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Title: "Zionism According to the Opinions of Non-Jews"

Summary: I. Zionism prejudices the rights of the Arab population that has possessed Palestine for so many centuries. - II. England is violating the treaty in which it gave Palestine to the Sheriff of Mecca. - III. The Allies promised the Arabs independence and the option of having their own government. - IV. Zionist abuses and overbearingness against the population in order to found the State of Israel. - V. Arab resentment: appeal to England with adverse results. - VI. Turmoils: protests: threats and dangers for the future. - VII. Union of all the inhabitants of Palestine against Jewish predominance in Palestine. - VIII. A vote in the House of Lords

Text: We described in our preceding article, concisely, the long history of the tenacious forces, political maneuvers, and public agitation with which the Zionists have accomplished in the midst of the world the opportunity to constitute for a second time in Palestine a national center for the dispersed tribes of Israel. These aspirations have found particular favor, as it is said, in England, to which the League of Nations has confided the extension of the articles of the "Mandate" with which Palestine will be governed. The Zionists could not wish for anything better: and in truth they give no thought to hiding the joy of their victory. Palestine is in their hands: and even if some prudent voices seek to moderate the excesses that could too soon betray the future, the facts of today suffice and then some, to provide the measure for knowing what to do tomorrow. *Ab ungue leonem*. [Latin: From its claw we understand the lion.]

But in the midst of Zionist joy there are shadows. We closed with succinct details warning how the occupation of Palestine and the proposal to create a Jewish state were a slap in the face to the rights of other peoples, giving rise to a struggle that threatens to disturb the peace of the Orient and to add another to the many causes of distressing unrest in which the early years of this eventful century have been floundering. We want to inform our readers also about those rights and that struggle for the sake of fairness, so that they know the necessary elements for making a judgment according to truth and justice.

I.

The struggle was inevitable. It would be rather naive gullibility of the Jews to believe that they could take over Palestine by just reaching out their hand, as if it was something found abandoned on the street: and the Jews are neither naifs nor fools. But accustomed to seeing everything bend their way in the political world and the stock market, they did not think they would have to take account of some nomadic tribes or savages who might oppose their aspirations. And this was a mistake. Savages or not, these people have rights, and if rights are worth anything in the world, they should not be allowed to be trampled even by Jews without a sense of shame. For many centuries the Arabs were established on Palestinian soil and for a long time they were the sovereign rulers; but what is most important, they continued to live there and still live there today as the majority, as among a population of 800,000 souls, eighty percent, that is 640,000, are Arabs, and the Jews, even with the immigration of recent years, are only about 80,000, same as the Christians of various denominations. Now every land belongs to its inhabitants. When a people, over countless generations, going back to the beginning of its history, lives, works, and develops upon a territory, they certainly have the right to be considered as the legitimate possessor. That is the condition of the Arabs in Syria and in Palestine.

The Zionists, trampling on this state of affairs which no one contested until just yesterday, today arrogantly invade the country, which is the home of the Arabs, to plant their home by expelling the peaceful former inhabitants. Their official representative, Chaim Weizmann, made a tour of Europe - and we heard him in Rome - repeating the word of the day: Palestine for the Jews like America for the Americans! But the Americans are in their own home, while the Jews are going into someone else's home. With what right? They cannot give any other foundation for their strange pretensions than the memory of a past that is buried in the ruins of the centuries. If it is true that God one day gave that land to their people; and it is easy to understand the instinctive passion with which the eyes of Israel are turning from countries of the dispersion to the shores of that land which was once the cradle of their greatness: but the poetry of sentiment in the record of a glorious past does not constitute a present right: and when crowds obsessed by the suggestions of Theodor Herzl and his cronies in the Congresses of Basil raved frantically, calling for the possession of the land of their fathers, those poor people forgot that over the course of more than eighteen centuries their fathers, struck by the divine malediction, or, if that is not pleasing, then subjected to a hand stronger than they, were expelled and scattered over the whole earth. So many events have occurred since then in the history of peoples! Who could ever imagine claiming title of right to a house he owned in former times, without taking account of the facts that have given rise to new rights in the subsequent inhabitants?

