees; everyone, with the Zionist movement's consent, wanted to push them towards Palestine. From here, Hitler's racist policy can be considered the main driver of increased immigration and its support by Western and Eastern governments that wanted to get rid of their Jewish population, whether for religious reasons or with later ambitions in view.

German racist policy predates Hitler, and has roots based on claims (with a pseudo-scientific background) to prove that the Aryan race is superior among humans, followed by less pure races, and at the bottom of the list are Jews and Arab Semites. Racism also engendered a vision of getting rid of the sick and disabled, and sterilizing some nations to prevent their reproduction. Consequently, Hitler engaged in implementation of his plans against Jews, the disabled, and any target who lived within German borders.

As for Arabs in general, who were on the list of Nazi extermination targets, most of them didn't grasp the reality of what was happening, and only a few understood Nazi ideology. As a result, the majority of Arab public opinion didn't object to what was happening to European Jews. Despite that, Arabs, on both popular and official levels, protected their Jews and refused to hand them over to Nazism or execute them in response to Hitler's request or vision.

Germany, Nazism, and Italian fascism were defeated in World War II, as Germany was defeated in the first war when it was allied with the Ottoman Empire. The horrors of the Holocaust against Jews became clear, and German leaders who were captured were tried for crimes against humanity. Germany was put under Soviet, British, French, and American occupation. Plans were made to divide Germany under Western occupation, where self-rule continued with conditions related to democracy, armament, and law, and it was forced to pay reparations to those affected, including Jews as individuals and as a state. No other affected party received personal reparations, not the English who fell under German bombs, nor others. And of course, no party considered the extent of the damage inflicted on Palestinians due to German policy; they were displaced, slaughtered, and lost their country and everything at the hands of Jewish German immigrants and Jewish fighters and pilots from Eastern European countries.

After Germany's defeat, large quantities of its weapons were handed over to Israel instead of being destroyed, and military cooperation became clear with Joseph Strauss taking over the German Defense Ministry. In the 1952 reparations

agreement, West Germany paid huge sums to Israel to cover the costs of resettling refugees and compensating Jews for losses due to Nazi persecution, including helping to build infrastructure and develop the Israeli economy in its early years, when the economy was struggling and survival required standing in lines to receive aid.

Financial payments haven't stopped; in the mid-1990s, reparations were estimated at around \$60 billion, with expectations of reaching \$80 billion by 2030, according to the then German Foreign Minister. Germany still provides additional payments to Holocaust survivors living in Israel, especially after the October 7th, 2023, attack, to help them "face difficult circumstances", and has allocated large sums for that. Besides direct reparations to the state and individuals, recent years have seen a huge increase in German arms export permits to Israel, aiming to boost its defensive capabilities, especially advanced missile defense systems. Submarines have also been exported to Israel, which aspires to have Germany develop them to carry Israeli nuclear-capable missiles. Germany considers it has a special historical responsibility towards Israel due to the Holocaust, justifying these reparations as part of its moral and legal commitment to survivors and recovery from Nazi crimes, and doesn't see any reason to provide aid to Palestinians who were severely affected by Israeli policy supported by Germany without reservation. Germany ranks second after the United States in supplying the Palestinian extermination campaign since October 2023. Were it not for the air bridge of supplies, Israeli tanks wouldn't have found ammunition after three months of the Holocaust. Palestinians are being subjected to.

Reviewing history reveals facts that were deliberately obscured and pre-planned, but these conclusions are rarely revisited except in specific cases; such as exposing the shortcomings of defeated powers, or when it's intended to deepen the facts with additions and exaggerations, or of course when sincere researchers are dedicated to revealing the real conclusions. For example, the view of Jews in Western and Eastern Europe portrayed them as a backward human element, deceitful, and characterized by other negative racist traits. During the Nazi period, from 1933 to September 1945, Nazism officially established Jews as the lowest human class, while the Aryan German race was considered the peak in form and intellectual and practical content; thus, deserving the top in every aspect, while the inferior elements (Jews, Arabs, and Roma) were allowed to be trampled and experimented on. All this was done with the knowledge and action of the German public, who

were imbued with these ideas even before the rise of Nazism, as most European peoples held the worst racist ideas against Jews.

When Israel plotted its course within well-planned strategies, Jews were practically reclassified as a superior human element, and they were transformed with European consent into "God's chosen people". Laws were enacted to prosecute those who spoke ill of them, pursue those who didn't support them, and antagonize those who criticized them; how and why did this transformation happen so quickly?

When the West realized the inevitability of the demise of their colonial empires, it resorted to several methods to ensure continued material benefit from the regions it colonized. One of these practices was planting agents loyal to the colonial mother powers to continue ruling in those ethnically divided regions, linking the interests of their ruling classes to the mother country, seeking to prevent development as much as possible, and sabotaging local markets by flooding them with cheap goods to eliminate manufacturing competition, and much more. But regarding Palestine and the Arabs, the colonial consensus was on planting an entity in their midst to hinder ideas of returning to the caliphate or establishing a unified Arab state, or even gathering Arabs, through the establishment of Israel and assigning it specific tasks and supporting it to ensure its continuity and the protection of the former colonial powers' interests.

Thus, the myth of Jews returning to their homeland was created, instead of considering them occupiers, and they were considered a superior and intelligent element in thought and excellent in implementation. In other words, they were elevated to the highest human echelon, which necessitated turning their opponents into a degraded human element that could be killed and displaced without taking their right to compensation or even continued existence into consideration. This has been evident since the beginning of Jewish settlement, then the establishment of Israel, and through all wars and positions, up to the ongoing genocidal war since October 2023... all relying on racism embedded in the Western mind.

The transformation was rapid and clear; initially, ideas were promoted that Britain's Balfour Declaration wouldn't harm the rest of Palestine's inhabitants. Later, ideas of Arab-Jewish coexistence in one state emerged from both West and East while seeking solutions, which Moscow supported and Washington openly considered. However, the partition decision was agreed upon, followed by European support for Jewish gangs with the latest Soviet weapons, including

planes that took off from communist Czechoslovakia under Moscow's control. The result was Jews occupying their allocated part and half of the part allocated to Arabs.

UN decisions were issued with Western approval, but they gradually ignored implementing them. Instead of enforcing the partition decision the West wanted, or implementing the return and compensation UN decision, they established UNRWA to distract the public and claim humanitarian concern. The West has continued gradual and rapid support for Israel and contempt for Palestinians, up to the extermination war being implemented under everyone's eyes, and in a way that surpasses Nazi implementation against Jews. Still the West only provided support for Israel and blamed Palestinians, while logic dictated imposing global control over the region and solving its problems consensually and equally, or at least cutting relations actually or formally with the aggressor, or maybe continuous official and media direction blaming Israel and influencing its internal politics and encouraging its Jews to adopt fair positions. But what emanated officially from governments, to varying degrees, was continued support for Israel, to preserve its functional role, and sacrifice of the Palestinians.

Germans weren't alone in their racist view, and they never cared about converting Jews or replacing them or elevating their status from lower to higher; what mattered to them was maintaining their self-perceived racial superiority, which necessitates having inferior ranks between them and others.

All Europeans hold a similar racist view that makes them see themselves as better than others, and they justified colonizing others on this basis, sometimes claiming their goal was to develop nations and elevate them on the human racial ladder. France, for example, has a shameful and ongoing past regarding its colonization of Arab and black Africa. To this day, there are official museums in French cities displaying skulls from North Africa, claiming that the measurements of these skulls prove the superiority of one human type over another, based on 'scientific' ideas applied by the French and agreed with by German ideas to prove racial diversity and hierarchy. Despite this, France still refuses to provide compensation or apologize to Maghreb countries for the massacres it committed, and there's no French educational curriculum that corrects these ideas rooted in the French mentality!

France's role in the Palestinian issue is marked by betrayal of humanitarian principles, with its stance oscillating between British and European positions; Paris

was London's partner in the 1916 Sykes-Picot Agreement, which contributed to determining the location of the Jewish settler state. Paris also played a role in facilitating immigration to Palestine, and slightly opposed British policy when the latter sought to limit the speed of immigrant flow.

It was from Paris that Napoleon launched a military campaign to occupy Palestine searching for artifacts supporting the Zionist Jewish myth, and when he failed, he turned to searching for Jewish artifacts in Egypt for the same purpose.

France's official modern relationship with the Palestinian issue dates back to November 1947, when Paris voted for the UN partition plan for Palestine into Arab and Jewish states. This decision led to declaring the establishment of the occupation state, which France recognized. By the 1950s, France was the ally the occupation turned to, the main supplier of arms and military equipment; France even contributed significantly to building the nuclear reactor in Dimona in the Negev desert. French protection didn't stop there; it intervened alongside Britain and Israel in 1956 in the Tripartite Aggression aimed primarily at overthrowing Egyptian President Gamal Abdel Nasser's rule. The French shift came when Charles de Gaulle asked both Israel and Egypt not to start war following 1967 tensions. When de Gaulle confirmed Israel started the aggression, France suspended arms sales to Tel Aviv and supported UN Security Council resolutions to end Israeli military occupation of Palestinian territories. These steps marked a rift in France-Israel relations. Diplomatic relations continued coldly, while the occupation state turned to rely on its close alliance with Washington.

French-Israeli relations continued quietly and the 1980s brought signs of a new rapprochement with French Socialist President François Mitterrand's rise to power and his visit to the occupation state, but that didn't stop him from recognizing the PLO, which Washington and Israel then considered a terrorist organization. France continued this approach after President Jacques Chirac, who explicitly called for recognition of a Palestinian state, but with Nicolas Sarkozy's arrival at the Elysée in 2007, coinciding with Israel's attack on Gaza following Hamas's takeover of the sector, French policy reached another turning point, first marked by the French president receiving then-Israeli PM Ariel Sharon in Paris despite his army's war crimes against Palestinians.

French policy continued pro-Israel with François Hollande and Emmanuel Macron, who presented themselves as friends of the occupation, without formally abandoning the two-state solution principle, and recognizing Palestinians' right to

establish their state, but all that remained ink on paper, and no French president pushed strongly for a fair solution to the Palestinian issue amid growing relations between Paris and Tel Aviv, and relations in all forms continued, while leaving Washington to protect Israel in international forums which sometimes spared France and Europe embarrassment.

Following the events of October 7th, France stood at the forefront of countries supporting Israeli retaliation, without issuing any statement recognizing the Palestinians' right to resist occupation or the same right to self-defense granted to Israel. Two weeks after the "Al-Aqsa Flood" operation, French President Macron met with Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu in Jerusalem, as part of a tour that included Egypt and Jordan in solidarity with Tel Aviv, ignoring the number of civilian deaths in Gaza. However, the French role did not continue at the same pace, they were among the first Europeans to realize the need to publicly stop supporting the genocide and distance themselves from the accusation of complicity, through media statements, while continuing practical alignment with Israel, to the point of banning peaceful popular demonstrations demanding an end to the genocide and criminalizing them. There was no halt to economic exchanges or military field support, including the transfer of arms, aerial reconnaissance flights, and countering Iranian missiles.

The reason for the shift in French rhetoric is likely due to concerns about the impact of the genocide on the position of Muslims in France, which is home to around half a million Jews. In contrast, Muslims represent at least six million out of 70 million, most of them from the Maghreb, making them the largest Muslim community in Europe. These considerations should have been taken into account by President Macron before announcing unconditional support for Israel, and before the Paris police took a tough stance against protests supporting the Palestinian cause.

A letter that was supposed to remain secret, but was leaked to the French newspaper "Le Figaro", revealed that 12 French ambassadors in the Middle East and the Maghreb region wrote a joint signed memorandum and sent it to the Elysee Palace and the French Foreign Ministry, a first in the history of French diplomacy. The memorandum included clear objections and warnings about the implications of Macron's positions supporting Israel, which made France vulnerable to accusations of complicity in the genocide committed by the occupation in Gaza. Therefore, the ambassadors took an internal diplomatic stance seeking to change

the French government's position, and return it to balance between its deep support for Israel and its opportunistic attempt to maneuver with Arabs by claiming neutrality or even showing false and continuous sympathy.

In mid-January 2026, it became clear that a leopard cannot change its spots, as French President Emmanuel Macron delivered a speech to soldiers at a French base near Marseille, using language that may be familiar from speeches by Napoleon or former French colonial leaders. Macron told the soldiers: "To remain free, others must fear you. To be feared, you must be strong. And to be strong in this savage world, you must move faster and strike harder." These statements came in the context of announcing the deployment of French troops to Greenland, a self-governing Danish territory, which the administration of US President Donald Trump was seeking to acquire. Macron stressed that "France and Europeans must continue to be present wherever their interests are threatened, without escalation, but without any compromise on territorial integrity."

The French president announced an addition of 36 billion euros to the defense budget until 2030, in addition to the 413 billion euros previously allocated for the period between 2024 and 2030 from the country's budgets, which are suffering from economic fatigue.

Why didn't civilized France resort to international arbitration, or to international law and UN resolutions? Why doesn't Paris struggle, even theoretically and diplomatically, to apply the principle of respect for the territorial integrity of states and peoples, but instead supports settler states condemned by international bodies? When France recognized the Palestinian state, why didn't it stipulate that its borders and Israel's borders are those determined in the partition resolution that Western countries relied on to recognize Israel? Why does it continue relations in all forms with a state that practices genocide and occupies the territories of other states?

Where are the principles that Macron urges his soldiers to apply, or has racist ideology blinded him? France, known for embracing freedoms and human rights, should have looked at the reality of Greenland's indigenous people and their demands before siding with Denmark's official position. At the very least, it should have proposed a referendum for the population on whether to sell their island to President Trump or remain under Danish guardianship. France and the French are aware of Denmark's attempts to exterminate the indigenous population and the scale of the popular movement demanding a referendum for independence. A

report by the French newspaper "Liberation" states: "Growing awareness was part of a broader movement rejecting Danish colonial influence".

University professor Ebbe Volgardson said: "We need to understand where to start. Danes have long believed they are benevolent settlers working only for Greenland's benefit, but in recent years, we've seen an identity awakening, and people are realizing they were victims of systematic injustice". In fact, the issue goes beyond injustice to approaching systematic genocide; Danish authorities implanted contraceptive devices in the wombs of half of Greenland's teenage girls from the mid-1960s to the late 1990s, reducing the population and saving state expenses in the Greenland colony. The discovery of this decades later led to a growing independence movement with broad popular support, but no party to the current dispute cares about this, whether supporting or opposing Trump's desire to seize the island. Everyone seeks to retain the land and people as if they were sheep with no opinion or choice. This is colonialism at its peak, competing for others' lands and the fate of peoples, no different from the Sykes-Picot Agreement or the occupation of Africa and trading its people as slaves, let alone similar policies in Canada against indigenous people and the systematic genocide of Native Americans in what became the United States.

Racist Democracy

The United States emerged as the first and actual victor of World War II as its economy revived, thanks to the war industries pulling it out of the economic crisis and the American collapse of the 1930's, known as the Great Depression. This depression, the worst economic crisis of the 20th century, began with the Wall Street crash on October 29th, 1929 (Black Tuesday), leading to a loss of confidence, bank failures, factory shutdowns, massive unemployment (reaching 25% in America), a decline in global trade, extreme poverty, and the displacement of millions. However, American effort and the war economy revitalized the US economy, especially since the United States remained geographically distant and was not affected by the destruction that befell Europe and the Soviet Union.

Britain, theoretically victorious with Germany's surrender, was suffering from bankruptcy, destruction, and food rationing. It appears that the people punished Churchill and the Conservative Party in the 1945 elections; while Churchill was at the peak of his glory, meeting with Stalin and Truman in Potsdam, the election results were announced in London, replacing Churchill's participation and his Foreign Minister's in the meetings with Clement Attlee and his new Foreign Minister, Ernest Bevin, from the Labour Party. Thus, the British rewarded their Prime Minister, who won the war that led to their destruction, the end of their empire, starvation, and left them queuing for bread and powdered eggs from the United States.

Before the Potsdam Conference (Berlin Conference), which took place from July 17th to August 2nd, 1945, Churchill informed the Zionists that the victorious powers in World War II should decide the fate of Palestine. The primary goal of the Potsdam Conference was to determine the fate of Germany, which surrendered unconditionally, and its administration was divided among the victorious powers, with France being granted an administrative share without participating in the conference. Britain was displeased with the Zionists, who realized London's dependence on Washington; therefore, Zionist gangs did not hesitate to kill British soldiers in Palestine to show they were liberating the country from the colonizer, seeking independence.

Edward Grigg, a British Foreign Office official, predicted, as mentioned by Lord Nicholas Bethell in his book "The Palestine Triangle," regarding plans to partition Palestine, that "partition would likely lead to the emergence of a Nazi Jewish state with a bitter and aggressive character".

