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Introduction

In this pamphlet we publish the full text of the plan which was put forward to the British Government by the Arab States for the solution of the Palestine problem. The fact that this plan was rejected by the British Government may give the impression, particularly to those not fully acquainted with the background of the question, that the solution it offered was in itself unreasonable or repugnant to justice. Moreover and quite apart from the British Government's formal rejection of it, the Arab plan has not been given in this country anything like the publicity and public consideration which in fairness is due to such an important document. By some newspapers it was mentioned—cursorily and inconspicuously—only to be dismissed out of hand as one more expression of Arab intransigence matching that of the Zionists and making a compromise solution impossible.

All attempts made to adjudicate on the Palestine controversy have been vitiated by one fundamental fallacy arising either from ignorance of the facts of the problem or from a deliberate refusal to apply to its solution the common principles of justice and international morality. This fallacy is that the Arabs and the Jews stand on a footing of equality as regards the justice of their claims and that therefore the only just solution is one that lies half-way between the two opposing positions. This, on any honest logical analysis of the question, is entirely untrue, and if the Palestine problem is to be solved on a moral basis, by the application of universal principles and regardless of the clamour and influence of interested parties or the appeal of irrelevant emotions, however laudable in themselves, the solution would be manifest.

In order that the solution offered in the Arab plan should be understood for what it is, namely as not only an eminently just but also a generous solution involving far-reaching concessions on the part of the Arabs, it is necessary that the Arab proposals should be seen against the background of such an analysis.

Historical Background

The incontestable fact from which any such analysis should start is that Palestine is and was when this problem was created 30 years ago an Arab country, belonging to the Arabs as its indigenous people and occupiers since the dawn of history. The only real title which any people has to its country by whatever means it may have acquired it in the first instance comes from long and continued possession. It is long and continued possession that gives the British their right to Britain, the French their right to France and the Americans their right to America. This is a criterion which the common acceptance of mankind has set up as a universal principle. It is recognized as the basis of just and civilized dealings between nations. It is indeed the basis of the integrity and security of all nations and no just international order can be established in the world to-day on any other foundation.

In 1917 when the Balfour Declaration was issued the population of Palestine was something like 650,000. Of these more than 600,000, i.e., over 90% were Arabs. As Arabs they had been in continuous possession of the country since the seventh century of the Christian era. In another sense however they had an even older title to the country for they were the descendants of the original native population which had inhabited the country from the dawn of history, which was there when the Jews came into it about 1,500 B.C., survived the Jewish occupation and retained possession of a large part of the country throughout the Jewish period, and remained in the country after the Jews left it, to be Arabised in the 7th century as a result of the Arab conquest and continue their occupation of the land in this new character.

Prior to the 1914-18 War, Palestine was a part of the Ottoman Empire. Its status however, like that of the other parts of the Arab world, was not that of a subject territory or colony but that of an equal partner with the Turkish parts, participating fully in the Government of the Empire with representatives in the imperial parliament and Cabinet.

Even this status, however, did not satisfy the Arabs who desired complete independence and with this object rejoined
against Turkey during that war. In return for their armed assistance Great Britain undertook, subject to certain reservations relating to French interests in Syria and Lebanon, to recognize and uphold the independence of the Arabs in a region which included Palestine.

Contrary to these pledges and in violation of their incontrovertible natural rights, the Arabs were not only denied their independence by the 1919 settlement, but also subjected to an unprecedented form of aggression, the attempt to establish in their country a national home for the Jewish people.

Here it is necessary to explain what the position of the Jews in Palestine was at that time.

Apart from the 600,000 or more Arabs, there was in 1917 a small Jewish community in the country numbering 35-40,000, i.e., less than 9% of the population. Most of these, however, were long-established naturalized Jews, like the Jewish minorities that existed in almost every country of the world. Even if these Jews had cherished nationalist ambitions against the Arab population and desired to increase their numbers by Jewish immigration from abroad, they would have been debarred, by another universal principle, namely the right of majorities, from any right to enforce their wishes against the will of the Arabs. But these indigenous Jews had no such ambitions and made no claim to the country. The challenge to the clear and natural right of the Arabs to Palestine came from outside, from a section of world Jewry in Europe and America.