A striking response in this regard was given by an Arab (and we have it from one who was there) to one of the Zionist leaders who recently, in a certain village not far from Jerusalem, was calling for the return of Palestine to the Jews who had conquered it and made their civilization flower there. Turning to declaim: "We, let's say, will give back Palestine to you when they have been made to return Spain to us." And he spoke well, for Spain still has traces of Arab rule that are far more notable than Palestine has of Jewish rule. The witty reply closed the mouth of the Jew, who turned away.

II.

That the idea of occupying Palestine without any regard to the rights of others or the offense given others arose in the minds of Jews is not surprising, indeed the opposite would be surprising. But that England has embraced such an idea and made it its own, this should not only surprise but stupefy, especially if one considers the circumstances in which such Anglo-Jewish connivance was cemented.

In truth, who obligated Great Britain to assume a commitment to give form to the utopias of the Zionists and to promise them Palestine, which they certainly would never have had without its support? Palestine was perhaps English property? By what right did they possess it? Perhaps by military occupation during the war? But the belligerent forces included Italy and France as well as Great Britain. And then perhaps Palestine was a land of conquest for the Allies? Here is the most serious ground of reproach against that Power. It is proven by documents from these war years that beginning in July 1915 negotiations were opened to break the Arabs away from the Turks: Sheriff Hussein, who was in command at Mecca, insisted on the condition of the recognition of the independence of the Arabs in all the countries, from the Mediterranean to the Persian Gulf; and in October of the same year the English representative in Egypt, Sir McMahon, replied categorically: “I am authorized to give you, in the name of the government, complete assurance that Great Britain will recognize and support the independence of the Arabs in all territories within the limits indicated by the Sheriff.” With these agreements the alliance was concluded. It is easy to understand how helpful this arrangement of matters was to the victories of the Allies in the Middle East. Even before the opening of armed conflict, the hostility of the population hindered the operations of the Turkish-German army. General Liman von Sanders complained in writing to General Headquarters of “being caught between two fires, the inhabitants of the country and the enemy armies: the whole country is against us.” Thousands of Arab deserters then served the cause of the Allies when in June 1916 the Sheriff declared war and placed his soldiers under the command of his sons, one of whom, Emir Feisal, had escaped from the hands of the Turks to join the Allies.

So already in 1915, that is two years before the Balfour Declaration – November 1917 – England had signed a contract with the head of the Arabs under which he was obligated to make war on the Turks, and it recognized the independence of the Arabs in their entire region, including Palestine. Sheriff Hussein, proclaimed King of Hedjaz, faithfully kept his word. How did England keep its word?

While the Arabs had exposed their land and their goods to the dangers of war, while they had taken up arms and were fighting alongside the Allies in the hope of winning the freedom of their country, here comes news from London that their country is instead given to the Jews who will establish their “national home” there, and this precisely under the protection of Great Britian which had accepted the agreement of October 1915 with the Sheriff of Mecca!

Who can imagine the dismay in the souls of that entire population who felt they were made fools, and in place of their longed-for freedom saw themselves passed from the yoke of the Turk to the despised and odious tyranny of the Jew. It was such an unexpected and greatly stunning blow that many did not want to believe in the possibility of such a traitorous betrayal. But they surely had to believe it when they saw the Zionist Commission arrive and after it began the rush of Jews from all parts of the world to grab a place in a poor Palestine put up for auction. Then began that immigration and that land grabbing of which we spoke last time, by which the Zionists intended in short order to change the proportions of the nationality of the inhabitants and the rules of land ownership, in order to attain a majority in the country and dispose of its fate according to the requirements of the utility and development of the Jewish people. If the Arabs did not like this, big deal: like it or not, repeated Weizmann, Palestine must be Jewish: no human power can prevent that fact. This was said clearly.

III.

