

THE PROBLEM
OF
ARAB UNITY

BY
TAWFIC HINEIDI

A thesis submitted to the Department
of Political Science in Partial fulfillment of
the requirements for a Master's degree.

American University of Beirut
October, 1943.

TO THAT PART OF THE ARAB YOUTH CONSCIOUS OF THEIR DUTIES
AND RESPONSIBILITIES TOWARD THE ARAB CAUSE AND
UPON WHOM LIES THE TASK OF REBUILD-
ING THE ARAB NATION

THIS THESIS

IS

DEDICATED.

C O N T E N T S

FOREWORD

INTRODUCTION

	<u>Page</u>
CHAPTER I - The Arab National Movement	1
CHAPTER II - Factors of Arab Unity	22
CHAPTER III - Obstacles to Arab Unity.....	36
CHAPTER IV - Extent and form of Arab Unity	51
CHAPTER V - Organisation of Arab Unity.....	66
CHAPTER VI - Palestine and Arab Unity.....	91
Conclusion	105

FOREWORD

The problem of Arab Unity has become recently a problem of international as well as national interest among the Arabs and those who are interested in the organisation of the Post-War World. For the Arabs, it is the problem of the formation of the Arab nation, of its unity, and of its progress and development along modern lines. For those caring about Post-War reconstruction, it is the problem of the solution of the major questions of the Near East, and of the settlement of a lasting peace in this part of the world.

The present conflict will be considered by the historian of the future as a turning point in the life of most nations of the world. Just as the last World War has changed the ^{map} face of Europe, and of many parts of the other continents, so it will be for the present one, and the life and happiness of millions and millions will depend once more upon the decisions which the peace-makers of tomorrow will have to make. The Arab nation has been kept so far under the domination of different European powers, and the colonial ambitions of those powers have always stood as obstacles in the way of its unity. The vast majority of the Arabs are now looking forward to the day when they will throw away the yoke of the foreigner, unite themselves into one political organisation and join their efforts to build the Arab nation and give it its right place among the other nations of the world. The new forces resulting from the awakening of the Arab nation are so strong, and its vitality is so great that one cannot look to its

future as being a mere continuation of the dead past. It is a completely new situation coming out of an intense feeling of nationalism, and it is the duty of the peace-makers of tomorrow to evaluate these forces at their real strength and to construct accordingly the new settlement of the Arab World.

The idea of Arab Unity has recently passed from the theoretical to the practical field, and yet, in spite of this fact, it is still in a state of embryonic development, ^{because of the doubt or hesitation as to the end itself, but} not because of the vagueness and misunderstanding which reign in the minds of the people. The vast majority of the Arabs have an ardent faith in its future, but they do not know how that unity should materialize nor what steps should be followed in order to reach the ultimate goal. Should all the Arab countries enter the unity, or should the number be restricted to a few ones only? Is the unity to be formed at once or should it go through different steps before it reaches its final form? No serious study of these and other similar questions has been made so far, and no scheme seems to have general agreement in the matter.

The purpose of this thesis is therefore to attempt a study of the problem of Arab Unity as it stands to-day and as to its future chances of success. The motive behind the choice of this subject is the feeling that the end of the present conflict will bring about a certain realization of the hopes of the Arabs, and that studies of this kind, helping

to the solution of those problems which we are going to face in the near future, are of imperative necessity in the present time. Most of the material presented in this thesis is made up of personal opinions which I have on the subject rather than of a scientific research work. Such a research, however, has been made in those parts of the thesis where it was necessary to do it.

The wording of the title - "Problem of Arab Unity" - needs some explanation before we embark on the thesis proper. The word "Problem" has been purposely chosen because the study of Arab Unity presents so many aspects and so many "unknowns" that it really deserves this qualification. What do we mean by Arab Unity? What is the form of Arab Unity? Is Arab Unity possible? These and other aspects of the subject have led us to consider the question as a "problem" and to make our study accordingly. The word "Unity" needs also some elucidation. It should not be understood as meaning a definite form of government, that is a "unitary" versus "federal" state; it should rather be understood as "the state of being one", or the coming or bringing together or closer etc., but not as a form of government. On what basis should that unity be built? What is the form of the state which would come out of that unity? These are questions which will be answered in the course of the thesis but which are not necessarily included in the wording of the title.