Following the end of World War II, numerous international committees, including American and British ones, sought to find solutions to the Palestine issue. Most Arabs believed Britain was one of the victorious states in the war, unaware of its economic reality or the transformations occurring in this rapidly declining empire. In contrast, the Zionist movement knew this even before the end of the war, and powerful American Zionists, with influence and in numbers, took charge of protecting the "Jewish national home" in Palestine.

In a resolution issued on the 25th anniversary of the Balfour Declaration on November 2nd, 1942, the majority of US Congress members called for the establishment of a Jewish state. American Zionists called for a conference at the Biltmore Hotel in New York to demand "official American recognition of the Jewish right to Palestine". The Biltmore Program addressed the "possibility of transferring the Palestinian population to Iraq", because, according to one participant, Ben-Gurion, "the fewer Arabs within the future state's borders, the better". The Biltmore Conference was a strategic turning point in the Zionist movement, charting a new course towards establishing Israel by explicitly demanding a Jewish state in Palestine instead of just a "national home". For radical Zionists like Begin and Jabotinsky, the Biltmore Program was too weak because it didn't explicitly call for "Palestine on both sides of the Jordan".

Most American politicians, mobilized by American Jews, adopted Zionist demands. When Arab diplomats protested to the US President about Washington's adoption of the Biltmore Conference resolutions, President Truman explicitly explained his motives to the Arab protesters, saying: "I'm sorry, gentlemen, but I have to satisfy hundreds of thousands who want the Zionists to succeed. I don't have hundreds of thousands of Arabs among my constituents". Thus, the Palestinian issue unambiguously entered the electoral and political arena, and this situation, skillfully managed by the Zionists, remains unchanged, making it unclear who controls whom: Washington or Tel Aviv?

After the end of World War II, Truman demanded the transfer of 100,000 surviving Jews waiting in European "displaced persons" camps to Palestine immediately. He presented this demand to appease New York Jews to encourage

them to vote for a Democratic candidate for mayor of New York City - the city with the largest number of Jewish residents in the world. The matter was repeated publicly in other American states, either to directly gain voters or to ensure the influence of Zionist media in America on voters in general. The British found themselves in a hopeless position in their administration of the mandate over Palestine. The United States, the new superpower, pushed by millions of Jewish citizens, exerted pressure on London to allow Jews surviving the Nazi Holocaust to enter the Promised Land immediately. In return, the Zionists in Palestine declared war on the mandate authority and were warring with all available means. British Foreign Minister Ernest Bevin commented on Washington's demands to send Jews to Palestine, saying: "The Americans only want to bring Jews to Palestine because they don't want them in New York".

At that time, signs of Zionist lobby media activity began to appear, as fierce press debates erupted against the British in the United States, prompting Bevin's protection from assassination threats during his visit to America. The British were unsure what to do, but they surrendered to American pressure because they needed everything from the United States, including flour. Initially, they allowed 20,000 Jews from displaced persons camps to enter. Then they formed a joint committee with the Americans to study the problem, and its members visited displaced persons camps in Palestine and also Cairo to hear the views of all concerned parties.

Zionists felt reassured by the United States' protection at their back; accordingly, their gangs in Palestine hanged British soldiers or shot them in the back, and "Irgun" terrorists affiliated with Menachem Begin flogged a British officer in retaliation for the British flogging Zionist fighters. The morale of officers and soldiers who came out of World War II feeling disappointed was low, and due to repeated incidents, soldiers were only allowed to stay in their barracks, according to a British army report at the time. London felt betrayed by the Jews, to whom it had given much since the 1917 Balfour Declaration in favor of a homeland for them, and it had been planning to rely on them and appease the Arabs to secure the interests of the collapsing empire through the Suez Canal, but it was too late; as the Jews rebelled and the Arabs generally despaired. To save the situation, Bevin, the British Foreign Minister and socialist who was considered a friend by many Zionists for many years and turned into a critic of the idea of a Jewish state in response to Zionist terrorism, proposed establishing an independent Palestinian state governed by the Arab majority (noting that the ratio was still about two to one

Arab versus Jew), with local autonomy ("cantons") for Jews, and limiting the ability of the Arabs to influence further Jewish immigration. However, the ministerial majority in London rejected the proposal, fearing it would lead to "unimaginable riots and bloodshed".

In 1946 (a year after the new British Labour government), Zionist terrorism caused the deaths of 212 people, including 91 Britons. In early 1947, 20 British soldiers were killed in an attack by the Irgun organization on the Officers' Club in Jerusalem. London lost interest in the Palestinian mandate, which had become a heavy financial burden on a bankrupt state emerging from war. In April, Britain referred the issue to the United Nations. The head of the British delegation explained: "We have been trying for years to solve the problem of Palestine, and since we have not succeeded so far, we are referring it to the United Nations in the hope that they will succeed where we have failed to manage it here". This means that after thirty years of the Balfour Declaration and theoretical, practical, and adoptive support for the idea of establishing a Jewish homeland, Britain discovered the failure of its idea and capability, or so it claims, and thus retreats from its responsibilities and hands over the reins theoretically to the United Nations and practically to Washington. However, Britain continued to kill, arrest, and disarm Palestinians, while Jewish settlements were awash with weapons, and imports continued unabated; Britain even sold them weapons and asked Arabs to wait for its departure before taking action as they saw fit!

We are talking here about racist colonial powers that deliberately created the Palestinian tragedy with premeditation and in a purely racist spirit, without any moral dimension or respect for the basics of humanitarian or international law. This hostility to humanity and inherent greed was not only directed against the Palestinian people but was also practiced against many other peaceful nations across the world and history, but what distinguishes the Palestinian issue is that it continues as the last settler colony and the last people resisting the remnants of the colonial settler racist vision and practice, and thus the Palestinian people have revealed their inherent steadfastness throughout these centuries of resistance, exposed the myth of Western moral development and civilization, and revealed the hypocrisy and flaws in applying Western democracy, whereby certainly not all Western individuals can be labeled as racist and greedy.

American and Western racism, manifested in contempt for weak peoples, is evident in the reluctance to conduct any review of bloody history or to innovate

and implement humanitarian solutions. In the case of Palestine, for example, there is a one-sided bias and genocidal aggression; they have not supported a moderate political solution ensuring Israel's security and Palestinians' dignity. Nor do they offer decent solutions in education, economy, living conditions, or security. Everything points towards stubbornness and genocide, similar to the elimination of Native Americans, aiming to remove any subsequent psychological impact or influence. The West could have secured Israel by encouraging coexistence with Palestinians and rewarding both parties, or through an advanced educational plan for Palestinian generations linking them to the Western vision and lifestyle and opening avenues for integration. Instead, the solutions chosen were oppression, arming the aggressor, and ignoring the victim. The proposed solutions centered around displacing Palestinians outside their lands to the desert, not to Britain, France, America, or Germany to occupy the places of Jews leaving those countries. The goal was to get rid of Jews by transferring them to Palestine, and Palestinians by transferring them to Arab countries or deserts or exterminating them, achieving the Zionist vision at the lowest cost. It is quite clear that the official Western goal aligns with and supports the Zionist goal of establishing a Greater Israel at the expense of the geography and peoples of other Arab countries. They are indeed seeking and supporting the genocidal solution practiced on Native Americans in North America, i.e., in Canada and the United States.

To distinguish between the worst and less bad outcomes of Western colonialism, we note that Western (Protestant) colonialism that dominated North America led to the extermination of the indigenous population. In contrast, Spanish and Portuguese (Catholic) colonialism in South America led to the plundering of the region's wealth, exploitation of its people in production, imposition of Catholicism and Spanish and Portuguese languages, mixing of races, and establishment of new social and economic structures, producing a new human mix. Although this existing situation is not good, it is considered better than the genocidal solution applied to the indigenous people in the north.

It is generally observed that British colonialism, as it foresaw decline and retreat, resorted to a "divide and rule" policy among groups and countries to maintain its role as a mediator and dominator at minimal cost. The United States followed the same policy in the East after the British collapse. Both powers exploit the religious element to create chaos leading to violence, which ensures continued underdevelopment and prevents various forms of progress, ensuring the seizure of power by subservient and ignorant leaders. Often, extremists are facilitated to take

power to exploit them in continuing this cycle. This is what happened between the British and the Muslim Brotherhood, and between Israel and Hamas. America also created ISIS to destroy Iraq and Syria and poison the region, after having previously benefited from Muslim fundamentalists to end the Soviet era in Afghanistan, leading to the collapse of the socialist bloc that competed with the West throughout the post-World War II decades.

What, then, was the Russian and Soviet role regarding the Palestinian issue? The Russian Empire participated in efforts to divide the Ottoman Empire's legacy and joined the Sykes-Picot Agreement in 1916. However, the Bolshevik Revolution, or October Revolution (the second phase of the 1917 Russian Revolution), led by the Bolsheviks under Vladimir Lenin, including leaders like Red Army commander Leon Trotsky, the Bolshevik Party, and the working masses, was based on Karl Marx's ideas and Vladimir Lenin's development of them; aiming to establish a socialist state and overthrow the provisional government. This revolution exposed the secrets of the Sykes-Picot Agreement and Russia withdrew from it, turning into an adversary of Western capitalism. However, it later joined with the Allies against Nazi Germany, which attacked and destroyed many major Russian cities during World War II.

Moscow saw the solution to the Palestinian issue through establishing a single state for Arabs and Jews, betting it would be a socialist state. After the war, and the Arabs' refusal to share a state with Jewish settlers, and during deliberations on Palestine's fate at the United Nations, Russian Andrei Gromyko, who opposed the partition idea until May, said: "The delegation of the Soviet Union notes that the decision to partition Palestine goes hand in hand with the principles and goals of the United Nations. It is in line with the principle of the national self-determination of peoples."

The Cold War had erupted between the Eastern bloc led by Moscow and the Western bloc led by Washington before the partition decision deliberations. The Soviet Union's shift from supporting a single state to endorsing a two-state solution (partition decision) angered Arabs and Britons particularly. Arabs expressed anger because the partition decision was worse for them than Moscow's previous vision of a unified state. However, Arabs generally, and Islamic countries with them, opposed partition and hated communism, and were swayed by Britain, which claimed neutrality and hinted to Arabs it would leave them alone after withdrawing

from Palestine and wouldn't support the partition decision (and actually did abstain from voting).

Britain's anger with Moscow stems from a misinterpretation by its secret services of Moscow's behavior regarding supporting partition, believing: "Centuries of wise British policy kept Russians out of the Middle East. American demagoguery now lets them in: when British forces leave, millions of communist Russian Jews will come to Palestine unchecked". In other words, British intelligence saw Moscow's support for partition as backing a socialist Jewish state serving its interests and opposing British and Western interests, hence British anger also encompassed American demagoguery.

33 countries voted for partition, while 13 countries opposed it, including Afghanistan, Egypt, Greece, India, Iraq, Iran, Yemen, Cuba, Lebanon, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, Syria, and Turkey. 10 countries abstained: United Kingdom, Argentina, Chile, China, Colombia, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Honduras, Mexico, and Yugoslavia. One country was absent from voting. The 33 countries that approved the decision, included the United States, Soviet Union, Australia, Norway, Iceland, France, Finland, Canada, and politically affiliated countries.

This was the United Nations' first attempt to address the issue. Although the resolution required the establishment of two states and subsequent decisions to achieve peace, the countries that supported partition did not change their stance or exert pressure on the Jewish state to redress Palestinians and implement international resolutions, such as the right of return and compensation, let alone implement the partition decision itself or counter the massacres committed by Zionist gangs after the decision. Zionist movement leaders made significant efforts on the eve of partition to convince hesitant countries, enlisting pro-plan diplomats within the United Nations to delay voting from November 26th to 29th, allowing them to convince Liberia, the Philippines, and Haiti to vote in favor of the plan, securing two-thirds support from member states, necessary for approving the partition plan. Arab countries tried to prevent this delay, with their delegates waiving their speeches to save time, but the American delegation supporting the plan insisted on postponing the session until after the American Thanksgiving Day, which fell on November 27th that year. Some American politicians and businessmen pressured hesitant countries economically tied to the United States. For example, the person who pressured Liberia was the famous American millionaire Harvey Samuel Firestone, owner of rubber plantations in Liberia and

founder of Firestone tire factories. US Defense Secretary James Forrestal commented on this in his memoirs: "The methods used to pressure and coerce other nations within the United Nations were a scandal".

Even before voting, American bias towards Jews was evident due to lobby pressure; despite constituting less than a third of Palestine's population, they received over 56% of the land, including the Negev desert, which was almost uninhabited by Jews, instigated by the United States and indifference from the Soviet Union, which justified its stance to the Arabs by saying they rejected the Soviet vision of a joint single-state solution and rejected the partition decision, and Moscow had a responsibility towards solving the Jewish issue.

Generally, it's worth noting that most Jewish immigrants to Palestine before the Nazi era were from Russia and Ukraine, where Jews faced persecution in Tsarist Russia and Eastern Europe. After the Bolshevik Revolution and Russian expansion in the region, the Bolsheviks believed Jewish immigration to Palestine would encourage building socialism and communism there. From this perspective, Soviet support for establishing Israel continued during the partition decision, believing Israel in the East would support them against Western expansion, especially since the Jewish economic system in Palestine relied on socialist cooperatives, Early and prominent Zionists came from Russia and Ukraine (like Vladimir Jabotinsky, Shaul Tchernichovsky, Menachem Ussishkin, Nahum Sokolow, Yitzhak Katzenelson, David Ben-Gurion, Menachem Begin, and Ukrainian-born Golda Meir, among others), all Russian-speaking Jews.

Hence, it's no secret that Andrei Gromyko, Soviet Foreign Minister for many years and Soviet representative at the United Nations, revealed in one of his private papers that the Soviet Union's role was fundamental in internationalizing the establishment of "Israel", and that "had it not been for the Soviet stance, Israel would have remained outside the international family and wouldn't have gained recognition". Andrei Gromyko drafted the resolution accepting "Israel" into the United Nations, famously saying: "With my own hands, I delivered Israel into the international family".

The political developments in the Soviet Union and its relations with the West and Arabs directly or slightly affected the flow of Jewish immigrants, a flow that never stopped, but doubled after Gorbachev took power and his open-door policy, followed by the collapse of the Soviet Union and the socialist bloc. These developments led many Jews to believe their opportunities would be better in

Israel or through it to the Western world. Ultimately, Russian speakers in Israel became a quarter of the population, surpassing Israeli Arabs (21%). These Russian Jewish immigrants are the most extreme and consider Israeli Arabs a threat to national security.

Russia did not object to the Zionist project from its early hours, but supported it with immigrants before and after the partition decision, and then with diplomatic support. When Washington hesitated to put the partition decision to a vote, fearing for its interests with Arabs, Andrei Gromyko insisted and sought to conduct a vote on the decision. Later, Russia refrained from arming Arabs in a way that competes with Western Israeli arms. It also did not allow the development of any Arab nuclear capabilities, and limited arms supplies to Arabs to second-grade, at prices and terms, and without providing any gifts or thinking about developing military industries for friendly countries like Egypt, Syria, or Iraq, etc.

Of course, Russia did not stop Jewish immigration, which was at the expense of the Palestinian people, and did not think of exchanging permission for immigration with improving the situation of Palestinians under occupation, or proposing any practical ideas to pave the way for justice and compensation for Palestinians. Its relations with Israel were always good, and influential Arab countries were pledged to its side against the West. It gained the support of Arab public opinion by appearing as a supporter of Arabs and the Palestinian cause through its speeches and later decisions at the United Nations, and its verbal confrontation with the West in this regard.

If the Jewish state benefited 100% from Russia and the Soviet Union, the Palestinian gain from it was practically zero. Arabs looked at Moscow as a supporter due to the rapid shift in international politics during the Cold War, as Moscow was hostile to Washington, the official ally of the nascent Zionist entity. Later, Zionists promoted the idea that Moscow and the socialist bloc sent arms to Palestinian Arabs during the 1948 war, which is not only untrue but also the opposite of the truth; during that conflict, Jewish immigration continued, and many Russian and Eastern Jews arrived in Palestine through territories and on ships belonging to communist Bulgaria, an ally of Moscow.

In February 2026, the extent of old Russian immigration to Israel became clear, and what Zionist circles are planning, in cooperation with hidden decision-making circles, to bring another million selected Russian immigrants to Israel. In the context of released files on the Jeffrey Epstein scandal, a video appeared showing

Epstein with Ehud Barak, former Israeli Prime Minister and former head of intelligence. Epstein's case is infamous for involving the provision of young girls and boys for coercive sexual purposes with global figures, on his private island and in his Manhattan home in New York. Given the redaction of many files, it is unclear whether Epstein served a gang or a secret global organization, manipulating and blackmailing actors, thus controlling global politics.