Aggravating even worse this state of things was the institution of the “Mandate,” the hypocrisy of new terms to mask the same old solutions to all wars: the annexation of a greater or lesser extent of conquered territories. We do not discuss whether Palestine deserved to be subjected to such treatment. Turkey was conquered, not the Arabs who rather had negotiated with the Allies. Palestine should then have been all the more considered as one of the “little nations” which the code of “Fourteen Points” should bring to freedom and independence. And precisely, as if on purpose, in November 1918, shortly before the Armistice, a solemn proclamation in the name of France was repeated in all the villages of Palestine, proclaiming to the population that “the purpose of the Allies in conducting the war in the Middle East was the full and final liberation of the Arabs, and the establishment of governments founded on the authority and on the free election of the people of the country.” The Allies were “very far from wanting to impose a form of government contrary to the will of the people” and only wanted to “provide security with moral and material assistance for the proper development of those governments and of those forms of administration that will be adapted to the people themselves,” putting an end – this was noticed – to “those internal discords which had so long been exploited by the Turkish government.” Golden words, magnanimous propositions, which however were to go up in smoke, not to say in new lies.

In April 1919 an American commission was sent to Palestine which made diligent inquiries, questioning delegates in each village to ascertain the preferences of the populations. The response was everywhere one and the same: all declared themselves in favor of independence and in favor of the establishment of national government. It seemed the dawn of a happy day and souls were opened to hope: but what was the result? The report of the commission was suppressed and nothing more was heard. The other Arab regions, that is Syria, Mesopotamia, Hedjaz, Iraq, had the autonomy they desire: Palestine, on the other hand, was kept like a pupil incapable of its own government, and confined under the strictest tutelage of England, that is to say, of the Zionists it had taken under its protection. Now who can explain why the Arabs of neighboring Syria and even those of the shores of the Red Sea were judged to have gifts of intelligence and the social habits required by the League of Nations in order to be independent and to stand on their own, and their brothers in Palestine were considered so worthless as to need to be governed by Jews. We give up trying to find the reason why, and perhaps many readers will do the same, since it is too obvious that the reason why the Palestinians were not given freedom like the others is not their imagined inability to know how to govern themselves, but an act of arbitrary despotism by which the Allies sacrificed the weak Arabs in the service of the powerful Jews.

So all the proclamations and all the promises and agreements were just glitter to tease the Palestinians and give time for the Jews to complete their plan. It was a deal already done at the outset of the movement: the Zionists would not have talked so lofty and so loud if they had not had a secure pledge in hand that the power of England would support them in the enterprise of the new kingdom of Judah. The Arabs were condemned to either servitude or exile: and the audacious were not ashamed to shout provocatively from the rooftops. The Zionist Palestine Week of July 30, 1920 printed in the light of day: “The Jewish nation has resolved its own national regeneration in its former fatherland. As for the Arab nation, there are other lands outside Palestine where they can develop their activity.” That newspaper only kept repeating the extremes dictated by the gang leaders, such as Dr. Eder, president of the Zionist Executive Committee, who wrote, in a report on the troubles of last May: “In Palestine there can only be one national center and it must be the Jewish national center … because no equality of treatment can be given between Jews and Arabs. It is necessary that the Jews dominate as soon as they have reached a sufficient number.” Even more cynical language was used by Zangwill, another satrap of Zionism, before a meeting of friends of the party in London. He warned that “all conquests involved the shedding of blood: No empire has ever succeeded without blemishes”: so it was not surprising if there were some bashed heads also in Palestine. If there was a Mandate for Palestine, it was for the advantage of the Jews, and “the High Commissioner should order his power for the sole purpose of establishing the Jewish homeland. The existence of the Arabs was an obstacle: if the Mandate does not order to drive them out, it still does not require help for them to remain in place, as if I was promised a property for building a house and a tribe of gypsies had the right to erect its tents, I could tolerate the tents but I would not be obligated to build their kitchens or teach them hygiene to prolong their lives” and going on in this sardonic tone, which elicited laughter and laughing applause from the Zionists, but will undoubtedly arouse the indignation of all the honest.

In the “Mandate” for Palestine it is repeated abundantly that the civil and religious rights of the non-Jewish inhabitants will be “strictly respected.” The reader has seen from what has been said thus far how the Allies – and England in their name – have practiced respect for those rights, at least on the part of the civil side.