Finally, the problem of Arab Unity is such a broad and extensive subject that one wonders what kind of material the writer should include in its study. There are indeed the political, the economic as well as the social and cultural aspects of Arab Unity, and each of these aspects would constitute by itself a thesis subject if one wished to treat it as such. I have chosen to deal with the "Problem of Arab Unity" from the political angle, not because this is the most important side of it, but simply because this work is a thesis in Political Science. The other aspects of the problem will not be totally disregarded; they will be dealt with in as far as their discussion is necessary to make this thesis a complete piece of work.

As a concluding word I should like to acknowledge my indebtedness and to express my deep sense of gratitude to my tutor, Professor Roger Soltau for the endless pains he has taken in guiding and advising me and without whose valuable help this thesis could not have been achieved.

T. H.

INTRODUCTION.

The present thesis rests on the definite assumption that there exists at the present time an Arab Nation, in the constitution of which most, if not all, the elements of nationality enter. If this nation has been for a long time, and is to the present day, divided into many communities, almost completely separated, and living independently from each other, it is because of various considerations the principal among them being the imperialist ambitions of the various powers, not because it lacks the necessary bonds which would make out of it a "nation" in the modern sense of the word. It is true that this nation is not as unified and homogenous as the English or the French or the German nations, but it is equally true that, even though weak and disintegrated, it is nevertheless entitled to that name. The purpose of this introductory chapter is therefore to show that this assumption is not unfounded, as some people are led to think, and that these separate communities constitute in the last analysis, but the component parts of the same nation. The problem of Arab Unity consists therefore essentially in the regrouping, as far as possible, of the different parts of that nation into one political organisation built on a modern and progressive basis.

There is no general agreement among writers as to the exact definition of the word "nation". Different and sometimes conflicting connotations are attached to it, so that one needs to be very

cautious when using it. Carlton G. Hayes says: "Since the XVII th. century "nation" has been used by jurists and publicists to describe the population of a sovereign political state, regardless of any racial or linguistic unity, and this description still enjoys general sanction"¹. Buell defines it in a totally different way and attaches no importance whatsoever to the existence of a sovereign state. To him: "a nation is a body of people, united by a corporate sentiment, a kind of fellow feeling or national sympathy, relating to a definite home-country, irrespective of religion, economic interests or social position"². Renan's definition, quoted in E. Barker's book "National Character" stresses the importance of this corporate sentiment, and relates it to the existence of a common heritage in the past, and a "will to live together" in the present: "A nation is a spiritual principle, made by two things, the one in the present, the other in the past; the one the possession in common of a rich bequest of memories, the other ^o ~~is~~ present sense of agreement, a desire to live together, and a will to continue to make effective the heritage received as an undivided unity."³ W. Hocking points out to the importance of the geographic, ethnic and linguistic elements, and the national character which would result out of them: "A nation is a large group, usually having a well defined geographic base, and a degree of ethnic and linguistic unity, whose common character impels its members to act together in the experiment of

-
1. Carlton G. Hayes; Essays on nationalism. p. 4.
 2. Buell: International Relations. p. 5.
 3. E. Barker: National Character. p. 12.

political life, while being so far distinct from nearby groups, that the inclusion of these groups would lower the worth of the experiment, for them and for all men."¹ Willoughby adds the elements of race, custom, language and history and stresses the importance of the rôle played by the feeling, which results from them:" When it is said that the influences of race, custom, language and history create a nation, it is meant that, from these sources, springs the feeling or sentiment that binds together a community of people and constitutes from them a single unit"². Finally E. Barker combines most of the elements already mentioned in this way:" A nation is a body of men, inhabiting a definite territory, who normally, are drawn from different races, but possess a common stock of thoughts and feelings acquired and transmitted during the course of a common history; who, on the whole and in the main, though more in the past than in the present, include in that common stock, a common religious belief; who generally and as a rule, use a common language, as the vehicle of their thoughts and feelings, and who, besides common thoughts and feelings, also cherish a common will, and accordingly form, or tend to form a separate state for the expression and realization of that will."³

The definition of the concept "nation" differs therefore from one writer to the other, and no kind of agreement should be expected in the delimitation of so widely used a word. There are how-

-
1. W. Hoeking: Spirit of World Politics. pp. 194-5.
 2. Willoughby: The Fundamental concepts of Public Law. pp. 60-1.
 3. E. Barker: National Character. p.17.

ever certain factors, upon which most writers agree as constituting elements of a nation, and it is these factors, as applied to the Arab people that we are going to study in the following pages. At the light of this study, we shall be in a position which enables us to judge whether the Arabs form a nation or not.

It is generally agreed that language is, and always has been, one of the most important elements in the formation of any nationality. Being a common medium of expression, and thereby one of the fundamental elements of social life, it works as a unifying factor of the utmost importance among the members of the same community. If that is true of languages in general, it is particularly true of the Arabic language because of the rôle it has played in the life of the Arabs.