It is important to convey the content of the meeting between Epstein and Barak, which revealed racism even among various Jewish categories. Barak said: "We can easily absorb another million Russians. I always told Putin that what we need is another million. The last million from Russia changed Israel radically, but I think many would prefer Belarusians. As we know, there are many beautiful young women in that country, tall and slim". Barak spoke about the importance of selecting beauties and avoiding what their fathers did by opening the door to everyone: "They took whoever came and acted as if it were a rescue operation, took from North Africa and from the Arabs, but now we can choose selectively". Barak also touched on the possibility of expanding the concept of who is a Jew, meaning focusing on young women and men, who are not necessarily Jews, they just have to claim to be.

Why does Barak present this idea to Jeffrey Epstein? Is he higher in rank and more influential in relationships so that he coordinates plans with him, or are they part of a hidden circle of influence planning to achieve this outcome? Or is Barak asking him to present the proposal to his backers, whoever they may be?

Artificial Intelligence Response:

It's difficult to determine the nature of the relationship between Barak and Epstein, but there are several possibilities:

1. Barak is higher in rank: Barak might be higher in rank than Epstein, seeking support or funding for his projects or ideas, such as bringing a million Russian immigrants to Israel.
2. Epstein is part of a circle of influence: Epstein might be part of a hidden circle of influence, and Barak is seeking support or approval from this circle to achieve his goals.

3. Barak is asking Epstein: Barak might be asking Epstein to present the proposal to his leadership or support his ideas in the circle Epstein belongs to.

4. Partnership: Barak and Epstein might be partners in a project or plan to achieve common goals, such as bringing Russian immigrants to Israel.

Given Epstein's known connections with influential figures and his significant influence in financial and political circles, it's possible Barak is seeking support or approval from Epstein to achieve his objectives.

End of AI

Between Ignorance and Fatalism

Palestinian national sentiments, Arab nationalism, and Islamic religiosity were at their peak, fueled by fear for Palestine and support for its cause, rejection of Jewish settlement, and the role of Western and Eastern powers in the conspiracy. No Arab side was thinking of accepting the partition solution or the one-state solution between Jews and Palestinian Arab Muslims. Everyone rejected partition on principle, without assessing the situation, studying the partition decision, or thinking about the consequences. Empty rhetoric and fatalism dominated the positions, and the Palestinian Communist Party was accused of treason for accepting the one-state solutions and then the partition decision.

Before the emergence of the Palestine issue, the Third World in general, which was exposed to concepts like freedom, democracy, and self-determination without experiencing any of them, tended to believe that its abstract opinion of rejection or acceptance would be taken into consideration by the dominant powers. This is what the Arab public also believed, behind their unelected leaders, thinking that their rejection of the partition decision would be respected, thus achieving Palestinian rights. This view, ignoring the balance of power, continued and then weakened over the decades. Events escalated negatively until the first intifada (stone intifada) broke out in December 1987, leading to the Palestinian-Israeli peace project. This was followed by the Islamic movement's rejection of peace, supported by Arab and Islamic countries, leading to resistance and the failure of the peace process, returning to armed resistance to reclaim Palestine from the river to the sea, and culminating in what is now known as the "October Disaster" starting from 2023 and its aftermath.

In 1947, Arabs felt strength stemming from psychological reasons unrelated to reality, thinking they could reject the partition decision supported by great powers, defeat the heavier armed and equipped Zionists, and liberate Palestine. Britain played a role in both involvement and deception; it wanted to discipline the Zionists for killing British soldiers and betraying London, but it was aware of the military balance its interference created and of the results that would slightly harm Jews, but considered Israel would be an extension of the English-Western plan for a Jewish state.

The Syrian delegate to the United Nations repeated after the General Assembly voted on partition: "Arabs and Muslims in the whole world will prevent this, and all of Asia with a billion people will resist".

It is necessary to clarify some points about the partition decision before delving into the balance of power in Palestine. The Negev desert was given to the Jewish state to open up future space for absorbing immigrants, thus the Jewish state owned 56% of natural Palestine's area. But the partition decision was clear in its articles and foundations, and it could have been called the "unification decision" instead of partition! The decision considered borders political and maintained economic unity and a unified currency, granting Jews and Arabs residing in the area the right to continue residence, ownership, buying, and selling, and everything else in the other side, except the right to vote; meaning an Arab participates in his state's elections and a Jew in his state's elections. Whoever wanted to move to live in his state could do so, the way was open, and he could sell his properties and move. As for Jerusalem, it was an international city for both sides and the whole world. Thus, the partition decision was like a federation relying on a similar economy, one currency, and free education. According to the decision, Arabs could keep their properties even within the part allocated to Jews, and they were allowed to live and reproduce in the Jewish section. Arabs from outside Palestine could come to live and settle in the Palestinian part, along with other advantages that God blinded Arabs from seeing, so they lived the moment full of false strength and reliance on foundations of hatred and thus refusal to think about mere coexistence!

So, what was the situation of Arab governments and peoples then? What was the balance of power between opponents in the Palestinian arena? Did Arab leaders understand the reality of the political and military situation? The Arab states were nominally independent but remained under colonial influence. The war broke out in Palestine nominally between Arab forces, represented by the Kingdom of Egypt, Kingdom of Iraq, Syria, Lebanon, and the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, against Zionist militias in Palestine, which consisted of the Palmach, Irgun, Haganah, and Stern gangs, in addition to Jewish volunteers from outside the British Mandate of Palestine.

In 1948, the Jewish population was about 650,000, while the Palestinian population was 1.25 million. The population of the seven Arab countries that sent troops to Palestine was about 40 million. The number of Jewish soldiers exceeded Arab soldiers threefold in some stages of fighting because some Arab countries

limited themselves to sending a few soldiers, while others refrained from intervening in the war. In Palestinian Galilee, the Arab Liberation Army, composed of Arab volunteers, was active.

Later, Ben-Gurion himself acknowledged what contradicts the myth propagated by himself and the Zionists that a small Jewish group overcame seven armies and an Arab majority; he clearly stated in a Foreign and Security Committee meeting in February 1960 that in most stages of the 1948 war, the Israeli army had a numerical majority, not just a qualitative one, saying: "We had a larger army than theirs at the time".

Financially, Arabs collected 25,000 pounds, while Golda Meir alone collected 50 million dollars in America and Canada, and the Haganah army's budget at the time exceeded three million pounds (sterling). Thus, despite rejecting partition and the idea of a joint state, and threats and intimidation, the Arab world and the rest of Muslims failed to mobilize enough to prevent the catastrophe, or even match half the number of Jewish forces militarily, with a ridiculous comparison financially, let alone comparing equipment and arms. At the beginning of the war, the total Palestinian and Arab forces comprised 13,000, reaching a peak later of 60,000. In contrast, Jewish forces numbered 29,677 initially, rising to 117,500 by the March 1949 truce. The four armistice agreements were signed between February 24th and July 20th, 1949. Supplies flowed to Jews during these truces, the last of which was in March 1949, where the Green Line was determined. Iraq did not sign the truce. The Security Council recommended accepting Israel as a full member of the United Nations, and the General Assembly approved this recommendation on May 11th, 1949.

After the partition decision and the results of its rejection, no Arab, Palestinian, or Muslim, individually or collectively, or governmentally, criticized themselves or bore even the slightest responsibility for acknowledging error. Everyone continued either ignoring reality, pretending not to hear, or trying to face difficulties with sterile and desperate attempts.

During the war, Britain planned for a Jordanian army presence in what was later known as the West Bank, which represented half of the part allocated by the partition decision to the Palestinian state, while Israel occupied the remaining half of Palestine's share, becoming occupiers of three-quarters of Palestine as a result of that war called the Nakba though it would be more apt to call it the Farcical War. The Jordanian Arab Army was under British military field command, and London

wanted this step to thwart any possibility of establishing a Palestinian state led by Amin al-Husseini. Arab governments were diverse before, during, and after the war, and have remained so, while Palestinians were divided and in conflict. By contrast, different Zionist factions united mid-war and formed the army of the nascent state.

Arab countries sent small numbers of soldiers across borders only. Egypt hesitated to send an army, but a visit by the Saudi king to Cairo pushed King Farouk to send forces, based on the Saudi king's wish that the Hashemites in Jordan alone wouldn't be credited with victory. Thus, Farouk sent forces with defective weapons and with specific lines not to be crossed, leaving the possibility of retreat. Arabs refrained from effective intervention, waiting for the end of the mandate and British departure. When they intervened, they disputed about everything, and demanded the withdrawal of the Arab Liberation Army, which was established after a late meeting of the Arab League Council in Lebanon between October 7-9th, 1947, with everyone aware of Britain's decision to withdraw on April 15th, 1948. One of the most important decisions taken during the Beirut conference was to form a military committee of representatives from Arab countries to study the military situation and help Palestinians defend themselves and their homeland. This committee, known as the Arab League Military Committee, consisted of Major General Ismail Safwat (Iraq) as chairman, and members Colonel Mahmoud Hindi (Syria), Lieutenant Colonel Shawkat Shuqair (Lebanon), and Subhi al-Khadra (Palestine), while Egypt, Jordan, Saudi Arabia, and Yemen did not send any representatives.

The intensity of battles had escalated since the 1936 revolution between Jews and Britain on one hand, and Palestinians without Arab support on the other. The Zionist goal was clear, declared, and known to Palestinians and Arabs alike, who all waited, clinging to rejecting partition and a joint state, but without any actual preparation. The day after the partition decision on November 29th, 1947, attacks escalated between the same parties, but this escalation coincided with a Jewish shift against the English, who were seeking to end the mandate.

The 1948 exodus is generally referred to as the "Nakba", which essentially indicates the speed at which Palestinian society collapsed under the Zionist military attack, leading to the displacement and dispersion of the Palestinian people. The magnitude of this event coincided with a complete absence of Arab expectations of defeat and its consequences, and ignorance or misjudgment of the

capabilities of Zionist gangs and the army, that despite being fewer in number compared to the Arab countries' armies that rejected partition, were more organized and powerful. The shock of realizing the Arab countries' inability to counter the attack, and the withdrawal of British mandate forces from Palestine with such speed and complicity, was part of the same picture.

After the Zionist project matured and the Zionist movement reached the peak of its power and preparation, and according to the Palestinian people's knowledge and vision, and amid constant declarations in Arab media and meetings held at the Arab League, which was established on March 22nd, 1945, Zionists saw it was time to establish their state "Israel" and start a comprehensive war against Palestinians and displace them from their cities and villages. In spring 1948, Zionist gangs began implementing their plan to occupy Palestinian lands, prepared two years earlier. Zionist forces occupied 213 villages and committed many massacres and atrocities during the British mandate period, notably: the Deir Yassin massacre, Tantura massacre, Ramla massacre, al-Dawaymeh massacre, Lydda massacre, and others.

Arab and Palestinian volunteers tried to counter Zionist forces while British forces were still in the country. In northern Palestine, the Britons handed over Tiberias to the Jews on April 18th, 1948, after facilitating supplies and preventing Arab reinforcements and ammunition from reaching the city, claiming it needed to evacuate the Arab residents for fear of Jewish majority treachery. Tiberias was the first Palestinian city to fall to the Zionists, followed by other Palestinian cities falling one after another. The Britons withdrew from Haifa with a planned scheme, where Zionist gangs occupied fortified positions and launched violent attacks on Palestinian residents. They had prepared for this with a psychological campaign through loudspeakers and leaflets, in addition to concentrated and intense shelling on Arab neighborhoods. Thousands of Palestinian refugees fled the city to Lebanon, and many died due to crowding while trying to board ships. Britain encouraged this exodus, assuring residents it aimed only to avoid fighting, and they could return when battles subsided. The tragedy was that Arabs believed them and fled, and chaos, looting, and plundering spread among Arabs themselves for houses and shops. This has been repeated in Palestinian crises and defeats, like the Naksa, and as happened after the October 2023 Nakba and expulsion of residents due to fire, shells, and Israeli advances in the Gaza Strip. After Haifa fell, Safed, Acre, Shafa Amr, Nazareth, Jaffa, and Salama fell, and most of eastern and western Galilee regions fell. Zionist media helped, intentionally, spreading panic

and terror by detailing massacres like Deir Yassin, as part of its psychological warfare against Palestinians. This had a great impact on spreading fear in Palestinian villages; Zionist broadcasts aired news of mass killings to crush Arab citizens' morale and push them to leave their lands and villages. On the other hand, Arab broadcasts, unintentionally, contributed to increasing the terror, as they repeated massacre stories to tarnish the Zionist gangs' image internationally, but Palestinians were the first to listen to and care about this news. In an advanced stage of the war, Jewish forces didn't just wage psychological propaganda war to pressure Palestinians to leave their towns, cities, and villages, but also resorted to force, ethnic cleansing, and massacres to expel them. Zionist gangs used various intimidation methods against Palestinians, including warning residents there was no room for mercy or pity, and the only choice was staying and dying, or fleeing and surviving. Thanks to these methods, massacres, and mass killings, Zionist gangs managed to occupy many Palestinian areas before May 1948, even those not designated by the partition decision, and displaced and scattered most residents using different means and methods. This behavior wasn't unexpected from a side that had declared its intentions beforehand, but the strange thing was the Palestinian mass collapse and rapid retreat of Arab forces and armies abandoning their positions, leading to increased residents' terror and causing a wave of displacement following these forces' withdrawal.

Despite all that tragedy and its consequences of losing the country and displacing its people, there was no criticism or review from Arab and Palestinian forces that participated in reaching this result. No Arab side dared evaluate the mistakes of rejecting partition, or lack of preparation for war, or not leaving matters to Palestinians to decide their fate before rejecting proposed solutions. No Arab, Palestinian, or Islamic side considered the possible social and scientific causes behind that shortcoming, failure, and defeat, which has necessitated continuing to deny reality and repeating disasters, leading to October 2023.

In contrast, Jewish residents in the part allocated to them by the partition decision received strict orders from their leaders to hold their positions anywhere at any cost, which they actually did, and they still adhere to their leaders' vision, with men and women participating in their army, and debating their democracy to decide their affairs and change their leaders.

Before delving into the Palestinian self-role in creating the Nakba, it's essential to point out the consensus in the Arab mentality generally and its practical, social,

and psychological connection to the Islamic religion, i.e., its connection to religious mentality, history, and dependency. History here includes periods before and after Islam. The English and the Zionists exploited this situation through applying a 'divide and conquer' policy, and through Zionist gangs exploiting the Prophet's migration in their psychological counter-propaganda against Palestinians. This scenario has repeated itself for decades; the Palestinian, Arab, and Islamic mind refuses to acknowledge the underlying causes of the negative results they've achieved. They deny differences at the scientific level, the need to master sciences and technology, the importance of planning and adhering to set plans, and they deny the advantages of military technical superiority and its ability to influence results. They also reject an international legal role, based on their belief that right is acquired by force, even if this force isn't in their possession. Palestinians seem to fear resorting to international and regional law, fearing exposure of their weakness, or maybe fearing showing this weakness and acknowledging the opponent by filing an international complaint against him. Therefore, we haven't seen any legal effort through international institutions matching what South Africa instigated for the Palestinians after the October 2023 events. We haven't seen legal rounds to apply return and compensation decisions, or demand accountability for massacre and war crime perpetrators before and after the first Nakba. An observer would assume that everyone was waiting for the inevitable divine revenge!

After the Nakba, Arabs, especially in the countries surrounding Palestine, didn't think within new frameworks differing from the past, but insisted on stubbornness and blaming the Palestinians for what happened, abandoning them politically and economically as much as possible. Refugees were housed in miserable camps without integrating them into society or granting them rights, leaving them to their Palestinian nationality. They were even denied any nationality at all, labeled refugees, put under surveillance, and deprived of the freedom to travel or to work. Even those who managed to study in some countries like Lebanon were prevented from working in the Lebanese economy for fear of competing with Lebanese citizens.

The truth is that there was a silent Arab decision aiming to keep the issue alive and circulating ideas seeking solutions. More importantly, whenever a solution was proposed, it was rejected on the grounds that it wouldn't restore the pre-Nakba status! Dozens of solutions were offered but rejected, and Arabs didn't seek preparation for war or peace until after the 1973 October War, which followed the 1967 setback that lost the rest of Palestine plus Israel's occupation of Syrian Golan

and Egyptian Sinai. When Sadat moved towards peace, Arabs officially boycotted him, and the public rejoiced at his assassination by Muslim Brotherhood affiliated groups.

There's nothing preventing respecting refugees and preserving their political status at the same time. But the vengeful Arab mentality insists that the refugee be poor, ignorant, deprived of money, hungry, to facilitate begging for him and about him and loading others with the responsibility. Would an educated, active, and rich Palestinian forget his rights in Palestine? Or would he practically become a useful human being for himself, his surroundings, and his cause? In fact, Syria did create a balance between the rights of its Syrian citizens and the rights of Palestinian refugees there, granting them everything available to a Syrian, while preserving their identity as refugees.