IV.

The Zionists did not lose any time in the midst of realizing their dream of a kingdom and affirming their domination over the country.

We said in our previous article that England designated a Jew as High Commissioner to govern Palestine, a fervent proponent of Zionism, Herbert Samuel. We will let every dispassionate man judge the opportuneness of this choice which sent, to govern a country in the throes of the most acute irritation against hated invaders, a man who professed to be their partisan: but it seems a rather naïve reflection put forward by Churchill, Secretary for the Colonies, that Samuel “would not be suspected by his co-religionists of having made judgments against them.” And what a statement! But would he not have to judge against them all the time if he wanted to do justice? And what would the Arabs have thought when he judged in favor? Of course, that position, given in relation to the Balfour Declaration, was as good as a full dedication of authority to the mercy of that sect, which expected nothing other than to rack up everything. To the post of legal secretary (which took the place of a minister of justice) a Zionist was appointed: to a Zionist was given the post of Director of Commerce and Industry, to another that of head of immigration, a post of maximum importance, as is easy to understand under the circumstances of the moment.

Everywhere, in all sessions of public office, the Zionists occupied positions in numbers exceeding their proportion to the indigenous population. The use of the Hebrew language, admitted by governmental disposition as the official language, naturally excludes non-Jews from all those public services that require knowledge of it, and the Arabs found that closed the door for them to each job, for example, in the postal, telegraph and telephone offices. In every way, in every occupation, the competition from the Jewish workers combined with Zionist immigration inevitably removed each post from the indigenous, who, while seeing nearly every day the best ones monopolized and exploited by foreigners, experienced every day also the inflation as to necessities of life as a result of the same immigration, experienced increases in taxes and the state of discomfort following the war which he had hoped would bring prosperity to his nation. And as if this was not enough, he soon saw the Zionists not only supplant him in everything where a profit was to be made, but also damage the fruit of his own work. So last year, for example, the abundant harvest of wheat and millet (FN: that is common sorgum, whose seed is used for food) would give a fair profit to the farmer, if the according to custom it was possible to send it to the market place in good time. But he was truly not to be permitted. The Zionist government, to assure the supply of immigrants, prohibited the exportation of wheat in spite of general protests, and the prohibition was only removed when Sudan’s harvest was already on the market and the prices so low as to lose all profit. The year before, another event even more serious showed the arrogance with which these sectarians treat the country and its inhabitants. An agreement was obtained from England to provide farmers with loans to restore agriculture ruined during the war. Now the Zionist Commission made every effort because these loans were revoked, and obtained it. Then the financial advisor to the English government, out of loyalty of spirit, went to London to show the harm the revocation had done and to re-establish the order of the loans. But he was forced to return to Palestine “for political reasons.”

So everything had to yield before the arrogance of these nefarious tyrants descended from all the gangs of Europe. The Arab, a proud and reflective spirit, remembered the pacts and promises of a few months earlier and began to take account of what was happening around him. So this was the fulfillment of what he had been told: Palestine for the Jews! A really nice change was done to him by escaping the old and feeble hand of Turkey to come under the iron fist of the Zionists. At least then he was governed by their own deputies to Parliament at Constantinople. Turkey was only represented in the midst of the Arab people by a single official, the *Wali* or the *Mutessarif* and he, more often than not was himself Arab, as Arabs also were members of the Council, all elected by the indigenous. Indigenous persons were likewise the judges and assessors of the tribunals: every Palestinian could aspire to any office in the judiciary. They had schools too for them, for all civil studies, and their diplomas opened the way to all jobs in the country. Today he is in a situation deprived of everything. The country is no longer his. The head of the Palestine government, the representative of Zionism, the High Commissioner put in place by England, is called the “prince of Israel”; the postage stamps of Palestine bear the inscription “*Eretz Israel*, Land of Israel.” What remains for him?

V.