Zionist Claims

The Zionist claim to Palestine on the basis of which, ostensibly, the Balfour Declaration and the Mandate for Palestine were framed, rests on a number of arguments all of which represent ingenious but manifestly spurious attempts to get around the fundamental universal principles on which the Arab right stands unshakably.

The first is the historical argument by which the Zionists claim Palestine on the grounds of the special historical association of the Jewish people with it and the fact that at one time more than 2,000 years ago the Jews had a kingdom in a part of it. If, however, as we have seen, long and continued possessi-
insistence, the humanitarian argument. This argument, however powerful as it is, can only give the Jews a right against the whole civilized world as such. It cannot give them any right against one particular country, especially as that country was in no way responsible for the sufferings of the Jews in Europe. It cannot in any way justify their going to a country against the wishes of its people. Moreover, the General Assembly of the United Nations, in its sitting of 15th December, 1946, unanimously adopted a resolution against the resettlement of displaced persons in such countries as Palestine, where this resettlement would be likely to disturb friendly relations with neighbouring countries, or to be harmful to the interests of the inhabitants of non-self-governing countries like Palestine. The resolution of the United Nations, which is in paragraph 9 in the Appendix No. 1 to the Constitution of the Refugees International Organization, reads as follows:

"The organization should endeavour to carry out its functions in such a way as to avoid disturbing friendly relations between nations. In the pursuit of this objective, the Organization should exercise special care in cases in which the re-establishment or re-settlement of refugees or displaced persons might be contemplated either in countries contiguous to their respective countries of origin or in non-self-governing countries.

"The Organization should give due weight among other factors to any evidence of genuine apprehension and concern felt in regard to such plans in the former case by the country of origin of the persons involved, or, in the latter case, by the indigenous population of the non-self-governing country in question."

The Zionists argue on the one hand that there is nowhere for the Jewish refugees to go except Palestine, and on the other that the Jewish refugees have no wish to go anywhere but to Palestine. Both contentions are untrue. The lie is given to the first by the fact that several South American States have offered to take refugees from Europe and that one of them in particular, the Dominican Republic, specified their willingness to take Jewish refugees. The lie to the second is given by the recent application of 5,000 German Jews in Palestine for per-

mission to return to Germany. But the Zionists are determined to sabotage all attempts to solve the Jewish refugee problem in a genuinely humanitarian manner and to refuse every alternative to Palestine because their real object is political and not humanitarian.

The Balfour Declaration and the Mandate

To any mind free from prejudice and guided by logic only, this analysis should make it clear beyond all doubt that the Zionists have no right to Palestine whatever and that their attempt to take it away from its rightful owners is an act of aggression. That this act of aggression was given a pseudo-constitutional form by the Balfour Declaration and its incorporation in the Mandate for Palestine does not alter its fundamental character. If there is any incompatibility between a certain policy or instrument of government on the one hand and the universal principles of justice on the other, it is the former, not the latter that must be declared invalid.

The whole Palestine problem was created by the Balfour Declaration and the Mandate which Britain obtained for Palestine and in which the Declaration was incorporated. By the Balfour Declaration Britain declared its sympathy with the idea of establishing in Palestine a national home for the Jewish people and offered "to use its best endeavors to facilitate the achievement of this object," provided that nothing should be done "to prejudice the civil and religious rights" of the rest of the population. Now quite regardless of what was actually meant by this declaration, it is quite clear that Britain had no right to promise Palestine or anything in Palestine to a third party. Palestine did not belong to Britain. Nor did Palestine belong to the Turks with whom Britain was at war at the time. As mentioned previously in this paper, Palestine, like the rest of the Arab countries, was a part of the Ottoman Empire, but the Arabs themselves were in revolt against Turkey and fighting on the side of Britain and the Allies for their national independence. Their right to independence had been specifically recognized by Britain in the agreement concluded between her and them in 1915 and more generally by the universal principles laid down by the Allies as the moral basis of their fight against
Germany and according to which all the subject peoples under enemy rule would be liberated and, if sufficiently advanced, recognized as independent communities. In so far therefore as the Balfour Declaration contemplated anything incompatible with the full political and economic freedom of the Arabs of Palestine, in so far indeed as it presumed to confer any rights on the Jews in Palestine against the wishes of the Arabs, it was morally invalid. Legally too it was invalid because it was incompatible with the honest fulfillment to the Arabs of the solemn pledges Britain had made to them a year before its issue.