The Arab League conceded the necessity of granting the refugees documentation from the countries they were residing in, but they were special passports confirming their refugee status, which often limited their movement even within the Arab countries themselves.

Eternal Conflicts

Observers and those interested in Palestinian affairs are widely aware of the extent of internal Palestinian conflicts. These conflicts didn't start with the split between Hamas and the Palestinian Authority following Hamas' control of Gaza in 2007, and continue up to and beyond the post-Al-Aqsa Flood battle and its consequences since 2023, while both sides remain unable to unify visions and reach a unified leadership contributing to ending the genocide war. Before this split, the Palestinian scene witnessed a long series of conflicts between armed factions (fida'iyyin), and conflicts dating back to the 1920s, and those conflicts were a direct factor in paving the way for the 1948 Nakba. This situation reflects the reality of Palestinian society and its mental composition, including large disparities between its different classes, between villages and cities, between deep religious tendency and worldly orientations, and between the spread of education and depth of ignorance.

The Zionist movement worked, exploiting circumstances created by the British mandate, to deepen these differences in multiple ways, most notably entrenching the belief that arms are the only tool to achieve goals, leading to armed men dominating the leadership and public submission to them as long as they possess force and arms, with absolute denial of the democracy principle.

When Britain occupied Palestine, the general situation was in line with the Ottoman caliphate's troubled and collapsing circumstances due to its backwardness in all aspects compared to European empires. With Britain's direct entry into the scene, it resorted to differentiating between influential families in Palestine to facilitate its rule. The conflict between the Husayni and Nashashibi families represented the main political division during the British mandate period (1920-1948), where both sides competed for leadership and influence, under the pretext of confronting Zionism and seeking independence.

Haj Amin al-Husayni, Mufti of Jerusalem, represented a more radical nationalist current, while conservative Raghیب al-Nashashibi represented an opposing current leaning towards compromise with the British administration. This conflict reached its peak during the Palestinian armed revolution from 1936 to 1939, where national factions split, and "peace factions", armed and opposed to Husayni emerged, pursuing remnants of revolutionaries, weakening the national movement and

dividing ranks in facing the Zionist challenge This period reveals Britain exploiting these conflicts through their "divide and rule" policy. Haj Amin al-Husayni held the position of Mufti of Jerusalem and headed the Supreme Islamic Council, giving him great influence, while Raghib al-Nashashibi held the position of Jerusalem governor and founded the National Defense Party in opposition to Husayni. The division in leadership led to weakening the national front, paving the way for failure of the general strike and a comprehensive revolution against the mandate and the Zionist project.

In the second half of 1938, armed factions led by Husayni opponents (like Fakhri al-Nashashibi) were established to pursue revolutionaries. Britons exploited this situation and supported it, and the conflict drained Palestinians' energies in internal strife instead of focusing on the greater national goal, contributing later to the loss of Palestine. The situation deteriorated; some leaders sided with Britons and Zionists, leading some tribal youth to participate in battles against Palestinians, and some northern villages even asked Zionists for protection! Following that, the Palestinian national movement split into two main blocs: "Council members", supporters of al-Husayni and Haj Amin's leadership of the Supreme Islamic Council; and "opponents", supporters of al-Nashashibi opposing Husayni and the Islamic Council. The fire of competition and conflict over political leadership between the two sides ignited, extending to all aspects of political, cultural, and social life in Palestine, and the conflict reached a point that pushed some Arab political figures to intervene.

One Arab writer wrote in "Al-Jam'iya al-Arabiya" newspaper (a daily political newspaper, first published in Jerusalem on January 20th, 1927, founded by Munif al-Husayni, one of the national and literary movement pioneers, who followed the nationalist tendency and was close to council members (Haj Amin al-Husayni's party). The newspaper emphasized its national vision from the first issue, confirming it wouldn't be affiliated with a party or person but existed to serve the homeland, and wouldn't engage in mudslinging but follow integrity and open its heart to everyone):

"If my sincere Arab word, which has never deviated from its authenticity, has any impact, the most I wish is that this impact contributes to unity, indeed to the strength inherent in unity.

But if Husaynis or Nashashibis or Touqanis (Touqan family) or Abd-e-Hadis (Abd al-Hadi family), or others from known Palestinian families, see in parties only

those that promote them and strengthen their name only, and see in the Arab League only a family institution and personal interest, it's better for them to join the Zionist party and send their children to the Hebrew University on Mount Olive.

Husaynis say Nashashibis appease Zionists and bargain with them over national rights, and Nashashibis say the same about Husaynis, and I don't believe - and don't want to believe - either statement.

I see it as the nation's duty to reject these two leaderships and form a new leadership from sound elements in both parties."

But, after they competed for decades while Zionists dug, in plain sight and hearing, the foundations of their state and undermined the foundations of Palestine's state, can their feudal or religious mentality, unite and build a single national leadership, sacrificing their personal interests for higher interests? History proves the opposite, and still says that with this mentality, and without commitment to democracy and embracing science and respecting law, it's impossible to agree on leadership, and every ignoramus or intruder will think himself qualified for leadership, especially if he possesses some arms and fighters to carry them. Therefore, the tragedy continued and grew and still rolls on.

Events before and after the 1936 revolution resemble events before and after the 1987 stone intifada; after the failure of the armed revolution attempt led by Sheikh Izz al-Din al-Qassam, his martyrdom, and the dispersion of armed men who joined him, and with the deepening and expansion of the British mandate in encouraging immigration and Judaizing Palestine, the public called for and declared a general strike, accompanied by disobedience and acts of resistance to the British and attacks on Jews. This event received wide popular participation and support; the mandate turned to Arab governments to calm the situation, and those governments started calling on the Palestinian people to calm down and be prudent, convincing them that friendly Britain had given promises and would fulfill them, would limit immigration and achieve independence.

Half a century later, the stone intifada against Israeli military occupation came as a spontaneous popular reaction, after Palestinian armed action had failed to achieve any liberation, and after the elimination of any Palestinian military institution and its deportation from its last positions in Lebanon, distancing it from all Palestine's natural borders and confining it to Arab deserts with American support and Arab negligence. In addition, the revolution leadership was under financial and political

siege, which pushed Palestinian people in Palestine, starting from Gaza, to resort to spontaneous peaceful action... the children's stone intifada.

The general strike continued from April to October 1936, and the revolution consisted of two distinct phases: the first was mainly directed by the Arab Higher Committee that adopted the strike and its path as political protest. Then came the second phase when British civil administration pretended understanding, then resorted to offering political concessions and hinted to Iraq, Saudi, Transjordan, and Yemeni rulers that it would give the Palestinians redress while, at the same time, threatening the implementation of martial law in Palestine.

In late 1937, a violent resistance movement developed led by peasants who countered British repression, and the revolution increasingly targeted British forces. During this phase, the British army and Palestine police force brutally suppressed the movement, using repressive measures aiming to intimidate the Arab population and undermine popular support for revolution. Meanwhile, the Nashashibi clan played a more important role, as its party (National Defense) withdrew from the Arab Higher Committee supporting popular rebellion, and stood with the British, sending peace factions in coordination with the British army against national and jihadist Arab faction units. According to official British figures covering the entire revolution period from 1936 to 1939, the British army and the Palestine police force killed over 2,000 Palestinians in fighting, executed 108 of them, while 961 people were killed due to what they described as "terrorist gang activities". In an analysis of British statistics, Dr. Walid Khalidi estimates 19,792 Palestinian casualties, including 5,032 killed: 3,832 killed by Britons and 1,200 killed due to "terrorism", and 14,760 wounded. This means over ten percent of the adult male Palestinian Arab population aged 20-60 were killed, wounded, imprisoned, or exiled during that revolution. Estimates of (Palestinian Jews) killed range between 91 and several hundred only.

In turn, the stone intifada after half a century brought a radical shift in the global view of Zionism and Israel...

Due to years of exclusion and siege imposed on the Palestinian leadership represented by the PLO, ideas of accepting compromise solutions with Israel started appearing. Throughout the 1960s until after Israel's invasion of Lebanon and expulsion of Palestinians from it, PLO factions rejected peace projects. They even attacked leader Gamal Abdel Nasser for accepting ceasefire within the

Rogers' plan, which the president aimed to exploit to deploy anti-aircraft missiles on the Suez Canal.

No criticism or blame was directed at those who rejected the 1947 partition project, and before that the idea of a joint state. It appeared that the revolution leadership, after the intifada, with feelings of the weakening of self-capabilities for military liberation, and feelings of betrayal by Arab brothers and their abandonment of the revolutionaries during the Beirut siege (and the preceding killing of revolutionaries and civilians, and everyone's acknowledgment that to that point the number of Palestinians killed by Arabs exceeded those dead by Israeli war acts), the Palestinian leadership, represented by the leader of the Fatah movement, Yasser Arafat, leaned towards accepting compromise principles. But this time, the basis was the 1967 borders, aiming to establish a state on a quarter of natural Palestine, and achieving peaceful coexistence with Israel, in return for Arab and Islamic recognition of the Jewish state. It was clear that the PLO favored leadership over the establishment of a state, as they neglected the area of democracy and held no elections.

Disaster occurred when the Islamic movement, which resorted to armed violence during the peaceful stone intifada, and became increasingly violent with the progress of peace plans and steps, objected, and renewed the slogan "Palestine from the river to the sea". The Islamic movement foiled peace in many ways, and returned the issue to the first Nakba point, where the surrounding Arabs abandoned the Palestinians, followed by resounding military defeat for those who supported (or were supported by) the Islamic resistance, and the occurrence of more disastrous Nakba events in the Gaza Strip, returning people to living in tents and primitive conditions.

In short, instead of the British mandate, an American mandate appeared, and everyone wished for President Trump to have mercy on Palestinians and the Arabs. Arab leaders started announcing their delight that the American leader asked them to join the peace council he created, leads and appoints members to, and they're happy with this appointment indicating the leader's satisfaction with them and acceptance of their leadership of their own peoples.

After the destruction of the Gaza Strip, Israel escalated and turned to annexing the West Bank, declaring it publicly, and Arab policy evolved from chasing UN resolutions to collective statements calling on the "international community to assume its legal and moral responsibilities and obligate Israel to stop its dangerous

escalation in the occupied West Bank and its officials' inflammatory statements"... Statements like these are issued by Arab countries that have political and economic relations with Israel but are asking the international community to act!! This is the low point to which the Islamic movement has brought us, not recognizing military defeat and not wanting to hand over the flag... And this is the humiliation produced by Arab politics towards the Palestinian issue, after a century of participating in producing successive disasters.

Wouldn't it have been more appropriate, for example, to think of coexistence before 1948, and benefit from Jews who would have accepted the Arab majority if we had followed the path of a joint state or accepted the partition decision, or later accepted a quarter of Palestine (Oslo agreements) to start from there quietly, with science and long-term plans? Obstinacy, supported by ignorance, was and still forms the basis of Palestinian thinking, with no objectivity, and unfortunately, nihilistic dependency is deeply rooted in most of the public, which feeds and is fed off political-religious mirage visions.

Over the 75 years between the first and second Nakbas, about fifty projects were internationally proposed to solve the refugee issue, including return of some, compensation, and settlement in Palestine and its surroundings. All these projects were completely rejected, responding to a vision not based on reality and the time wasn't utilized to improve conditions that could lead to better solutions. As a result, millions of people live in waiting, nihilism, dependency, and misery. with wishful thinking, and painful memories.

The Palestinian refugee issue remains, pending solutions negatively affecting their livelihood and future. This issue is unique globally and perhaps historically; usually solutions exist for tragedies leading to displacement and population transfer. Examples, whether before or after World War II, include the Jewish experience; when they were deported, expelled, or fled from Nazi Germany to all corners of the world, they were absorbed and integrated in Europe, US, Canada, and Australia.

When the Germany Empire was defeated, its successors were obligated to pay compensation and restore rights to those wanting them... Had they remained refugees, wandering, waiting for solutions wherever they settled, they wouldn't have achieved their rights. Nazism led to the displacement and expulsion of about twelve million Germans from their homeland in the east, and about two million of them died before reaching Eastern Europe; survivors were later integrated.

When the Soviets occupied Eastern Germany, a large section of the population migrated, rejecting the Soviet system and settled in the western part. After the Soviets' defeat and Germany's reunification, the displaced had their rights restored. West Germany treated these migrants positively and benefited from their capabilities, facilitating the restoration of their rights.

In a related context, with the British Empire's collapse in India in 1947, over ten million Hindus, Muslims, and Sikhs paid the partition price with violent expulsion from their homes to other side, where many died during horror journeys across the Indian subcontinent. However, survivors managed to integrate into new societies in India, Pakistan, and later Bangladesh, and most now feel at home where they found a new homeland.

Defeated nationalists in the Chinese civil war still dream of returning to mainland China, while living safely in Taiwan; they haven't abandoned their rights, and aren't treated as refugees. Similarly, Tibetan refugees settled on other side of the Himalayas, i.e., the Indian side of their original mountains.

Exiled Cubans settled in rich America, consider Florida home, but claim restoration to Cuba, participate in governance and institutions, and support counter-revolution in their ancestors' original homeland.

Three million Afghans, fleeing Soviet invasion, lived and still live with neighbors in Islamic countries, better than those countries' residents, thanks to international aid, and have the option to return under Taliban rule or stay abroad, waiting for their country's situation to change.

We shouldn't forget Kurds and Armenians, subjected to persecution, massacres, and expulsion by foreign regimes for centuries, but living their lives where they are without abandoning their rights and still seeking to achieve them.

The lesson learned here, and in other contexts and times, is that helping refugees and integrating them contributes to bringing change and addressing imbalance, thus restoring assets and rights. The opposite is true of course; a strong, knowledgeable, educated, and productive person is better than a weak, ignorant, poor, and begging person. The portrayal of the Palestinian as a destitute refugee, waiting to have his rights restored, wasn't and won't be the right solution.

Among projects proposed after the Nakba to settle Palestinian refugees and rejected by the Arabs, was then US Secretary of State McGhee's plan. McGhee traveled to Beirut 1949 to explain his plan, considered one of the earliest proposals

to settle Palestinians where they are. This plan was proposed by the US through the International Conciliation Commission established by General Assembly resolution 194 to protect Palestinian refugees, and the commission consisted of representatives from US, France, and Turkey. The plan was based on establishing an agency, comprising France, Britain, and the US, tasked with providing necessary aid to create development projects aiming to contain refugees in countries able to absorb them. The McGhee plan included returning a hundred thousand refugees (about 10% of refugees approximately) to the occupied territories, plus settling remaining refugees, not wanting to return, in other countries. The US declared readiness to bear the financial cost. In return, Israel demanded full recognition from one side, and resettling the hundred thousand refugees in areas conforming to its interests on the other side, i.e., they did not accept the restoration of the status quo before that year, but did agree to settling them in different areas inside then-occupied Palestine. The plan was abandoned, after widespread rejection by the Arabs, but no specific reason was identified. Maybe psychological, religious, and national factors worked against accepting a fait accompli, or the shame involved in accepting solutions and procedures worse than those that had been rejected before (partition and an Arab state on half of Palestine).

After that, projects focused on settling refugees where they currently were, some offered incentives to Arab countries, while others exerted pressure to end the refugee issue through in country settlement and improving their conditions. But all these proposals met Arab rejection. Often, the Israelis kept silent and refrained from commenting, waiting for a guaranteed Arab rejection that exempted them from embarrassment.

In 1955, US Secretary of State John Foster Dulles gave a speech following his Middle East tour, addressing the US administration's vision of settlement in the region. Dulles raised the refugee issue as one of most important issues, proposing returning some to Palestine where possible, compensating others by Israel, and settling the remaining number in Arab countries on lands reclaimed by US-funded projects. This project met with opposition from Arab countries like Egypt and Syria.

In 1957, US President John Kennedy gave a speech during a National Conference of Christians and Jews, reflecting some of his perceptions of the Arab-Israeli conflict in the Middle East. Regarding Palestinian refugees, he proposed returning

those wanting to live under Israeli rule under the "faithful friendship" slogan, compensating those not wanting to return, and settling the remainder through establishing economic projects in the region. For refugees to return to live under Israeli authority was a basic point of rejection for the Arabs.

Projects focusing on compensation and settlement varied, and Arab countries like Syria, Iraq, and Egypt accepted American proposals for settlement, but these projects were aborted as soon as they were revealed.

Solutions evolved with entry into a peace phase after the Oslo agreement (1993), and centered around specific numbers of refugees who would return to 1948 areas, and housing larger numbers in areas designated for the Palestinian state. During negotiations, decisions on some main issues like water, refugees, and borders were postponed, and naturally, everything failed when negotiations stopped and armed operations escalated, threatening to displace two million Palestinians from Gaza started, plus other numbers from the West Bank, with Israelis starting to demolish camps and deport their residents, practically proceeding to annex it to Israel.