The Palestinians, treated with such impertinence and despotism, thought they at least had the right to object and appeal, arguing their own case. It was the least they could request: and to give greater weight to their arguments a congress of notables was assembled, the elders of the nation, in other words men of great account, according to the tradition of the country. One such congress – there were three (FN: The first was held in Jerusalem in 1918: the second was announced but then blocked by the government solely on a partisan pretext. The third was in Haifa in 1920: the fourth next year again in Jerusalem.) – gathered in Haifa, convened with eighty delegates elected from all of Palestine. The result of the discussions was compiled in a memorandum in which, exposing the causes of the disputes, it was concluded:

“For all these reasons we demand in the name of justice and right: 1st, that the principle of a national center for the Jews be discarded; 2nd, that a national government be constituted which is responsive to a parliament elected by the Palestinians who inhabited Palestine before the war; 3rd, that Jewish immigration be suspended until the time when the national government is constituted; 4th, apply the laws and decrees that were in effect before the war and cancel all those issued since the British occupation and do not promulgate new laws until the future national government is constituted; 5th, unite Palestine with its sister, Syria.”

The protest was the word of free men, representatives of a nation, one of those “little nations” whose defense and protection was one of the points for which the war was fought. They knew to turn to England which had agreements with the Arabs, and they believed they had the right to courtesy from its minister. Mr. Churchill instead began by refusing to receive them and sending them back to the Commissioner as the representative of the Crown in the country, whom, as a Zionist partisan, they could not tolerate. When he then granted their request and admitted them to his presence, he protested openly that he “could not and did not want to annul the Balfour Declaration and prevent immigration: it was right that the Jews could come together in a national home in Palestine, to which they were tied by three millennia: this will also be a benefit even for the Arab Palestinians.”

To these statements, so strange for those present who felt only too well effects of the Jewish invasion, the minister added some phrases that did not ease the harshness, recalling that “the validity of the promises made to the Jews is just as much as the validity of those made to the Arabs... *National home* does not mean a Jewish government to rule the Arabs. England, which has more Muslims than any country in the world, is well disposed toward the Arabs and esteems them as friends. You should not have fears for the future: England has promised to give the Zionist movement a chance to show its worth, but it will only succeed on its own merits. These words were quite enigmatic since the showing its worth, for the Zionist movement, consisted in oppressing the Arabs. Where however Mr. Churchill showed that he did not quite understand the spirit of his audience was when he invited them to admire the progress of the new Jewish settlements where, with millions administered by the Anglo-Jewish Bank, electricity and other modern inventions had been introduced. The Arabs could certainly not enjoy progress that was costing them their freedom. Finally, making an allusion to the *memorandum* they had presented, he added with crude irony: "You speak as if it were you who had brought down the Turkish Empire: but that is not so; many English lives have been sacrificed for Palestine ... You speak as if you miss the Turkish administration ... And if you liked the Turks so much, why did you rebel against them?" The answer was simple and was expressed by the *Carmel*, an Arab newspaper in Haifa: The Arabs rebelled against the Turks to have independence, and it was precisely the English who urged them to rebel by the promise of liberty which now they do not want to keep. To devalue thus the cooperation of the Arabs after the victory was neither just nor responsible.

VI.

No one will be surprised that the Arabs, seeing how resorting to peaceful ways and legal remonstrations served them nothing, would lose their patience and let themselves be dragged into the path of violence. The discontent eventually became irritation and the brazen Zionist provocations easily became occasions for quarrels, commotions, brawls or worse. At the end of April 1920 Jews and Arabs fought in the streets of Jerusalem and a dozen men from one side or the other remained on the ground. The following year on the occasion of the 1st of May, certain demonstrations were carried out by Bolshevik Jews, quite a number of whom had come from the eastern provinces of Europe, who came to blows with other non-Bolshevik Jews making noise in the city: which outraged numbers of Arabs who happened upon them: scenes of bloodshed followed: the city was put into a state of siege and tumult which lasted several days.