It has brought together peoples and communities of far distant regions who would most probably have had totally different destinies, had it not been for the Arabic language. Peculiar among all other languages, Arabic has witnessed a phenomenon of exceptional importance which has had a far-reaching influence upon its history and determined its form for all ages; the fact that the "Koran" was written in Arabic had as a result that it established the classical basis of Arabic prose for all times. Ever since the rise of Islam the Arabic language has enjoyed therefore its original vigor and strength, and down to the present day it has kept its classical purity without any symptoms of weaknesses or alterations. It constituted thus a social basis for the life of the Arabs, and even nowadays it remains the only medium of expression for millions of them. The genius of the

language, its vocabulary, grammatical rules and expressions are the same all over that extensive area. If it has been divided into the written classical Arabic and the spoken dialects of the different regions, it is only for the purpose of the masses, and, even the colloquial dialects have always gone back to the classical to borrow its words and expressions.

Just like anyother language, Arabic has been the principal instrument of self-expression among the Arab peoples of all regions. This fact helped much to bring about a similar way of thinking and thereby a uniformity of interests and ideas, so that the different elements of the people, even when differing in religion and creed have been brought together by the use of the same language and the same medium of expression. It has thus helped in cementing those elements together and produced a kind of like-mindedness which is very important in the life of nations.

While there seems to be a general agreement about the importance of the language element in the formation of a nation, the racial factor remains a subject of controversy : while some give it a primary importance, others resolutely oppose it and question the existence of pure races at all. The word "race" has in fact been associated with so many ideas that it came to be counted among those words which are made to suffer a constant misuse. There are indeed four ideas which may be distinguished when race is mentioned: one is biological, another linguistic, a third cultural and a fourth political. To the first of these ideas a

race is a physical or zoological breed, and it is in this sense that scientists and publicists speak of the various races: Nordic and Alpine and Mediteranean. The word "race" may accordingly be used to denote a zoological variety of human beings distinguished from other varieties by physical attributes. The philologist, concerned with language, seeks to classify men on the basis of the languages which they speak: he unites those who speak languages derived from Latin in a group and, by a similar way, arrives at the large language-groups called by the names of Celtic, Teutonic and Slavonic races. To the third idea, race is understood as a culture group different from language and blood, and as such the Jews, who became and still remain a group united by a common culture and way of life, are sometimes called the Jewish race. There is a fourth idea besides those of breed and language and culture, which has sometimes been designated by the word race: it is the idea of the nation, which belongs to the historian or the political scientist.¹

The importance of the racial factor in the formation of the Arab Nation depends therefore upon the meaning in which the word race is understood. If we were to take the linguistic or cultural or political connotations of the term, we would say at once that the racial factor is of great importance in the formation of the Arab Nation. If, on the other hand, we were to consider the biological connotation of the word, our conclusions have to be ~~prudent~~ *different* -

1. E. Barker: National Character. pp. 19-23.

In fact, to pretend that the Arab peoples are constituted of a pure Arab blood is a folly, because none of the existing nations comprises members of a single race. The doctrine of racial purity is an artificial doctrine having no foundation in reality, and it is claimed that from the strictly scientific point of view, there is no such thing as a purity of race. Where nationality is most diverse, race may be quite uniform, just as there may be very homogeneous nations constituted of many races. Further the successive events of history, whether in migrations or wars or conquests, show that there has been constant shifting of races and mixture of populations throughout the ages, so that all semblance of racial purity has long since vanished. This is especially true of the Arab World, constituted essentially by large migrations of people from the heart of the Peninsula and their assimilation with the inhabitants of the newly conquered regions who were of different races. However the Arab blood remained dominant in those countries all along the borders of the Peninsula because it was always fed with fresh migrations coming from there.

The role played by the racial factor in the formation of the Arab Nation is therefore of the same nature than it is in the other nationalities, and consequently it should not be given a primary importance.

Of a much greater importance than race is the religious factor in the formation of the Arab Nation. Islam has played a primordial role in the life of the Arabs in the past, and down to the present day it may be considered as one of the strongest bonds which unite the masses together. In its early history and later development it has been the main factor to mould the Arabs into a nation and has enabled them consequently to carry their banner to the remotest corners of their world.