Arab rejection of compromise solutions regarding the refugee issue doesn't necessarily mean Israeli acceptance or welcome. The Israeli goal was clear, and might have been modifiable before the Nakba by international action, especially with growing thinking regarding modification of the partition decision.

In spring 1948, Arab countries' forces were generally better than Zionist forces in the Palestinian arena, but the situation had reversed completely in favor of Zionist forces by the fall. Jewish units soon managed to launch their attack; by November 1948, six months after Israel's declaration and continuation of war, those forces occupied the entire north and Palestinian coast, and by January 1949, the entire Negev. The main reason for this shift was the presence of Swedish Count Bernadotte, UN envoy, end of May 1948, where he achieved a quick truce enabling Jews to gather arms through wide global Zionist activity to rescue the deteriorating Jewish forces' situation in Palestine. Arabs agreed to that truce after being informed of initiatives the Count would propose. Bernadotte proposed again a federal union, granting Arab Palestine (about 80 percent of the country united with Transjordan) and Jewish Palestine as in the partition plan, but without the Negev desert, and the plan was strongly rejected by all concerned parties.

On September 16th, Bernadotte presented a second plan, envisioning a fully independent Jewish state - but again without the Negev - controlling about 20 percent only of Palestine's total lands. In addition, displaced Palestinians should be

allowed to return to their birthplace, in line with the partition decision which did not speak of differentiating between Arabs and Jews. These proposals came after Israel's state declaration as an attempt by Count Bernadotte to improve the partition decision, especially since Israeli forces hadn't at that time occupied the partition area designated for Jews. Thus, Bernadotte's efforts aimed to end the war and modify the partition borders by removing the Negev desert area and annexing it to the Arab section. The Jews rejected this idea, but accepted the truce proposal to break the arms crisis and update their military plans. Israeli Foreign Minister Sharett criticized Count Bernadotte and the UN delegation, accusing them of bias against Israel. On the day after this criticism, September 17th, Bernadotte set out to travel to the UN. Israelis wearing Haganah uniforms stopped the jeep carrying him and the UN envoy to Jerusalem, French Colonel André Serot, at a checkpoint on a road near Jerusalem, and Bernadotte and the Frenchman were shot. Arms arrived during the truce, and Israeli attacks and Arab retreats continued until the situation stabilized with Jordan controlling what became the West Bank, Egypt controlling the Gaza Strip, and the 1949 truce was concluded with the drawing of ceasefire borders between Israel and its neighbors.

A large part of the Arab Palestinians, 800,000 people, lost their homes. Although the UN later demanded their return, after Israel had rejected Bernadotte's proposals in the last stage, Israeli Foreign Minister Sharett clarified to the UN in 1950 that "refugee return can't be approved because that means Israel's suicide". Ben-Gurion affirmed nothing would be given back and no one would return, saying: "No foot on the ground, no single refugee". Eventually, Golda Meir declared the displaced simply didn't exist, and there was no such thing as a Palestinian people, adding: "It wasn't as if there were Palestinian people in Palestine, considering themselves as such, and we expelled them and took their land. They don't exist!"

In return and with no plan, Arabs sent their Jews to Israel; about half a million Eastern Jews came, including a quarter million from Morocco, 125,000 from Iraq, about 50,000 from both Tunisia and Yemen, and about 40,000 from Egypt. Immediately after the establishment of the Israeli state about a million Jews from around the world arrived.

Israel seized Palestinian properties and enacted laws to seize everything on the grounds the owners were absent and would not be returning. In addition, Israel granted Israeli nationality to every arriving Jew, with additional facilities and broad global campaigns to attract Jews from around the world, while preventing

Palestinians from entering the country. The situation of those remaining there, where they were subject to emergency law and deprived of any rights or equality with Jewish citizens did not bear mention.

"And You Became Like Them"

This is how Britain created the Palestine tragedy, and our Arab rulers, being subordinate to them, participated in its making. And thus, the Germans concluded European racism towards Jews by pushing them towards Palestine, abandoning any responsibility for the crime they were committing against Palestine; rather, they turned from killers of Jews to helpers of those killing Arabs... And thus again, Moscow adopted the Israeli cause, aiming to establish a socialist Jewish state. And in its turn, Washington hesitated, then sided with the Jews to satisfy its local electoral interests. And the Arabs continued preserving refugee status for Palestinians, even suffocating them. By a combination of these factors, a Jewish state capable of life and expansion was established, and Palestinian progress and societal growth were blocked.

The Jewish author, Eric Fried, wrote bitter words in his book "Hear O Israel", 1974 saying: "Your longing was to become like the European peoples who killed you. And now you've become like them". (Fried, 1921-1988, a prominent Austrian Jewish writer, who settled in England after fleeing Nazism, was considered one of post-World War II's prominent figures of German literature.)

Jewish writer Moshe Menuhin also complained that "there's much hypocrisy, brutality, and aggression at the core of Zionist political thought". Thus, Israel became a military state whose surroundings don't enjoy peace.

"The oppressed became oppressors", and "the people of the book, the enlightened, and victims of Russian massacres and Nazi genocide, closed their eyes and ears to the Palestinian misery they made". Historian Ilan Pappé is among prominent new Israeli historians, author of dozens of books about Palestine and its national cause. During a seminar held in Nazareth jointly with historian Johnny Mansour, after two years of the genocidal Gaza war, Pappé stated: "We need a Palestinian national liberation movement, and the solution is clear: Palestinians should join global anti-Israel forces, and accuse Israel of ethnic cleansing and genocide. And address Europe saying: this is a Western state, and this is the only democracy you support. Europeans, look at what a dark state you've created with your own hands". He added that Palestinians inside can also join this global struggle, because already they stand accused as a "fifth column". Pappé pointed out that there's no difference between the Netanyahu government and any coming government like the Bennett-

Labid government of change, because the world has "realized the essence of truth, that Israel is a racist state regardless of its government", and mentioned that the "Judea state" (settlements) today control all of Israel's institutions, only the judicial system remains, adding: "If "Judea state" continues, it'll be hard for the world to absorb and accept it. We're four or five years away from millions returning to demonstrate in the streets against Israel as part of the struggle for humanity, the globe, and international order".

A few Jews and Zionists supported the idea of coexistence with Arab residents and the joint pursuit of a better future, but their leadership, especially from the military, spread hatred and acted with extreme aggression, even turning against Britain itself; in March 1944, Jewish terrorists killed six British police officers, and in November of the same year, two Stern gang members shot at British Colonial Minister Lord Moyne in Cairo. This incident angered even their old Zionist ally Winston Churchill, who stated: "If our Zionism dreams are to be dissipated in the smoke of assassins, and if our efforts for its future are to lead to the emergence of a new gang rivalling the Nazis, I and my like must carefully reconsider a position we've long and insistently supported". However, Churchill and his like among Britons didn't reconsider their position, and continued betraying humanitarian principles and the terms of the mandate also.

Journalist and former leftist MK Uri Avnery wrote about that period: "Expelling the Arab civilian population became the main goal of the Zionist war".

Sometimes, Jewish soldiers refused to implement inhumane orders from the Zionist leadership; after being forced to leave Europe, they didn't want to become oppressors themselves.

Rabin describes in the original text of his memoirs how a large part of the military regiment refused orders initially when Ben-Gurion ordered them to forcibly expel over 50,000 Arabs from the Lod-Ramla area. But the leadership eventually managed to convince the soldiers of this measure's "necessity".

After the 1982 Lebanon invasion and the Sabra and Shatila massacre, a slight and temporary shift occurred among some officers and soldiers who refused the violent policies of Begin and Sharon at the time; they didn't want an aggressive militaristic Israel that continues to wage new wars until it loses a war that would be its end.

Under Netanyahu and the settler-backed right-wing control, extremism returned with violence and reckless racism, driven by close ties with US administrations,

especially Trump's. Officials and people drink coffee and cake while massacres and genocide happen kilometers away, genocide they support and implement. Politicians make boastful statements belittling war crimes, like "there are no innocent people in Gaza" or describing residents as "human animals". These statements are known, heard, and seen by all, without moving the Israeli public whose parents and grandparents suffered persecution, and established their entity with global support to avoid repetition of those events.

Has Israel benefited from its actions and racist vision? Was this the only way? Does Israeli policy harm sovereignty or global democracy politically? The initial and brief answers are: Yes, Israel benefited from stealing land and resources without compensation, but this wasn't the only way to benefit. Yes, Israel harms itself and the principles of democracy in the region and the world, negatively impacting the principle of sovereignty.

What we see in early 2026 is a direct reflection of Israel's style, the global silence about it, and the West's continued support. This is evident in US administration practices, and Trump's embodiment of the emperor controlling the world, especially regarding Iran, Venezuela, and of course, Greenland! Trump expressed the desire to acquire Greenland to derive economic gain from its resources. Politically, Greenland is part of Denmark, a NATO member led and overseen by Washington. The US has all rights to exploit Greenland militarily and strategically if that were Trump's real goal; he's previously demanded the annexation of Canada, owning Gaza, the Panama Canal, and the Gulf of Mexico, controlling Venezuela, Cuba, changing Iran's regime, and imposing economic sanctions on any opposing party, including allies like Western Europe.

European reactions to the Greenland claims were verbal with quasi-military signals about defending it. Macron renewed opposition to Trump's view, stating at the January 2026 Davos forum "the time isn't right for new colonialism or imperialism". Other European leaders followed, condemning the US vision, with Canada's PM clearly considering it "new colonialism".

The European Parliament condemned Trump's statements, calling them "a blatant challenge to international law, the UN charter, and the sovereignty and unity of a NATO ally's territory". But isn't Israel a colonial state established by Europe, which is now protesting Trump's claims on a Danish colony where indigenous people suffered genocide? What about France ruling over a dozen territories globally, like Guadeloupe and Mayotte? These were officially removed from

"colonial" classification to become "French provinces" part of the EU, isn't this "new colonialism"

It's not just France; many European powers now declaring opposition to colonialism carry a bloody legacy of brutality and exploitation worldwide. These powers supported Zionist settlement and still support Israel in exterminating Palestinians, despite all international bodies' decisions. From Africa to Asia, the Middle East, and beyond, hardly a spot hasn't been touched by European plundering and destruction, or hasn't been defiled by enslavement, mass killing, and other atrocities. Britain terrorized every place under its influence. King Leopold II of Belgium oversaw the killing of nearly 10 million Congolese starting in 1885, when he declared the "Congo Free State" his personal property. In 2022, Belgium's King Philippe expressed "deepest regret" for colonial-era atrocities without any official apology. One article noted life in the Congo Free State was characterized by "villages failing to collect rubber quotas being forced to present severed hands instead". No European state has paid reparations to countries regressed to the lowest development levels due to colonialism.

Regarding Iran, US and Western European policy was never in the Iranian people's favor. Whenever this people approached a new stage, serving their interests, the West intervened to support dictatorships tied to it. This policy deepened after Iran's oil discovery, as the old and new colonial West sought to dominate Iran for two main reasons: continued absorption of the country's riches, and preventing Iran from restoring its imperial strength to compete with West in the region, especially as its Arab neighbors supply the West with cheap energy and invest their money there.

Under the Shah, Iran was Washington's subordinate and Israel's friend. After the Islamic revolution and Khomeini's and the mullahs' rule since 1979, Iran turned to the opposite; sought ideological expansion among neighbors, declared hostility to Israel, and proceeded with self-armament programs due to Western boycott. It also sought to develop its nuclear energy declaring it doesn't aim to make a nuclear bomb, but no one believed it, especially as its rulers raise the "death to Israel" slogan while struggling to achieve self-sufficiency.

With escalating Israeli attacks on Iran's allies post-October 2023, and events developing into mutual air and missile strikes between Israel and Iran, Washington joined Israel in attacks, and Western Europe supported aggression on Iran. These positions unified and continued siege on the Iranian people through blocking oil

exports and preventing industrial progress, serving the Israeli vision and demands, aiming to strip Iran of arms and ideology and neutralize it. This stance resembles the West and Arabs uniting to destroy Iraq, serving the Israeli vision and protecting this entity's future, based on destroying the Palestinian people. In February 2026, the vision crystallized when negotiations between Washington and Tehran resumed in Muscat, Oman, regarding the nuclear file. Netanyahu rushed to Washington to promote his vision, requiring negotiation of other issues, specifying four points he demanded President Trump commit to, as if Netanyahu determines the course of a President elected by the American people. Israel doesn't just demand stopping Iran's uranium enrichment; it seeks complete dismantling of all nuclear infrastructure and shipping all enriched uranium stocks out of Iranian territory. In an escalating demand, Israel pressures to limit Iran's ballistic missiles range to maximum 300km, practically stripping Tehran of the ability to hit Israel, without any corresponding Israeli concession. As its third condition, Israel insists any US-Iran agreement include an explicit clause preventing Tehran from arming or funding what Israel considers "its regional arms", specifically Hezbollah in Lebanon and the Houthis in Yemen, especially as the Hamas danger has receded. Netanyahu also demands Trump impose sudden international inspection oversight on Iranian military and civilian sites. In clear terms, Israel seeks to dominate Iran and the Arab region, or sabotage the negotiations to ensure US forces remain heavily in the Middle East, and Israel isn't left alone fearing any big surprise retaliation threatening its existence!

Meanwhile, massacres continue with American and Western arms in the Gaza Strip under the "ceasefire" banner declared with US mediation, while planning, as per Trump's vision, to manage Gaza via a so-called "Peace Council" headed by Trump himself. This council includes Israeli PM Netanyahu, who has become one of the era's genocide symbols, portending "new colonialism" of most malicious and cunning type.

In Davos, Switzerland, in January 2026, surrounded by many minor global leaders, Trump signed an agreement establishing the Peace Council he'll personally lead indefinitely, even post-presidency. Trump has individual veto right, and controls funds allocations, reaching apparently \$1 billion per seat in this council. Palestinians or Gaza weren't mentioned, the right of return or compensation for disasters since the first Nakba to the ongoing Nakba since October 2023 weren't referred to, nor the right to self-determination. The text didn't even confirm the Peace Council focuses on Gaza and Palestine issues specifically, raising the belief

that Trump aims to make this council an alternative to the UN establishment which the president clearly dislikes.

A week after 19 states signed up to join the Peace Council, New Zealand refused the invitation, joining the limited list of states rejecting the US offer. The New Zealand Foreign Minister put his finger on the wound stating: "NZ won't join the council in its current form, but will monitor developments". He added: "Several countries, especially in the region, expressed readiness to contribute to the council's role on Gaza. NZ wouldn't add much extra value to that". The Minister affirmed his country's commitment to the UN, calling for the Peace Council work to "complement and be consistent with the UN charter", noting "it's a new body, and we need clarifications on this and other issues regarding its scope, now and future".

As for the EU, it set conditions before the states' approval to join the "Peace Council". EU foreign policy chief Kaja Kallas stated: European leaders may join the council "if its focus is limited to the Gaza Strip". Before an EU leaders' summit to discuss the council launch she said: "We want to work towards peace in the Middle East, and want this Peace Council's work limited to UN Security Council resolutions as is appropriate.

While many states expressed reservations, only a few explicitly rejected the invitation, including France, Norway, Croatia, while Arab state media cheered the invitation to president, king, or prince to participate, considering it American confidence in their country's good management.

Trump confirms he's Council president for life, granted himself monarch-like powers, where he can't be removed from council except if he resigns or is deemed unfit by unanimous vote, which is hard to get. He can appoint new council members, and can veto any council decision. This 'Peace Council' is a hierarchical structure: under Trump is the so-called 'Founding Executive Council', including figures like Jared Kushner and Marco Rubio. Below this is the 'Gaza Executive Council', supposed to consist of Palestinian technocrats tasked with implementing policies. Similar executive councils are likely to be formed for other countries like Venezuela, whose elected president was publicly and boastfully abducted by Trump, Iran is facing the threat of fleet mobilization to force its leadership to surrender to Israeli-American terms, and any other country intended to be dismantled and rebuilt may be submitted to the same format. All this is being done

with Western approval, and participation in the case of Palestine, Venezuela, Iran, Cuba – the same West protesting Trump's attempt to buy a Danish colony!

The key observation here is that the Peace Council with technocratic administrations possibly emerging from it, as in the case of the Gaza Council, means legitimizing governance from external sources rather than via popular election or referendum. In other words, international (specifically American-Israeli) approval and acceptance have precedence over the national will. Thus, governance turns from a political right to a privilege granted to those complying with specific terms under whatever circumstances.