News of these events spread through the countryside and there excited a ferment of rancor against the foreigners who had come to disturb the country. Arabs attacked Jewish settlements on the plain of Sarona: they plundered houses in Kafr Saba and Ain Hai, whence the inhabitants fled. Another day, it was rumored that the Jews of Kedera, a village between Jaffa and Caesarea, had imprisoned some Moslem workers, a group of Arabs rushed to invade the land and tried to force the place where the inhabitants had barricaded themselves in: but an English airplane suddenly appeared nearby and bombed from high up, wounding and killing many, and dispersing the others. When the serious conflicts in Jaffa of the same month of May 1921 occurred, the English government applied a rigorous censorship to the telegraph service and the press, so that the truth of matters would not leak out to the public and everything would be contained within the prescribed limits of “minor incidents.” But will “incidents” always be left smothered in silence? And is silence the appropriate medicine to heal the plague that gnaws at the souls of the people? Meanwhile it is necessary to augment the military contingents in the face of a continual state of alarm in which the hostility of the parties has divided the inhabitants. The Arabs, so submitted to authority until yesterday, no longer contain their opposition to the government: and if they could express the reasons to the same Secretary for the Colonies who since his first landing at the port of Haifa was greeted with an anti-Jewish mutiny and then going through the villages on the way to Jerusalem heard the gathered people hurling the cry in his face: Down with the Jews! While visiting the Holy City he went onto the site chosen for the erection of the Zionist university, of which we spoke in the preceding article, for an official ceremony of planting a tree, and his speech there contained an augury for the foundation. During the night the tree was uprooted and replaced by a pile of filth. From a report published in the *Edinburgh Review*, we know that the same Sir Herbert Samuel, in a tour he made recently in the northern part of Palestine, was surrounded by a crowd of malcontents which pressed in close to him menacingly, and could only be saved by starting to give orders for the stopping of Jewish immigration. In sum, Palestine has lost the security and tranquility of order that it formerly enjoyed.

VII.

But Palestine has lost, by the stroke of Zionism, something more serious and precious than material order: that of moral order and honesty of tradition. A great number of the foreigners whom Zionist propaganda has summoned back to the country are far from the flower of humanity: they come especially from the lower levels of the ghettoes teeming within their confines in Russia, Poland, Hungary, Romania: and from there with other pestiferous infections has been brought the insanity of the most extreme bolshevik communism. Behind those crowds a filthy tribe of nameless females invaded the city and suburbs, spreading vice and depravity throughout. On the authority of the same High Commissioner, in those districts that had for so many centuries the dear name of the Holy Land, whence the shadow of the Divine Redeemer had until now kept them far from prostitution, it began to have a legal hotel with some restrictions, then, by order of February 3, 1921, with full freedom for anyone to open houses of ill repute, in the face of the Sepulchre of Christ, in Jerusalem, or next to his manger in Bethlehem, or in Jaffa, or in Haifa, or in Gaza or in other townships: and the turpitude immediately swept in so shamelessly that in short order the Holy City alone had five hundred of these miserable creatures. Together with vice, its inevitable contagions spread, and according to information we receive from the localities, there are thousands of victims of these shameful diseases that were previously unknown in this country: not to mention the illegitimate births and other vileness that are wont to accompany the dissoluteness of public morals.

Against all this filth that dishonors Palestine together with the Arabs, and more, there are protests from the Christian population, which suffers the abuses of power and the oppressions with which the Jews arrogantly tyrannize the country, and much more do they complain of the insult done to their faith by converting the consecrated sanctuary of the life of the Man-God into a refuge of vice and a theater of corruption. In other issues we have already reported the conference held here in Rome by His Excellency the Latin Patriarch of Jerusalem concerning the damaging upheaval caused by the Zionist invasion and the deplorable influences that the invasion has exerted upon public morality. How much and how far the ugly truth of the facts as to the lying declamations of religious ascendancy that Israel would be established by the return to the land of their fathers! The truth is that the misconduct and political intrigues of the Zionists are condemned by the same Palestinian Jews who are the most faithful followers of the Mosaic traditions, who always lived in peaceful proximity to the Arabs. That is why they are full of wrath against these pseudo-brothers and their work of arrogance and oppression.