It may be thought that however invalid the Balfour Declaration was in itself as a promise emanating from Great Britain alone, the Mandate by incorporating it and so apparently giving it the endorsement of the League of Nations gave the Zionists a right which cannot be lightly dismissed. The answer to this is two-fold. In the first place the terms of the Mandate for Palestine were not worked out by the League of Nations but by the Allied and victorious powers, as Lord Cecil of Chelwood, than whom no one is more closely acquainted with the early history of the League of Nations, pointed out in a letter to the "Times" of the 25th February, 1947. Indeed the text of the Mandate was largely the work of the Zionist leaders themselves. The same pressure and the same considerations that had induced the British Government to issue the Balfour Declaration brought about its incorporation in the Mandate and the "granting" of the Mandate to Britain so that she should be in a position to carry out the policy envisaged in the Declaration. With certain modifications Britain accepted the draft Mandate drawn up by the Zionist leaders, and got the Supreme Allied Council to accept it and pass it to the League of Nations for formal endorsement. The wishes of the Arabs were not consulted, their protests not heeded. One attempt was made (by the Government of the United States) to ascertain the wishes of the Arabs and so apply the mandatory principle in an honest manner and in the spirit in which it had been conceived by President Wilson. A competent American commission (the King-Crane Commission) was sent to Syria in the summer of 1919 by the President himself to investigate the matter on the spot. This Commission reported strongly against the Zionist design as incompatible with the rights of the Arabs and recommended that only a very modified programme of Jewish immigration into and settlement in Palestine should be attempted, but no more notice was taken of these recommendations than of the protests of the Arabs themselves.

Thus the manner in which the Mandate was framed and awarded to Britain was only one instance of the workings of international intrigue and power politics which only too often in 1919 sought to clothe themselves with the moral dignity of the League of Nations.

In the second place the terms of the Mandate for Palestine were in themselves a manifest violation of the Covenant of the League of Nations. Article 22 of the Covenant (from which all mandates derive their authority) recognized in principle the independence of all the Arab provinces of the Ottoman Empire subject only to their receiving temporary help and guidance from one of the more advanced nations. Palestine was one of these provinces. In fact it was merely a part of Syria and nothing was said in Article 22 that might conceivably be interpreted as excluding it from this recognition. Yet when it came to the framing of the Mandate for Palestine, the provisions of Article 22 were disregarded. Palestine was arbitrarily severed from Syria and a special kind of mandate devised for it in which no mention was made of independence (as in the case of the mandates for Syria, Lebanon and Iraq) and in which moreover the first obligation laid upon the mandatory power was not the task of helping the native population to achieve self-government, but that of establishing by immigration a national home in the country for a foreign community. The Mandate did indeed require the Mandatory to safeguard the interests and rights of the native population and to develop self-governing institutions in the country, but this obligation, which according both to the spirit and letter of Article 22 of the Covenant should have been the one and only task of the Mandatory, occupied in the text of the Mandate for Palestine an inconspicuous part as compared with the provisions for the establishment of the national home and at least gave the impression that the intention of the Mandate was to subordinate it to the other, though later the British Government denied, with the approval of the Mandates' Commission of the League of Nations, that this was the case.
Consequences of the Mandate

It is quite clear from all this that in issuing the Balfour Declaration and framing the Mandate for Palestine neither the British Government nor its allies, who (either as in the case of America urged the action or as in the case of the others merely accepted and endorsed it), were applying universal principles of justice or taking into honest account the unquestionable rights of the people of the country concerned. Both instruments were conceived and framed by a foreign movement that had designs on that country inimical to the rights and interests of its people and both instruments were issued under the influence of that movement which was in a position to exert considerable pressure on the Allied governments when the Arabs lacked the means of making their voice heard or of putting similar pressure on those who were deciding the fate of the world.