As for Gaza's sovereignty over its own security, the founding document mentions it as a deferred merit-based reward not an inherent right, tying Palestinians' border management to a strong international security presence ensuring Gaza remains "demilitarized". This means security, the essence of national sovereignty, practically remains outside Palestinian control, and will be put under permanent trusteeship with the pretext of ensuring stability. This indicates what's being plotted isn't the pursuit of a Palestinian state, nor linking the Gaza Strip to the West Bank politically, but managing the Strip under vague sovereignty practically and executively tied security-wise to Israel and President Trump. The goal is dismantling the Palestinian issue into separate administrative files, where each area becomes a "special case" requiring transitional management under Peace Council supervision, instead of e.g., being part of a single state under occupation. This isn't the pursuit of a two-state solution, that ended under Netanyahu and was buried on October 7th, 2023, nor is reforming Ramallah's Palestinian Authority on the agenda.

Western and Arab leaders responding warmly to Trump's invitation to join the council don't consider the council's goals or the consequences of their involvement, nor do they realize Gaza's people's suffering is being exploited to push through arrangements possibly determining their fate for decades. A person seeking a tent isn't asked their opinion on the nature of the political system, but a system imposed in a moment of weakness may become a permanent life framework, where talk of democracy, elections, peace, institution-building, and education of the population disappears. Western governments approving a two-state solution and believing in the Palestinian people's right to self-determination are ignoring that international law requires any transitional phase under international supervision to be short and goal-specific, enabling the people to achieve their full destiny. But what's proposed

for Gaza resembles undeclared "modern trusteeship" models; i.e., local administration in form and actual external control in essence, with sovereignty deferred indefinitely. Thus, the continuation of an international presence becomes both goal and ceiling for people stripped of arms and will, having to start from scratch, under strict oversight, to rebuild themselves while preserving the vision of ultimately possessing rights in their own homeland.

This miserable situation has resulted from the reckless involvement and participation of the fundamentalist Islamic movement bringing us to this impasse, till the residents' aspiration ceiling has become obtaining a tent, after being on the threshold of reclaiming statehood. Regardless of the fundamentalist movement's role, how can such a nihilistic outcome occur with international participation? In other words, how is the state president of a democracy allowed to turn dictator, with US state institutions unable to correct course or remove him? The answer lies in this being tied to Palestine, Zionism, and the deepening response to Israeli plans.

How?

The Antithesis of Democracy

The key lies in lobby groups in general, and the Zionist lobby in particular, which controls US administrations, and executive and legislative institutions. It controls anyone needing election and votes to gain a position, whether to the presidency, House and Senate, state governors, or judiciary. The lobby controls the media, influencing voters, and provides funds via legitimate channels, financing candidates' campaigns. In the US, the successful candidate has a huge election budget and supportive media, both subject to Zionist lobby control. That's why President Trump succeeded within pre-agreed terms and promises that paid for his campaign. Also, majority representatives from both parties fall under the lobby's will, making it difficult to form a large majority opposing the president or removing him if he moves against democracy, laws, ethics, or the interests of the country and its allies; the lobby ensures his continuation in power. Besides, the competition between Democratic and Republican parties limits the chances of finding a majority from both sides against the president, regardless of any common interest, not to mention the Zionist lobby's dominance over majority representatives from both parties. This situation puts the president under the lobby's guardianship, besides the threat of blackmail from files collected on sex and corruption, pertaining to the elected candidate, his financiers or their intermediaries, which they know may be resorted to if the president opposes their vision. For the president, this means that he can do whatever he wants, as long as the lobby is pleased with him and his Israel policy, He can serve Israel as required, serve himself and his vision and personal interests, and enjoy political freedom globally as desired. Hence, we repeatedly see Israeli PM's bullying US presidents or courting them, especially Trump who has come into conflict with almost everyone, imposed tariffs on neighbors, allies, friends, and foes, but refrained from touching Israel or thinking of easing support.

To clarify, the idea of lobby groups emerged as an organized political tool influencing government decisions. These practices evolved from informal activities in parliamentary corridors during the 19th century to complex professional organizations in the 20th and 21st century. There are specialized lobbies in several fields like personal arms sales in the US, agricultural and industrial lobbies, or ethnic lobbies. But the Zionist lobby is by far the most famous and influential; it was established in the US in 1953, responding to a need to increase American

support for Israel, especially after the Qibya massacre and the imperative to cover it up. (The Qibya massacre occurred mid-October 1953, when Israeli soldiers, led by Ariel Sharon, attacked Qibya village in the Jordanian-controlled West Bank. The attack killed 69 Palestinians, many of whom were hiding in their homes as they were blown up. The UN Security Council condemned the operation in resolution 101, and US aid to Israel was temporarily suspended as a result.) In 1954, the US State Department requested a unifying Jewish electoral voice in the US for both parties' benefit and at democracy's expense.

After Israel's 1967 military victory, Washington realized additional potential benefits, enhancing American compliance and increasing the response to this lobby.

However, a Zionist lobby appeared earlier in Europe, where its roots began with the Zionist movement founded by Theodor Herzl in 1897, seeking to rally international support for a Jewish national home. This lobby's first nucleus started in Britain before the 1917 Balfour Declaration, and continued exerting political and academic pressure.

The basic logical conclusion is that had the West not engaged in the worst of colonial methods, the world would not have reached this impasse. If every colonizer at least apologized for its actions and sought to repair damage instead of clinging to racist ideas, the world wouldn't have reached this fateful stage. If the West hadn't created Israel for its own selfish interests at the Palestinian people and Arab region's expense, the Zionist lobby wouldn't exist, producing these harmful results for all nations, whereby the outcome in the US is the worst, with Trump imposing himself as a dictator domestically and an emperor globally, due to factors crystallized from Zionist lobby policies. The West could have created a different Israel to compensate for its failure and the end of the colonial era, but it created it to continue colonialism in its ugly and failed form. It could have contributed to a humane and progressive Israel, coexisting with its surroundings and dominating by virtue of its economic success, but they tolerated terrorist gangs and supported Israel as a bloody state, which succeeded in exercising influence over Western democracies' individual and joint decisions through increasingly powerful lobbies, leading to their ruin and to the control of any US president's steps and fate.

The result they're ignoring is that they have fallen into their own trap, but their arrogance will prevent them admitting it. It is true that the Palestinian is the primary loser, but he stands as humanity's defender against tyranny and darkness.

The Arab region, politically and economically attached to the West, is the second loser due to the backwardness imposed on its people for Israel-related reasons. The third loser is Western public opinion, which has been marginalized into the service of Israel, and all intellectuals and free people unjustly silenced and pursued and damaged in their professions by Zionist lobbies. Western democracy, despite parliamentary representation, is a major loser since becoming unable to speak a truth that is unacceptable to Israel, its lobby or its protector and tool in the White House. Democracy ends when ethics are abandoned to the pursuit of mere personal and sectarian interests.

There are similar stages in modern human history where an honest, wise, and innocent public was subjected to negative events and changes with eyes wide open. The clearest example is the Roman Empire rule in Europe and the Mediterranean basin, in a way close to contemporary democracy, but which then permitted Caesar to become emperor during his term as ruler, although, nominally the senate councils were still available for opinion and counsel. But the emperor soon practiced dictatorship to an extreme degree, like Trump now, lying and fabricating positions causing external wars and internal dictatorship. Some Roman emperors' lives were characterized by weirdness and crazy acts including installing horses in political positions, burning cities, and claiming divinity, most prominently Caligula installed his horse as consul, Nero is said to have sung during the great Roman fire and killed his mother, Commodus fought as a gladiator, all reflecting the political corruption and personal extremism of these emperors and the statesmen supporting them. Yes, there were some brave contemporaries, including one who asked his fellow congressmen: When will we be served barley meal? When the emperor heard, he ordered them fed horse food and forced them eat it, and they did. Caligula's madness included forcing the senate to watch him having sex with his wife, and choosing from among their wives as he liked, till some honorable commanders rebelled and killed him together with his wife and daughter. Many removed the heads from the statues of Gods and installed their own without anyone daring to object. This doesn't differ much from Trump's self-glorification, where state leaders smile at him and there are few objections from the House, Senate, or judicial system.

When Trump issued an executive order declaring "national emergency" on Cuba, justifying it with what he considered an unusual and extraordinary threat from the Havana government to US national security and foreign policy, he accused Cuba of supporting Russia, China, Iran, and terrorist groups and suppressing freedoms!

Thus, Cuba should be embargoed and any state dealing with it economically punished. In other words, he accuses half the world, including nuclear states, of evil, but punishes Cuba due to its relation with China and Russia. Trump's congress supports this, thanks to the Cuban lobby, and in this the congress doesn't differ much from a Roman emperor's senate; whoever aligns with Trump gets his support.

The injustice inflicted on the Palestinian people and the occupation by the Zionists with Western support, the lobby's control over Western policies, specifically the US president's policy and administration, hasn't contributed to entrenching any democracy: It has blown up Western democracies' foundations. It has also destroyed Israeli democracy, which prevailed domestically till Netanyahu took power, when he consolidated his position by escalating in collaboration with right-wing forces to ensure repeated re-election, so that he has become host to most of the extreme Jewish religious racist groups.

The lobby's control in Washington became complete and blindly supportive, devoid of any basis other than self-interest. The American political parties have had to absorb the reality imposed on them, especially the Democratic Party which should've seen during Trump's first term the end of any hope in Netanyahu's conservation of even a spark of democracy; after Trump abandoned the Oslo approach and moved the US embassy to Jerusalem, Netanyahu and his supporting lobby (AIPAC) lavished him with praise.

Yet, when Trump launched the "Abraham Accords" between Israel and some Arab regimes, many Democrats rushed welcoming them as a "peace deal" though they didn't end any war, completely bypassed the Palestinians and jumped over the two-state solution that the Democratic Party had previously verbally endorsed.

When Biden won the Democratic Party nomination in 2020, some, inside the party, initiated attempts to add language to the party platform referring to Israeli "occupation" of the West Bank and promising to restrict aid if Israel annexes Palestinian territories. This proposal was rejected, reinforcing the message that Democrats aren't prepared to oppose Israeli policies even where they conflict with the Democratic Party's own principles! During Biden's presidency, conflict intensified between the remnants of democracy and authoritarian tyranny in Israel, and it was clear which side Netanyahu chose; he placed himself at the head of authoritarians suppressing civil society, attacking independent media, embracing the extreme settler movement, and attempting to neutralize the judiciary and

dominate the Knesset, leading to huge popular protests. Despite that, Biden's Middle East policy in essence adhered to the Trump-produced Abraham Accords, bypassing Palestinians, and Biden turned a blind eye to the destruction of democracy in Israel, he even went beyond Republican reservations and eagerly sought to include Saudi Arabia in the Abraham Accords without being willing to meet the Saudi condition of establishing a Palestinian state.

After the October 7th shock, the Democratic administration submitted to Netanyahu and the extreme right's vengeful desires, citing the right to self-defense, as if a Palestinian army occupied Tel Aviv. Biden kept silent on Israeli leaders' descriptions of Gaza Palestinians, indiscriminately calling them "human animals" living in "a city of evil", and on the cutting of food and water, while Israeli forces bombed Hamas fighters and civilians alike with a huge and continuous barrage of American bombs.

Days, weeks, and months passed while civilians were killed before the world's eyes with Western arms and American support. When Biden tried exploiting this support, attempting to convince Netanyahu to stop the escalation amid continued arms flow, Netanyahu insisted on prolonging the war to preserve his extreme coalition, though polls showed a majority of Israelis supporting ending the war in exchange for the hostages' release. When some Democratic representatives protested the continued war, AIPAC pumped money into the Republican primaries to defeat these representatives, defeat the Democratic Party, and return Trump to the presidency.

Before the elections of Republican Trump and Democrat Biden, Democrat Obama held the presidency amid world expectations of goodness and correction, and the restoration of some ethics to American politics. But, during his tenure, the American Israel Public Affairs Committee (AIPAC) and allied organizations within the Zionist lobby insisted on not creating any disagreement between the US president and Israeli PM, putting the burden of compatibility with Netanyahu on Obama. During those years, Netanyahu attacked Obama's foreign policy, especially his attempts to define Palestinian state borders and seeking a nuclear deal with Iran. This situation put the Democrats in an awkward position; they were seeking support from AIPAC-linked donors while these donors used tens of millions of dollars attacking the Democratic president's policies and undermining any two-state solution efforts in Palestine.

What confirms the truth is that every US president since 1948 says similar things post-presidency, and their memoirs reveal the administration's inability to confront this impasse or get out of it, thus subverting and adapting American democracy to the lobby and Israel's vision and desires.

There is proof that American people are a kind-hearted majority and responsive to developments, but their democracy is corrupt to its core; representatives oppose their voters' vision and cling to narratives unrelated to the Palestine conflict, the global rise in authoritarianism, or the extreme right trend in Israel and America. Voters understand this reality; polls showed only a third of Democrats have a positive view of Israel post genocidal war, compared to 73% in 2014. Also, a majority of Americans generally opposed providing military aid to the Israeli government in summer 2024, and 77% of Democrats considered what happened in Gaza 'genocide'. Even among American Jews, over 60% concede that Israel committed war crimes in Gaza, although a majority believe Israel should exist.

Everything representatives and leaders in both Democratic and Republican parties claim, accusing the Palestinian side, whether the accusations are true or false, doesn't justify dropping American bombs weighing 2000 pounds (1ton) on camps crowded with children, nor justifies extermination by starvation and thirst and destroying all life necessities for a civilian society that neither elected nor chose the leaders behind the October 7th events; a plot which has proved to serve Netanyahu's interests first and foremost, raising many questions.

Today, no one can deny that the Israeli government prevented aid reaching Gaza, used force against civilians violating the rules of war, and destroyed most of the Gaza Strip. These facts have driven many researchers, rights organizations, and UN bodies to state that Israel committed genocide using US-provided arms, representing a moral stain that can't and shouldn't be erased, directly confirming US legal responsibility in this extermination. We shouldn't forget that all this Palestinian human devastation, and the democratic deterioration in America and Israel, result from Zionist acts, starting with terrorist methods, continuing with racist mentality, and developing through lobbies paralyzing Western democracies, primarily in American and Israel.

"The Genius" and the Big Stick

Is it an exaggeration to compare American presidents, specifically Trump, to some crazy Roman emperor, and to correlate his actions to those that led to democracy's destruction there and accelerated the Roman Empire's collapse? Trump has been described before and during his first term in negative terms, at the least as being mentally unfit for his position, yet he succeeded in elections and later secured a second term.

In his January 2026 Davos forum speech, lasting 72 minutes, the president displayed ignorance and confusion in ways unbecoming to a leader aspiring to lead the world, and the leader of the supposedly strongest democratic state. He mocked the president of US ally France publicly, kicked Canada's PM out of the Peace Council membership, declared anger at 'Denmark' for denying him the Nobel Peace Prize and demanded they give him Greenland to appease him. He claimed before everyone that the Secretary General of NATO had given him Greenland; the Secretary General then denied this, minutes post-speech. He claimed the Japanese Toyoda family owns 92% of Toyota, while they actually own only 2%. He claimed China produces and exports clean energy generators and sells them to the world's fools but doesn't produce such energy domestically, although China actually produces half of the world's clean renewable energy. He also claimed the US gave Greenland to Denmark post-WWII, although it had never been under American control. He addressed the audience, stating that had he not liberated Greenland, most would speak German, ignoring that, for example, the Swiss speak German, French, and Italian as official languages. He repeatedly confused Greenland and Iceland, claiming Iceland caused Wall Street harm the previous day, though the decline was due to concern over Trump's policies, tariffs, and war threats. All this ignorance unfolded before world leaders, expert in economics and politics, reinforcing the president's non-reliance on advisors and that he considers himself a 'genius', like Nero.

Democratic representative Jared Huffman commented: "We have a crazy man in the White House, running the biggest scam in American history". Former White House lawyer Ty Cobb said: "The man's mentally unstable and his narcissism is out of control". Thomas Friedman wrote in the New York Times: "Trump's taking us to the abyss, financial, moral, and political bankruptcy, threatening the collapse of America Incorporated" (a pre-Trump description of the US).

Much negative has been said about Trump, health-wise, politically, and psychologically, but what does he say about himself? "I'm a very smart genius". He also said: "One saving his country doesn't violate any law", a quote in which some observers see an authoritarian tendency. Trump ignored the devastating results of supporting Israel, saying: "Israel will have my full support in finishing the task of eliminating the Hamas threat". He also said: "The world will soon understand... nothing will stop what's coming"; adding: "The World would be better if Saddam Hussein and Muamar Ghadaffi still ruled."

A week after his Davos speech, Trump stated: "The US won't help Iraq anymore if Nouri al-Maliki is chosen as Prime Minister", i.e., he is issuing imperial orders and preventing a sovereign country from applying the results of its elections. This is the tip of the iceberg, and what should concern us primarily is identifying the threat facing democracy in the West and globally too, especially as many third-world countries aspire to applying democratic principles as being the best available system of government. The question remains: Does the West, and foremost Washington, prefer returning to dictatorial rule, to control and dominate under the "benign dictatorship" label or to save democracy by returning to an ethical, legal, social justice-orientated base for their own citizens as an example for aspiring democracies.