Let us think with the reader about what can be expected from such sectarians, by the Catholic portion of the population, with all the works the Church has created and maintained through the centuries in memory of the august mysteries that came to pass on that sacred soil. Until recently, the respect for the ancient rights sanctioned by international treaties was imposed upon that same Turkish government, as well as the universal sympathy surrounding the beneficial activities of the Catholic nations in their institutes of religion, education and charitable works in the holy name of Christ. What will be the fate of those institutes, those activities, those rights, under an empire in which Protestant-Jewish-Bolshevik influence vies, without any guarantees but those inscribed in the Balfour Declaration, of which we know the value? The common danger has already united the Christian and Muslim populations in a defensive league for the rights of their own existence, raising protests in public rallies and, in view of the hostility of Great Britain, taking direct recourse to the Council of the League of Nations, to which the conventions of war have assigned the decisions about the future of this country. (FN: The Muslims had recourse to the Holy See via Cardinal Giustini when he was in Jerusalem as pontifical legate for the feast of the hundredth anniversary of St. Francis of Assisi.) Will the force of law finally have its rightful weight among the rulers of the people, or will it prove true that might always makes right?

VIII.

It is the opinion of many that England has not adequately weighed the consequences that could result from the cruel step into which it has been led by Zionism. Anyone who knows the Arab knows how, along with his frank generosity of character, he is tenacious in his vendettas. The greater the trust he placed in Great Britain when, embracing its cause, he had hoped from it political independence, the deeper will endure in him the rancor over the deception he suffered. The wrong he received in Palestine has repercussions from the Taurus Mountains to the Cape Ras el Hadd among all those tribes linked by bonds of race that line the seas on the way to India. It should stand close to the heart of Great Britain to avoid having enemies along that way: the methods used by them, however, in their conduct toward the inhabitants of Palestine, are not optimal for success. Among the politicians of that nation are those who do not fail to hear: and to seek more effective means for a remedy, a large meeting was held last May in London at the instance of the *National Political League*, with the involvement of a large number of members of the two chambers of parliament and other personages. At it, after having observed that it is not possible to allow the current form of the government of Palestine to continue without danger to order and peace in the country and without shame to the name of Britain in the Middle East, the assembly chose by unanimous vote to present to the Prime Minister a resolution requesting the abolition of the Zionist Commission, the concession of an autonomous government to the Palestinians and a parliamentary vote whether to approve the Mandate.

This National League wanted to show its favor to the justice of their cause by holding a banquet in honor of the Arab delegation sent to England to present its memorandum to the government and to request an impartial inquest into the state of matters in their country. Also on this occasion member of parliament Joynson-Hicks, who presided over the meeting, recognized the rights of the Palestinians, denouncing the Balfour Declaration as a “mystery of modern politics,” and concluded by exclaiming sadly: “The violation of our word of honor in Palestine would bring even worse than in Ireland!” It is certain that the state of more or less open agitation and hostility that has been reigning in the region has forced England up to now to maintain a strong garrison of occupation, to be prepared for any possible eventuality, which is costing it no less than 60 or 70 million per year. Neither is it to be hoped that such a state of agitation will cease, if the current state of violence and oppression does not cease, and if the Arabs are not given the essential guarantees of their freedom and independence. Thus the advantage of the English public Treasury accords fully with the interests of the Palestinian people founded on fidelity to treaties and principles of the strictest justice.

A resolution of the House of Lords came in these days to recognize loyally the principles of these treaties, approving by 60 votes to 29 a motion by Lord Islington, in which it was stated, “the Mandate for Palestine in the present form is inacceptable, because it is directly in violation of the promise made by the government to the Palestinian people and is opposed to the sentiments and desires of the majority of the English people”: and it proposed that it not be accepted by the Council of the League of Nations unless changes were made in accordance with the contractual obligations of the government.

Finally, with superior authority, intervening in defense of the population that has sought its protection, the Holy See sent on June 28 a letter to the League of Nations protesting against the granting of economic, administrative and political predominance to the Jews over the other nationalities of Palestine and calling for guarantees of security for the Catholic interests that the new Mandate threw into play among warring passions.