Britain herself however was not unaware of the alarm and opposition of the Arabs to the policy on which she was embarking. To allay Arab fears she gave the Arabs categorical and repeated assurances that Jewish settlement in Palestine would not be allowed to interfere with their economic or political freedom.

The aim of the Zionists, which Britain had undertaken to further was however from the start one that meant destruction for Arab freedom in Palestine. The Zionists regarded Palestine as their property and were determined from the outset to dislodge the Arabs from it by intensive immigration and colonization. They aimed at both political and economic domination. They wanted to acquire all the cultivable land in the country by tempting absentee landlords and impecunious peasants to sell it to them and they wanted to become ultimately the majority and be able to have a Jewish National State in which the Arabs would either be a landless and impotent minority or from which they would be gradually squeezed out into the surrounding Arab territories.

Both designs were immediately put into execution under the protection and with the help of the Mandatory Power. Jewish immigrants from Europe, in what the British Foreign Secretary himself described in the House of Commons on the 25th February, 1947, as “a virtual invasion,” poured into the country and every facility was offered them to acquire land in Palestine including State lands. A Zionist organization was set up in Palestine called the Jewish Agency to co-operate with the Mandatory Power in building up the national home. Enormous powers were given to this organization which soon developed into a government within the Government and was in a position to exercise considerable influence amounting often to pressure on the Mandatory administration.

Lastly a number of concessions calculated to monopolize the mineral wealth and motive power of the country, and therefore to control its entire industrial development, were given to Jews by very questionable methods.

As was only natural and indeed inevitable, the Arabs felt that they were being invaded and that a novel and unique kind of aggression was being committed against them. A bitter conflict ensued which has now lasted for nearly 30 years and which on several occasions expressed itself in outbreaks of violence and once assumed the proportions of a national rebellion. On three occasions during this period the British Government have attempted to define the precise meaning of the Balfour Declaration and their own obligations under the Mandate towards the Arabs and Jews. The first of these attempts was made in 1922 when the British Government of that year issued a statement of policy denying Zionist allegations that it was the intention of His Majesty’s Government to convert the whole of Palestine into a national home for the Jewish people or to subordinate the Arab element in the country to the Jewish. Further, the British Government tried in this statement to define what they meant by a “national home,” and the definition they gave was such as to preclude any idea of political sovereignty or a national state. Again in 1930 the British Government in a second important statement denied the Zionist contention that the paramount obligation laid on Britain by the Mandate was to establish the Jewish national home and that the obligations undertaken towards the Arabs were subordinate to it. The British Government affirmed that in their view the two obligations assumed by Britain under the Mandate, i.e., the one to establish
the national home and the one to help the people of the country develop towards self-government and to protect their rights and interests, carried equal weight. This interpretation by Britain of the relative weight of her obligations under the Mandate was endorsed by the League of Nations. Further the British Government affirmed their belief that these two obligations were in no way irreconcilable.*

This statement of policy was met with such opposition from the Zionists in Britain and so much pressure was put by them on the British Government to rescind it that the then Prime Minister, Mr. Ramsay MacDonald, wrote a letter to Dr. Weizmann a few days after its issue which almost entirely nullified it.

By stressing the equality of the two obligations in the Mandate and affirming their reconcilability, the British Government of 1930 had in fact implied that a limit on the expansion of the national home would some time or other home to be imposed, since if this was not done then Britain would be manifestly failing to protect the rights and interests of the Arabs. And this was what the British Government of 1939 had to do. In the White Paper of that year the British Government made it clear that in their view the national home as envisaged in the Balfour Declaration and subsequently defined in the 1922 White Paper had come into being and that Britain had therefore discharged her obligation towards the Jews. To persist in developing the national home beyond that point by continued immigration against the wishes of the Arabs, the British Government stated, would constitute a breach of Britain's undertakings towards the Arabs and would inevitably mean rule by force. Moreover the British Government recognized that the time had come for them to implement their undertaking to promote self-government in Palestine which, unlike the other Arab countries placed under mandates in 1919, was still under a semi-Colonial rule and had no self-governing institutions whatsoever, and that for no reason save that the establishment of the Jewish national home could only be effected by a foreign power ruling the country without reference to the wishes of its people. The White Paper of 1939 therefore provided for the complete stoppage of immigration and the establishment of self-government for Palestine as a whole. It also imposed certain restrictions on the sale of land to the Jews.