Speaking of the role of lobbies generally, and the Zionist lobby specifically, in undermining Western democracies, differences between its influence in Europe and the US should be noted. In Europe, campaign finance laws prevent the pumping of Zionist money to candidates, unlike America. Yet, the Zionist influence appears in media control, either through ownership of major media institutions or by influencing journalists through carrot-and-stick policies, and imposing the use of specific terminology, a broad topic requiring separate detailing. In the US, the pressure is doubled; the law allows virtually unlimited candidate funding, there is extensive use of the media through ownership and control, and intimidation of representatives and politicians at all levels is common.

In addition to previous American presidents' post-term confessions of Zionist pressure, shortcomings, and American political subservience; a sense of this reality overcomes anyone visiting the White House. The Spanish actor Tony Banderas narrated in a TV interview that he was invited to visit the White House with his wife during Clinton's presidency. While walking with the president down one of the corridors, talk turned to the Palestinian issue; the president carefully looked

around in all directions before telling Banderas that the Israelis block solutions. The Spanish actor wondered how the president of the world's strongest state seemed afraid to express his opinion in his own home, didn't trust his advisors and surroundings, and didn't want his opinion reaching the Israelis!

There are other economic forces seeking democracy's end, aiming to eliminate the idea of the nation-state, an era with clear geographical and political borders. The role of the nation-state has already started to decline; it is no longer possible to control your citizens' fate without external interference. Any scrutiny of US policies towards world states provides clear vision in this regard; interests have become intertwined and transnational, and the final decision and rule lies in the strongest hands, leading to conflict between the few strong states. It is clear democracy is no longer strongly tied to the existence of specific "political groups" competing for rule through elections within state borders, with the opposition participating in parliaments; external decisions can change any parliament, government, or state's course, especially if it is unable to protect itself by force or the strength of its economy. Modern examples unfold daily, like US President Trump seeking lands like the Gaza Strip, Greenland, and Canada, abducting the elected president of a UN member state, threatening to abduct the Cuban president, assassinating the Iranian leadership, even appointing himself the Iranian people's protector, objecting to the appointment of the Iraqi Prime Minister. These arrogant actions are being imitated by other's, viz the extermination of the Palestinian people and the plundering of land, not to forget the annexation of additional parts of Syria, which poses no threat, all under Trump's protection. Meanwhile, Russia seeks to annex Ukrainian lands by force.

In all these examples and others, there's no respect for democracy or international law, but clear marginalization of the role of the nation-state and of democracy. This marginalization is occurring, not just through brute force elements and Trumpish political bullying practices, but has decentral economic and media dimensions, where national identities dissolve into a "globalism" led by technology and financial markets, making traditional political control hard to maintain; the state is unable to control its markets, consumer goods, and prices, nor is it qualified to manage or influence the information, scientific theories, and rumors being pumped into peoples' minds.

The current global financial and economic system doesn't rely on real production, but has turned into an "enslavement system" with speculations led by major

financial institutions and central banks. Real power in the Western world isn't in elected governments' hands, but in that of the "money owners" who control debt volume and distribution, thus controlling the fates of states and their citizens.

It is noteworthy that practicing usury at the highest international levels moved from a forbidden and disliked category to a basic pillar of the modern economy, leading to the accumulation of unsustainable debts, and creating crises used as tools to reshape state policies and subordinate national sovereignty to transnational corporations' interests. This situation inevitably leads to the citizen's alienation and the sense that his electoral voice changes nothing in the complex global system. Moreover, individuals in these societies turn to consumption instead of participation, fueling selfishness and destroying social bonds, thus, political structures, formed centuries ago, producing traditional democracy aren't adequate to the challenges of the digital era and globalization, hence the need to anticipate the results of these developments and redefine politics, state, and the meaning of democracy in a world with no clear borders and little respect for international law. Anti-democratic developments are the direct result of colonial practice, capitalist policy, and the policies and practices of the lobbies corrupting the electoral process and controlling its outcome, deepening imbalance and exposing it through political bullying. The Palestinian people may be the first and clearest loser currently, followed by third-world peoples whose governments openly submit to lobby pressure and its outcome, while Trump and his administration openly promote tyranny, injustice, and greed. Yet, Western peoples with parliamentary electoral systems have started to demonstrate uneasiness and feeling trapped, due to the 'emperor's' actions and not knowing where this will lead.

Clearly, the Zionist lobby is specifically pushing American policy towards adopting the empire principle at the expense of democracy and freedoms in all its forms. Thus, added to the West's pre-WWI responsibility towards the Palestinian people's tragedy, additional direct and intense responsibility falls on Washington, and certainly on Israel that is planning and executing these developments. This shame will stick to them for all time...

As for Arab governments' and leaders' shame from the collapse of the Ottoman caliphate till now, it's basically the result of Western policy, when Britain, France, and Italy planned borders and the fate of the region under their military occupation. No Arab king or president could have opposed colonialism's desires and plans, and had one tried, no elements would have been available for effective implementation.

Only popular, moral, and overpowered resistance existed due to the lack of means available to the leaders. But weakness, helplessness, and falling into the trap of Western promises is one thing, and dealing in no less than betrayal is another thing entirely, and both issues are quite clear. The Arab dilemma affecting the region and its continued submissiveness in the Palestinian issue and the Arabs' admiration of the West and their lack of success in imitating it, is due to fundamental differences in their cultural, historical, and economic backgrounds which are complicating basic imitation. The result of importing a political system the West wanted imposed on the region's states and others in Africa and Asia, ended in failure of the imitation due to the disparity of the backgrounds involved so that conflict arose between the states' traditional identity and the modern political system. The previous religion-based ruling system had been shown to be inadequate for centuries, so ruling elites understood the necessity of importing a Western-based system. The dilemma lay in that the rulers and classes supporting a Westernized system ignored the importance of intellectual and cultural preparation. They even attempted to unify the inherited religion-based system that had led to the caliphate's failure with an imported system, based in its origin on secularism, law, and the adoption of a logical scientific approach, rather than a fatalistic supernatural approach. Hence, disagreements arose and intensified, and intellectual confusion, administrative, economic, and thus political and military failure emerged, deepening the deterioration in the Palestinian issue generally. This situation pushed ruling elites to rely on suppression or tribal and family loyalties and on marginalizing democracy to stay in power, thus counterforces prevailed. Political practices turned into modern "shells": constitution, parliament, elections, while in essence states remain governed by traditional relations and clientelism, due to retaining a corrupt heritage, and an unchanged system of education, upbringing, and religious practices.

An authoritarian state seeks to compensate for lack of cultural legitimacy by using the tools of security domination to support its ideas and confront opposing forces threatening destabilization. As a result, the state finds itself engaged in renewed conflict, because it didn't address its roots, unlike China for example, which achieved success by abandoning its fatalistic heritage and prohibiting dealing with it. Due to the continued dominance of religious and tribal thought on society, development projects continue to fail, and pursuit of plunder and looting remains from all sides. Briefly, instead of producing democracy, enlightened thought, and creating human freedom, which would have supported economic

productivity and supported Arab positions towards Palestine and its people, a "badocracy" was produced, this description being closest to the reality of what's happening in Arab systems, whether those with parliaments or shura councils and relying on tribal, clan, and nepotistic bases. Arab states remain flailing in their affairs, and have become hostage to Western states' policies, following them basically, willingly or unwillingly; the same states that are selling Palestine and creating Israel.

Arab states, formed as result of Western colonialism, clash among themselves over borders, engage in repeated armed conflicts, and resort to the West, seeking support for their positions against neighbors or their own citizens. These states also fail to protect themselves from Israel or any non-Arab state. They're almost completely indebted states, lacking industrial sectors producing goods or an agricultural sector capable of achieving self-sufficiency, and unemployment rates can reach as high as fifty percent. Despite the peoples' desire for unity and cooperation, all unification attempts have failed. The Arab League, founded and left by British colonialism is empty of any practical essence, it's never been anything but a meeting platform aimed at pacifying the masses.

All Arab states use religion and sharia as a weapon preserving their authority against any intellectual rebellion, and emphasizing backwardness and differences, so that it forms an important tool in retaining power. Hence, Western states intervene plundering the region, basically allied with ruling bodies against individual and societal freedoms and human rights, resorting on occasion to apparent condemnation aiming to return the ruling systems to complying with their will. Thus, Arab states could but submit at best both in the past and in the present, or conspire, mostly to the West's and therefore Israel's benefit, and at the expense of the Palestinian people and Arab citizens generally.

This nihilistic Arab experience contrasts with Europe's progress towards democracy. Pre-WWII, European states were in conflict due to unresolved problems stemming from WWI. None of those states were truly democratic, but rather monarchical and imperial systems, later turning into fascist, Nazi, and authoritarian systems against their citizens and neighbors.

After US intervention deciding the war in favor of the allies and Soviets, fascism and Nazism were removed and the perpetrators of their crimes tried. Western Europe then pursued party democracy, supported by huge American political and economic support. The result appeared successively and quickly in reconciliation

between democratic European states, then uniting them in a unified entity with a common currency and complete freedom of movement for individuals and the economy, and resorting to dialogue to solve any dilemma between states. Had American intervention and the role it played not existed, there would have been no historical founding moment when conflicting European powers decided to replace wars with democracy between themselves, and through ballot boxes, solving ethnic issues in each state, leading to the vanishing idea of states' sacred borders.

European political parties became effective electoral tools, even institutional alternatives to civil and regional war; party competition and voting became an alternative to war and the promoter of civil development, where the goal of exterminating an internal opponent was replaced with defeating him by majority will, changeable in future elections. based on the elected officials' performance. Thanks to democracy and elections, civil institutions, representing the people's will, managed to impose control over military institutions, and peaceful party competition contributed to entrenching this control and preventing coups or wars or the repetition of dictatorial rule (as in the case of Spain and Greece).

In other words, democracy in essence isn't just a slogan or an empty formality, but the practical application of a mechanism regulating internal conflicts and opening the field for cooperation with neighboring democracies. Europe provides the best example, while states claiming to apply democracy in most third-world countries prove the falsity of their claims by failure. Every state suffering internal unrest and at war with its neighbors is a non-democratic state. Conversely, any state engaging in war and aggression is actually a non-democratic state by virtue of its aggression, even if practicing electoral rituals.

Where does Israel stand within this democratic classification? It is an entity practicing war and occupation against neighbors and shirking the application of democracy internally, meaning it's a society with varying classes and rights, including authoritarian parties and leaders seeking to destabilize the independence of the judiciary and harness it to partisan interests.

An article by Israeli writer, Gideon Levy, about a meeting between Netanyahu and Trump at the end of 2025 sheds some light on fair-minded Israelis' view of their country:

"In Mar-a-Lago (Trump's resort), Trump's invitation to Netanyahu didn't include two million people wading through mud and cold, nor the memory of about 100,000 dead.

The only presence from Gaza there was Ran Gvili, the last dead hostage still held in the Gaza Strip.

Our 'close friend' supports us unconditionally. He sees us as perfect, decries criticism, and everyone else is guilty except us.

And this 'close friend' is also Benjamin Netanyahu's close friend, who, in his view, is perfect too and a war hero.

Hadn't it been for him, we would have been destroyed.... Netanyahu says we've never had a friend like this, and he's right.

And it's our great luck we didn't have another friend like him.

The public part of the Netanyahu-Trump meeting was disconnected from reality. For many Israelis, this disconnection was comfortable and intoxicating; their feeling can be understood, as any absence from Israel's current reality seems like that.

A government head, wanted by the ICC in Hague for crimes against humanity, of a state accused of genocide before the ICJ, with the blood of innocent masses on his hands, including huge numbers of children and over a thousand babies, is received for the sixth time in his current term with all this honor, without any of his crimes mentioned. How can someone, wanted as a war criminal, be received? How can he be glorified when his and his state's hands are stained with all this blood?

It's highly unlikely Israel was actually on the brink of destruction, as many supporters believe; it's far from that. And it's even more unlikely that Netanyahu is saving it. But if that is the case, who exactly led it to the edge of the abyss? This question isn't asked in the US president's residence.

You can't threaten half the world and at same time exempt Israel from any blame or responsibility. Yes, Hamas is guilty no doubt, and so are Hezbollah and Iran. But how can Hamas be threatened with opening the gates of hell, already open wide in the Gaza Strip for about two and half years, without saying a word about who ignited Gaza's hell?

How can we criticize the Palestinian Authority after Israel did everything to destroy it? Maybe the criticism should focus on the Palestinian education curriculum, yet on any ordinary day, Israeli TV channels broadcast more defamation and incitement against Palestinians than all Palestinian textbooks together contain against Israelis.

We need to broaden our perspective, looking beyond details to the full picture. The Trump administration granted Israel complete, blind, and automatic immunity. Whoever thinks this is good news should head to the Gaza Strip.

Trump, 'the friend' is the friend of genocide.

How could he win the Nobel Peace Prize while supporting starvation and a war of extermination?

Friends like this also corrupt those they patronize.

It's true he's now trying to do much more than his liberal enlightened predecessors – Barack Obama and Joe Biden – to change the face of the Middle East. These two presidents did nothing but give beautiful peace speeches, while showering Israel with more and more weapons with no conditions attached. Their successor, though, is trying to shake things up and change the region, and he deserves credit for that – and maybe even the Nobel Peace Prize, if he succeeds. But change can't be achieved just by threatening Hamas and bombing Fordow (the Iranian nuclear facility). We've already seen where that leads.

And as long as Israel is behind much of the bombing, destruction, starvation, occupation, and assassination in the Middle East, no change will happen without imposing change on it too. Trump can't become a genuine "close friend" until he grasps that.”

This reflects the nihilism of Israeli democracy and highlights realities about new world order slogans and human rights, where great powers support fascist, colonial, or repressive systems as long as they serve their interests, and attack other systems in the name of lacking democracy only when those systems touch the US and its Western allies major commercial or geostrategic interests. The US doesn't support democracy in its true sense (people power), but seeks to curb it if the results conflict with the economic and political elite's interests. Acceptable democracy for these powers is one ensuring resources and decisions remain in powerful minorities' hands. As for freedoms, including media freedoms, they're negatively exploited, resorting to blatant propaganda shaping public opinion in Western countries; this media overall isn't free but follows specialized and funded entities generally serving interests not aligned with the people's interest, but aiming to shape their consciousness. In dictatorial systems the stick is used, but in democratic systems "manufacturing consent" is at work, i.e., making people agree with policies harming their interests through media deception.

The 26th US President Theodore Roosevelt laid the strategic foundations for contemporary American influence, especially overseas and across oceans, and was among the first to acknowledge that the state with the strongest fleet in the world is the only one capable of controlling oceans and practicing its diplomacy fully and defending its borders, and he is remembered for his saying: "Speak softly, and carry a big stick".

The 47th Imperial President Donald Trump, former real estate dealer, applies negotiation philosophy through direct threats, building wealth through economic blackmail, and moving fleets to impose his will on the world without caring about international law or human rights.

This means that the US and other great powers can't rely only on "soft power" (diplomacy, culture, economy) to maintain a world order suitable for them, but must possess deterrent military power, ready for use when necessary, seeking to defeat opponents and terrorize others.

The 'genius' emperor applies the philosophy that opposing parties aren't deterred by cultural values or economic enticements or reprimand if they sense military weakness; so, the "big stick" must be brandished while demanding submission. He applies this approach to militarily weaker states and nations where aggression risks are feared, and seeks in this way to terrorize competing powers like China and Russia, and permanently threaten powers he considers rogue like North Korea and Iran, or liberation movements he classifies as transnational terrorist organizations, and even shows the stick to allies who hesitate to obey blindly. And of course, Trump declares his country's responsibility for protecting the seas and straits and navigational freedom, and demands exemptions from fees for American 'Imperial' ships in the Suez and Panama Canals.

Returning to the Arab situation, reflecting on the betrayal of Palestine and its people by the West and Arabs both past and present reveals multiple aspects, and Palestinian self-failure in mental and practical aspects can't be ignored. Western colonial powers contributed to the rise of Zionism and its empowerment, and Zionism and Israel later managed to attract Western powers, led by the US, to serve their interests, thus controlling the keys to the greatest injustice. Arab governments didn't have their own policy regarding Palestine and its issues, neither in the 1940s nor before or after. These governments, either willingly from self-interest or out of fear of repercussions, were content with verbal support for Palestine while actually participating in diluting and dissolving the rights involved.

Kings, princes, and then presidents met with Zionists repeatedly and secretly agreed with them against Palestinian interests to achieve their own interests. Some kings, who claimed to be guardians of Jerusalem, leaked summit minutes to Israel to enable it to study Arab capabilities and agreements. The series is long, and it suffices to mention examples like President Mubarak, who isolated himself in Sharm El-Sheikh, leaving the management of the country to his unelected son, while Israeli helicopters landed repeatedly to take him to dinner with Sharon in Israel. All Arab countries are turning into American bases that any American force can use, and Arab governments provide the American ambassador with all details of what's happening before making any decision, while the ambassador is welcomed and celebrated in tribal and clan meetings. In a related context, when Egyptian President Abdel Nasser directed his country's intelligence service to plant listening devices in the American embassy, Sadat, when he took over, informed Saudi intelligence to pass on the news to American intelligence.