But even this belated and incomplete attempt to do justice to the Arabs, or at least to arrest the further progress of the injustice done to them in 1917 was not carried out when the time came for its implementation. Only that part of it which constituted a further concession to the Zionists, namely the provision for the admission of another 75,000 immigrants in five years, was put into effect, but the part concerned with the establishment of self-government, i.e., with the fulfillment of Britain's obligations towards the Arabs, was left unimplemented and the British Government further decided that immigration should continue at the rate of 1,500 a month beyond the final quota provided for in the White Paper, until a final solution could be reached.

Meanwhile nearly half a million Jews had been brought into Palestine since 1920 against the wishes of the people of the country. The number of Jews in Palestine had risen from about 45,000 in 1917 to well over 600,000, and the Arab population having risen by natural increase to 1,200,000, the ratio of Jews to Arabs had been raised, almost entirely by the artificial means of immigration, from under 10 to over 33 per cent. More than a third of the cultivable land of Palestine had passed into the hands of the Jews and the land remaining in the hands of the Arabs was no longer enough to provide viable lots for the total of Arab peasant families. Further the Jews had built up for themselves an exclusive economy from which the Arabs were debarred. Land purchased by the Jewish National Fund could never again be resold to Arabs and the employment of Arab labour on it was forbidden in the terms of the deed by which it was leased to individual Jewish farmers. The Zionists established their own trade unions closed to Arab workers and Jewish industrial undertakings as a rule employed Jewish labour exclusively. To complete their invasion and colonization of the country and acquire absolute political control of it, the Zionists, mobilizing all their forces in Britain and America and exploit-

*Another seventeen years were to elapse before the British Government finally came to the conclusion, announced by Mr. Bevin in the House of Commons on 25th February, 1947, that the two obligations were in fact irreconcilable, since, as he put it, the one provided for an invasion of the country, and the other for the protection of the rights of the people in possession.
ing the irrelevant humanitarian appeal which the sufferings of the Jews under Nazi rule in Europe had made to the peoples of the Western democracies, demanded the establishment of a Jewish national state in the whole of Palestine and continued immigration to give them the majority which they needed to achieve this object. Some of them however, realizing that this demand was too fantastic to be capable of realization in the immediate future, have professed their willingness, as though making a great concession, to accept a Jewish national state in a viable part of Palestine.

**Alternative Solutions**

Thus there are to-day in theory three possible solutions of the Palestine problem (i), the establishment of a Jewish state in the country as a whole; (ii), the partition of the country and the establishment in it of two separate states, a Jewish and an Arab; (iii), the granting of independence to the country as a whole and the establishment in it of a unitary state on the basis of the present population with a democratic government in which all citizens would be represented and guaranteed in the enjoyment of civil and political rights. The first solution would involve the suppression of the indigenous majority and its forcible conversion into a minority by continued immigration. It would involve the cynical violation of every principle of justice and democracy recognized as the basis of all civilized international relations and enshrined as the supreme law of the world in the Charter of the United Nations. In principle the second solution, i.e., partition, would be just as immoral as the first, for if the Jews have no right to Palestine as a whole they have no right to any part of it. No line of demarcation could be drawn that would not leave a large Arab minority under Jewish rule. And if the Zionists, who are a foreign community in Palestine, object to living as a minority in the country as a whole, what justification can there be for forcing a part of the indigenous population to live as a minority in a Jewish state established in a part of the country? There can, of course, be none, and Mr. Bevin frankly admitted this in his House of Commons' speech on the 25th February. Lastly, Palestine is too small to be divided into two viable states and any division of it in the interests of a foreign community that has forced an entry into it would be a grave political and economic wrong to its people.

An official Commission (the Woodhead Commission) sent out to Palestine by the British Government in 1938 in order to study the possibilities of partition, came to the conclusion that it was entirely impracticable and on its recommendation the British Government decided against any such solution.

If therefore both these solutions would be morally wrong and should be ruled out, what is the answer? The answer is to be found in the Arab proposals. A careful study of the solution contained in them will show that it is based on universal principles whose validity cannot be questioned and that while providing for minimum justice to the Arabs as the owners of the country and the vast majority in it, it offers a very generous concession to the Jews. The most outstanding feature of the Arab plan—and this should be clearly realized—is that it does not require the eradication of the original wrong done to the Arabs in 1917 together with all that has grown from it up-to-date, but merely that that wrong shall be arrested at its present stage. The Arabs have not asked that all the Jews that have entered the country during the last 30 years—although they did so against their wishes—shall be evicted from it. They are only asking that the fantastic Zionist claim to the country, a claim which does not rest on any kind of right whatever, shall no longer debar it from the independence which is its right; that the indigenous majority in it shall no longer be suppressed in the interests of a foreign minority; and that no more immigrants shall be brought into the country until it has a government of its own through which the will of the people can be expressed. To all those Jews who have been in the country for more than ten years and become citizens the Arab plan offers the maximum rights of citizenship, a permanent and secure position in the country with full participation in its political life on a footing of absolute equality with the Arabs themselves.

Only by accepting the position offered to them in this plan can the Jews in Palestine achieve a normal moral and healthy relationship with the Arabs, a relationship based on goodwill and co-operation. And surely this is the only way in which the Jews can secure their future in Palestine and vis-a-vis the Arab world as a whole. If they reject this plan and persist,
under Zionist inspiration, in defying Arab wishes and attempting with foreign aid to prosecute their invasion of the country, they will continue to be regarded and treated as aggressors by the people—a national community of 40 or 50 millions—among whom they have come to live. A situation would thus be perpetuated fraught with peril to the Jews themselves and to the peace of the Middle East.

Lastly it should be emphasized that the Arab plan offers the only solution which would enable Palestine to fulfill its natural destiny as a part of the Arab world. Palestine can have no future if abstracted from the Arab structure and converted into an alien entity in conflict with the surrounding Arab countries.

**THE ARAB PROPOSALS**

The following are the proposals submitted by the Delegations of the Arab Governments at the Palestine Conference held in London in October 1946. The full text runs as follows:

1. "The first step would be for the High Commissioner to establish, by nomination and after consultation with the leading Palestinian elements, a Provisional Government consisting of seven Arab and three Jewish Ministers of Palestinian nationality. The legislative and executive powers of the present administration in Palestine would be transferred to the Provisional Government as soon as it has been appointed. The High Commissioner would retain a power of veto throughout the transition period.

2. "Simultaneously, the High Commissioner would initiate the preparation by the Provisional Government of an electoral register on the basis of one stage adult male suffrage. As soon as this register was prepared, the Provisional Government would hold elections for a Constituent Assembly in accordance with an electoral law to be enacted by them. This Constituent Assembly would consist of 60 members. The electoral law should provide for the adequate representation in the Constituent Assembly of all the important sections of citizenship, as defined in paragraph 4 (vi) (a) below, in accordance with their respective numbers.

"The representation of Arabs and Jews in the Provisional Government would be without prejudice to the proportions to be determined in the constitution for the representation of Arabs and Jews in the Legislative Assembly. The method of election of the Constituent Assembly would similarly be without prejudice to the permanent electoral law (see paragraph 5 below).

3. "The Provisional Government would prepare and submit to the Constituent Assembly a draft constitution for Palestine. If the Constituent Assembly proved unable to reach decision on the terms of the constitution within a period of six months from the date of its opening, the Provisional Government would reconsider their draft in the light of the Assembly's debates, would revise it if necessary, and would then enact it themselves.