During his first term, President Trump called on Arab countries to normalize relations through the Abraham Accords. Arab countries that don't border Palestine rushed to sign and make peace, completely ignoring the Palestinian issue or UN decisions related to it, and didn't even accord the Palestinians the slightest dignity, let alone set any conditions that might spoil Arab-Israeli relations. When the genocide started, they continued smiling and shaking hands. Generally, the Arabs failed to face Western-backed Zionism and protect Palestine, and even failed to stop the continuous deterioration that started before the 1948 Nakba and continues until now (2026).

Consequently, due to their submission to Washington, no American political awakening or preparation for democratic conditions is expected to influence American policy to side with the Palestinian people and their rights. In other words, American society lacks the components of political and social justice; everyone is chasing gain and self-interest. Moreover, Arab Americans, who share the same mentality as most Arabs, won't be able in the near future to form pressure groups (lobbies) capable of competing with others and changing the course of American policy towards Palestine and Arabs. The Arab mentality tends to rush results and adopt a commercial mentality, unlike the agricultural mentality, characterized by long-term planning. We won't find wealthy Arabs establishing pressure groups and paying huge sums to support American presidential and legislative candidates. Most Arab Americans are working-class, and the middle class is a minority, estimated to be less than four million people with the inclusion

of Muslims. When they expressed their anger at Biden's administration for supporting the Gaza genocide war, they elected Trump, known for his clear pro-Israel positions, through his words and actions during his first term

The Europeans, the closest geographical neighbors of the Arabs and the first colonizers, spearheaded the planting of Israel in the region, yet they have never apologized for the destruction they caused. Their racist mentality prevents them from acknowledging their wrongdoing and need for correction, offering only temporary verbal sympathy that doesn't prevent killing or provide an alternative. Despite the genocide, Europe as a whole hasn't declared that its recognition of Israel is based on the borders set by the United Nations, which formed the basis for the entity's establishment and recognition. This is not only betrayal but also cowardice and conspiracy. Europe engages in trade with Israel, treating it as an EU member, without imposing conditions on its settlement and oppression policies. It supports investment funds in Israel, imports arms, and exports tanks, shells, submarines, and warships. There are absolutely no practical steps being taken to condemn Israel.

Discussion about the shells that Germany provides for Israeli tanks, engaged in genocide, and the sale and development of submarines was replaced by complaints that the Palestinians in Gaza were oppressing donkeys, citing this oppression as one of the reasons for the destruction in Gaza, an idea derived from Israeli propaganda. It didn't occur to Germany to replace the donkeys with small solar-powered vehicles or alternatives with a plea to Israel to spare them. Instead, Berlin applauded the deprivation of Gazans of their only remains of transportation while avoiding speaking out against their suffering from lack of transportation and fuel. In other words, Berlin put itself at the service of Israeli propaganda and hostility towards the people who are being exterminated by its shells. Can there be any greater baseness?

Europe's double standards are evident. Spain took a clear stance against genocide, but it's a theoretical, emotional stance without concrete action towards Palestinians or economic or diplomatic pressure on Israel. Spain allowed Sephardic Jews, expelled in 1492, to obtain citizenship by a law passed by parliament in 2015. This law came as an "historical correction" and allowed naturalization applications to be submitted by those who could prove their Andalusian lineage, language, and culture, and thousands of Jews around the world have benefited from it. Portugal followed with a similar step later. But Arabs expelled during the same period

received no apology, compensation, or naturalization offer. It is known that the Spanish city of Sidonia (Shadhuna) had a majority population of Palestinian origin before the expulsion, and the majority of those who were expelled settled in the Maghreb countries, yet no party, even morally, has offered them an apology, compensation, or opened the door to naturalization. If the Spanish and Portuguese had announced a similar step towards a Palestinian group, it could be considered part of clarifying the equality between Arabs and Jews, but racism and its repercussions are still deeply rooted in the European consciousness.

The Gaza crisis is clear, despite ceasefire talks. The main obstacle to ending it is the US and its allies' support for Israel, whether directly or through indifference. Tel Aviv is integral to US Middle East policy, and what's happening to Palestinians reflects this American role and European complicity.

The Israeli historian Ilan Pappé states, "Europe's silence on Gaza reflects a deep failure to confront its colonial legacy. This silence isn't neutrality but a historically rooted political stance. Some European powers' support for colonization in Palestine stems from an historical desire to maintain imperial influence rather than uphold justice and human rights. Europe, which claims to defend human values, finds itself today facing a real moral test that it has failed to pass when it comes to Gaza. The double standards in the European position undermine the credibility of the Western human rights discourse, and what is required is a radical revision of European policies towards Palestine, and a clear bias towards international law and the rights of the Palestinian people, instead of continuing to justify the occupation and cover up its crimes."

Israel prevents Israeli and foreign journalists from accessing Gaza, kills local journalists, and disrupts the dissemination of images and videos of its atrocities through its relations with social media companies. However, what leaks out reflects a spirit of hatred, especially when occupation soldiers film their actions and share them. The world is well aware of what's happening in Gaza, and Western powers are trying to persuade Israel to "tone down" its actions, essentially practicing genocide with a lower profile to avoid disturbing the West and stirring Western public opinion. They're beautifying the genocide by showcasing some trucks carrying minimal aid, while silencing discussions about the destruction and atrocities committed by Israelis. When Western humanity raises its head, they're prepared to accept some Palestinians, meaning accepting their expulsion from their homeland. If Palestinians insist on staying, there's talk of ceasefires, while killing,

starvation, and dismantling life's foundations continue unabated. Western governments don't oppose Israeli policy; they want it calm and continuous without military fanfare, with smiles and blame shifted to "non-democratic terrorists".

It's unhealthy for a party or state claiming to uphold democracy to be so disconnected from humanity, justice, and its voters' declared beliefs, fearing self-destruction and turning democracy into a Roman Empire farce.

The simplest and most correct actions include:

- Refusing military aid to a government that has committed war crimes
- Implementing a comprehensive and escalating economic boycott, similar to actions against apartheid South Africa
- Supporting the International Criminal Court, whether targeting Vladimir Putin or Benjamin Netanyahu
- Opposing any attempt to annex the West Bank or ethnically cleanse Gaza, and declaring countermeasures if Israel proceeds
- Investing seriously in an alternative civilian leadership to Hamas, capable of governing a democratic Palestinian state, based on the same UN decisions that established Israel

This requires standing with democracy in Israel, Palestine, and the Arab countries, and supporting the rescue of democracy in the West and the US, which in turn involves eliminating the principle of pressure groups (lobbies) and banning their work by law to secure democracy.

Hypotheses

We have the luxury of looking back at the past without being able to control or change it, but we also have the ability to analyze and learn from past experiences after studying them. Yet, we often refuse to change and insist on pursuing illusions resulting from deep-seated human selfishness. As human beings, we have the capacity to change beliefs inherited through centuries, but we refuse to change and insist on repeating mistakes. For example, Britain was an empire where the sun never set on its colonies, plundering, killing, and corrupting without the need to hide its activities from any sane person. But where is it now? Where are Britain and its colonies today? What is its current geographical size, level of progress, and degree of tolerance among its peoples? What is its international weight and respect among nations? These questions can be asked about other former colonial powers, adding a comparison between European nations that practiced colonialism and those that didn't on an international scale, like Norway, Sweden, and Switzerland. Which peoples are happier, more loving, and respected by others? Which nations are destroying the planet relentlessly pursuing gains that could be achieved in more planet-friendly ways?

Which nations live by producing and exporting arms, inciting others to fight to sell their goods? It's certainly those countries and peoples saturated with ideas of racism, colonialism, and corruption, profiting from bloodshed and spreading destruction and death. (These countries collectively spent \$465 billion in 2025 on weight loss measures, and 20% of their population's deaths are food-related, providing ample speculation for those who think). Countries that contributed effectively to establishing the Zionist entity for colonial and corrupt purposes, funding, arming, and supporting it, are the same ones producing and selling the most arms, thus profiting most from spreading death and destruction. These countries claim commitment to democracy's rules and ethics, human rights, international law, and self-determination; why don't they resort to economic gain through self-development benefiting themselves and humanity? In other words, why do they insist on following racist visions and prefer profiting through despicable means that don't honor them? Where's the opportunity to resort to soft diplomacy, especially when tough diplomacy hasn't improved their situation but made them less significant than before colonialism?

Soft power enables users to achieve what they want through attraction rather than coercion; it's the ability to influence others' behavior to do what you want, not by force, but by convincing them of your values and culture and wanting to emulate you. When a country's culture is attractive – in art, cinema, education – and presents a bright image of its lifestyle and application of political values like democracy, human rights, and freedom, and applies these values sincerely internally and externally, it possesses soft power bringing good and benefit to all, serving the global common good. In contrast, hard power through oppression, war, economic pressure, and negative exploitation of media and culture leads to conflicts and discord, while soft power makes others adopt your goals as theirs spontaneously. It's obvious that countries leaning more towards using soft power develop faster and have much better incomes than those that practiced hard power before and haven't actually changed their approach, even if they pretend to have overcome colonial racist thought. Look at China and its economic and social growth, and countries like India, Brazil, Japan, and Korea; how's their economic situation compared to Britain and France, which haven't shed their colonial psychological legacy based on racism? Compare Singapore and Malaysia's economies in East Asia to the economies of countries they were colonized by until half a century ago? Singapore (with 6 million people) has become an advanced global financial and tech hub, with per capita GDP over \$90,000 annually, while Britain's per capita income is under \$50,000! Britain's economy relies on services (over 75%), whereas Singapore's economy is a global center for industry (electronics, chemicals) and financial services, with London's financial status declining year by year. The world is full of examples proving success isn't tied to racist theories attributing progress and backwardness to racial or geographical bases, like assuming whites are smarter, more active, and successful than others, or northern peoples are better than southern ones.

Europe and North America dominated economically and militarily in the last two centuries through military superiority, lack of human values, and selfishness. In contrast, Eastern civilizations that preceded them, like China, Pharaonic Egypt, Babylon, then Islamic civilization, excelled through military strength and continued through moral strength, opening the field to coexistence for all peoples. When the British Empire developed gunpowder and warships, it launched a brutal colonial campaign involving extermination, enslavement, exploitation, corruption, and plundering. Since this empire, like other Western empires, was selfish and nihilistic, it quickly collapsed due to spreading hatred and igniting wars

everywhere, until destruction reached its own doorstep. This fate awaits anyone following the same brutal racist path. Westerners aren't naturally smarter, their culture isn't inherently superior, and their geography isn't the most suitable for controlling trade routes. They were, through the ages, in a worse position than others until they adopted piracy as official state policy. Energy was used in Asia before Europe, but for non-military purposes. Civil, social, construction, and health administration in Eastern civilizations far surpassed its European counterparts.

Comparing Eastern and Western cultures is a lengthy discussion. European kings followed plundering at all levels; they plundered their subjects, neighbors, and practiced piracy with their fleets to steal others' loot. The radical shift happened when they seized Andalusian sailors' maps, enabling them to reach China and India, stealing gunpowder from China, which they later used for war instead of celebrations.

They then reached America, starting extermination and plundering in north and south. They turned to peaceful Africa, oppressing peoples, enslaving and transporting them to American colonies, achieving huge profits through slavery. Later, they turned to colonization based on force, oppression, and injustice, claiming alleged racial superiority. Practically, no hypothesis proves or even discusses whether this path was best for Europe's future, nor studies the possibilities if Europeans had resorted to coexistence, cooperation, and exchange with others instead of colonization and violence.

Resorting to oppression and violence is the biggest proof of anxiety and intellectual shortcoming. The West's economic and social decline will continue as long as it adopts colonial racist thought, which is why we see Western powers, led by the US, converging against China, which adopts a different approach. China actually emerged from colonialism and European intervention with the People's Republic's establishment on October 1st, 1949, led by Mao Zedong, ending a century of "unequal treaties" and civil wars resulting from colonial policy. China later regained full sovereignty over Hong Kong (1997) and Macau (1999) peacefully from Britain, while Taiwan remains under US influence and protection, and Beijing continues political dialogue and economic cooperation to reclaim this last Chinese region. Compare this Chinese policy with US policy, especially under Trump, who demands annexing independent countries like Canada and neighboring regions, practicing political and military bullying and extortion.

With the start of European colonialism's decline, Israel was created to continue the same tasks and violent approach: claiming ownership, stealing land and expelling owners, racial superiority, and practicing massacres and escalation towards extermination, blackmailing the entire region to seek protection from Western powers, especially the US, which adopted the European colonial approach. If the Western world truly wanted to rid itself of its Jewish citizens or believed in their right to a national homeland, it would've sent them to an uninhabited area or settled them in a special American state. If it had to be Palestine, why was injustice and extermination adopted, instead of attempting coexistence?

True, Palestinians and Arabs rejected the partition plan, but that's due to Britain and Zionism's declared bad intentions from the start, and British colonialism's bullying and oppressive approach, a path the American heir didn't change.

Even assuming past Palestinian and Arab mistakes, the Palestinian people, with Arab and Islamic approval, are now ready and demand either a two-state solution or a shared state, implementation of the UN return and compensation resolutions, living peacefully with Jews and Israel in the entire Arab region, equal lives without racism and dominance; this is actually best for everyone, including the Jews. The apparent truth is that Israeli policies, especially the "occupation" policy, have backfired, harming Israeli society itself and its claimed moral values, just as it harmed Palestinians. The daily occupation policy deepens distortion and hostility between both sides, corrupts Israel's political spirit, and leads to rapid erosion of any remaining Israeli democracy. Occupation made Israel less secure, not more, creating a society living in constant anxiety and hostility, encouraging the growth and control of Israeli fascist forces on one hand, and Palestinian and Arab religious fundamentalism on the other.

Imagine if Israel or the West, after October 7th, 2023, had demanded that the Palestinians hold elections, refusing Hamas or Palestinian Authority candidates, aligning this demand to threats of war! Imagine if something like this happened even later, after over two years of genocide... for example while announcing a peace council to decide Palestine's fate! Of course, the West and Israel don't think of that or want democracy and security for Palestinians; they have extermination and displacement plans, and October 7th came "to order".

Imagine if Britain and France apologized for colonial-era actions and harm done to Palestinians, would Israel continue its decades-long policy? Imagine if Israelis

had sought to implement the Oslo Accords positively, with joint Palestinian-Israeli resolve against peace-opposing forces? It would've been enough to ease the situation if Israel had committed to "Oslo" and its benefits started to appear.

What if the UN, backed by the Security Council, issued resolutions demanding Israel pay compensation for damages after every aggression? Where would we be? Would genocide have happened and continued for years? What would the world's and Arabs' view of Israel be?

But what has happened is the application of Israeli colonialism, harsher than the long-lasting British and French colonialism; previous colonizers benefited from the human resources of the occupied through ordinary labor or siphoning off those with skills and brains. The Israeli occupation is a racist, expelling, settlement occupation, denying the Palestinian people's existence, claiming Greater Israel will rise on its small nucleus, implying hostility to the Arab region, even if delayed. Thus, this occupation lays the foundations for Arab backwardness and Israeli dominance through methods deepening peoples' hatred for Israel and Jews globally, reinforcing misleading myths about Judaism and actions towards children and innocents, strengthening extremists and fundamentalists everywhere.

Professor Israel Shahak, in his book "Jewish History, Jewish Religion: The Weight of Three Thousand Years," discusses the backgrounds of racism and presents a critical view of Jewish history and religion. Shahak argues that Zionism is an extension of some insular aspects of Jewish religion, seeing Israel, as a "Jewish" state, adopting discriminatory policies rooted in these religious backgrounds. Shahak focused largely in his book on laws and legislation in the Talmud, concluding they contain a negative view of "Goyim" (non-Jews). He concludes there's a duality in moral standards within traditional religious texts; certain values apply within Jewish society and are replaced by different ones when dealing with others. He also sees Zionism wasn't entirely a secular movement as it promotes itself, but drew its "superiority complex" and land attachment from old religious traditions. Shahak warned that Israel turning into a religious state poses danger not just to Palestinians but threatens global democratic and human values. (Israel Shahak, who didn't experience the Gaza genocide, was born in Warsaw, Poland in 1933 and died in 2001. He was a chemistry professor at Hebrew University in Jerusalem, survived the Holocaust at age 10. He was known for human rights activism and strong opposition to Israeli policies. The Zionist

movement launched incitement campaigns against him, making him subject to insults and spitting whenever he walked Jerusalem streets).