4. "The Provisional Government in drafting or enacting the constitution, and the Constituent Assembly in debating and voting on it, would be bound by directives issued by the High Commissioner. With the exception of these binding directives, the constitution, as decided by the Constituent Assembly would not be subject to the power of veto by the High Commissioner. These directives would provide for the embodiment in the constitution of the following principles:

(i) Palestine should be a unitary State.

(ii) It should have a democratic constitution, with an elected legislature.

(iii) The constitution should provide guarantees for the sanctity of the Holy Places, covering inviolability, maintenance, freedom of access and freedom of worship in accordance with the status quo.

(iv) The constitution should guarantee, subject to suitable safeguards, freedom of religious practice in accordance with the status quo throughout Palestine (including the maintenance of separate religious courts for matters of personal status).

(v) The law of naturalization should provide amongst other conditions that the applicant should be a legal resident of Palestine for a continuous period of ten years before his application.

(vi) The constitution should provide guarantees for:

(a) Full rights of citizenship for:
(1) Any person falling under Part I and subject to (3) below, any person falling under Part II of the Palestinian Citizenship Order, 1925-41.
(2) Any person who acquired Palestinian citizenship by naturalization before May, 1939.

(3) Any person who acquired Palestinian citizenship after May, 1939, under the Palestinian Citizenship Order 1925-41, and has been permanently resident in Palestine for a period of ten years.

(4) Any person who in future acquires Palestinian citizenship by naturalization under the new law of naturalization referred to in sub-paragraph (v) above.

(b) The right of any resident in Palestine to apply for and acquire Palestinian citizenship on the same terms and conditions without discrimination on the grounds of race, religion or language.

(c) The right of religious bodies or other societies and individuals to maintain, in addition to educational establishments administered by public authority, private schools and universities, subject to the compulsory teaching of Arabic in the schools and to Government control for the purpose of maintaining educational standards and preventing subversive teaching with the object of creating common allegiance.

(d) The right of Jews to employ the Hebrew language as a second official language in districts where they form an absolute majority.

(e) 1. Securing that the electoral law for the Legislature shall provide for the adequate representation of all the important sections of the citizenry, as defined in sub-paragraph (a) above, provided that in no case shall the number of Jewish representatives exceed one-third of the total number of the members.

2. Securing that the constitution shall provide for the adequate reflection in the Executive and the Administration of the distribution of the representation in the legislature.

(vii) Unless and until legislation provides otherwise, Jewish immigration into Palestine should be entirely prohibited, and the existing land transfer restrictions should remain unchanged. The constitution should provide

that any change in the above two matters can only be effected by law requiring the consent of the Arabs in Palestine as expressed by a majority of the Arab members of the Legislative Assembly.

(viii) The guarantees concerning the Holy Places should be embodied in a declaration made to the General Assembly of the United Nations by the independent Palestine State, which would bind itself thereby that those guarantees should not subsequently be modified without the consent of that Assembly.

(xi) The guarantees concerning the rights of the Jewish citizens which are prescribed in the preceding provisions should not be subject to amendment without the consent of the Jewish citizens of Palestine as expressed by a majority of the Jewish members of the Legislative Assembly.

(x) Machinery should be provided, through the establishment of a Supreme Court, for determining whether any legislation is inconsistent with the provisions of the constitution, and it should be open to any citizen of Palestine to have recourse to that tribunal.

(5) “When the constitution had been adopted, the Provisional Government would proceed forthwith to hold the first parliamentary elections. The first Head of the independent Palestine State would then be appointed, by whatever procedure was laid down for the purpose in the constitution. The Head of the State would forthwith assume full powers under the constitution. The Mandatory Power should effect the termination of the Mandate and recognize the independence of Palestine. A Treaty of Alliance should be concluded to define the future relations between His Majesty’s Government in the United Kingdom and the independent State of Palestine.

(6) “During the transition period, substantial numbers of Palestinians should be progressively brought into the administration.

(7) “Every effort should be made to complete with the least possible delay the stages described in the preceding paragraphs, notwithstanding the non-co-operation of any section of the Palestine citizenry. The assumption of powers by the Head of the Palestine State should take place not later than the 31st December, 1948.”
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