Customs, habits, and the mentality of the people are usually moulded in the practices of religions and traditions. Thus wherever Islam came to be practised, it established in the arabic-speaking countries similar habits, modes of living and ways of thinking. The cause of this is that it has a strong hold upon its followers and interferes in the details of the individual's life. In this sense it may be considered as a social order and thus its influence upon its followers is much stronger and far-reaching than that of Christianity and Judaism upon the Christians and the Jews. Islam is a mode of life as well as a religion, and its dogmas, while dealing with spiritual questions, interfere in the material life of the people and organise them to a large degree. To take a very typical example, the organisation of the Arab family is practically the same all over the Arab World. The

laws which are at the basis of its formation, development and even dissolution are derived from the same moral code. It is the "Koran" and its teachings, completed by the "Hadith" that constitute the structure of Arab Society and commands the life of its Moslem majority.

This fact raises a very important problem about the Non-Moslem elements of the Arab countries. The existence within the Arab nation, of large communities of Christians, and elements practicing other religions, has always raised the question, whether these minorities should be called "Arabs" or not, and whether these minorities can live in the long run in an Arab State, the religion of which is Islam.

There are no reasons to question whether these minorities are Arabs or not; the fact that they have always lived among the Arabs, spoken Arabic as their mother tongue, shared in all phases of Arabic life, culture and civilization make it obvious that they are Arabs, in no way different from the majority. But whether they can live smoothly in an Arab Moslem State is another question. It is perhaps better to put the question in another form: should the future Arab State be a Moslem State or a Laic one? In other words should Islam be institutionalized politically and given the structure of a state, or should the Arab State disregard religion altogether, and base the whole of its organisation on Laic institutions so as to be able to have a uniform legislation, applicable to Moslem and Christians alike, even in matters of personal status?

This question is of primary importance to the future of the Arab Nation because the attitude and future conduct of the minorities living within its fold, depends upon the issue. The same problem has been faced by the Turks at the end of the last war; they solved it by abandoning religion to the individual's sphere and the adoption of Laic political institutions, thus building the whole structure and machinery of the state on a new and modern basis.

The present conditions of the Arab peoples do not offer any possibility for such a revolutionary change: the hold of Islam upon the mentality and life of the peoples is too strong to offer any chances of success. The Arab State should therefore pass through a transitory stage in which it has to be a Moslem State, and meanwhile the mentality of the people as well as their institutions should be worked out in such a way as to prepare the change. This transitory stage may last very long, and prove to be very hard for the consolidation of the new State, but it seems to be inevitable, if the latter is to be built on firm foundations. In the mean time, the Christians and other minorities should be offered all kinds of guarantees to safeguard their rights, and these guarantees will be discussed at length in the course of the thesis. But in the long-run, the only hope for the homogeneity and cohesion of the nation, as well as the harmonization of the attitude of the minorities toward the state with that of the majority, is in shifting religion

from the state to the individual's sphere and organising the public powers of the state on laic foundations.

As far as the vast majority of the people is concerned, religion has therefore played and is still playing a very important role of unification, and as such it contributed to a large extent in the formation of the Arab nation. All Arabs, whatever be their religion or creed, share now to a great extent the same moral code, habits and philosophy of life. Their custom and outlook are influenced by islamic civilization and their bases in that civilization are found in the nature, qualities and habits of Pre-Islamic times.

Along with language, race and religion, history and culture play an important role in the formation of the Arab Nation.

The amazing history of the Arab conquests in the VIIth. Century, and the building of their extensive empire in a relatively short period, have been exceptional events in the history of nations. The Arabs ruled their empire under multiple forms: at one time it was unitary, at another feudal; now, disintegrated into many small kingdoms, and then, reunited under the authority of the Caliphs. It included a number of provinces, some very distant and others less distant. Civil Wars and foreign conquests used to be waged by troops and armies gathered from all over the Empire: thus victories and

defeats, invasions and conquests inspired common joys and hardships. Marriages, commerce and other kinds of intercourse between the different peoples cooperated with the work of nature to mould together the different elements of that vast area. From generation to generation, the Arabs were gradually becoming conscious of their being, and were gaining in strength, vigor and cohesion.

In spite of centuries of decadence, of Turkish rule and recently of foreign domination, the heritage of that civilization and culture continued to unite the Arabs and to serve as a foundation to their national feeling. The identity of their mentality manifested themselves in their daily life as well as in the manifestations of their social, political and cultural life. To consider one aspect only, art and literature for instance, one would be amazed of the similarities offered by Arabs, working in the same field, in spite of the differences which separate them, and the diversity of the regions in which they live.

There is no such thing as a Syrian literature or an Iraqi literature; there is and there always has been an Arabic literature, animated with the same genius and originating from the same soul. In its contents as well as in its form, it is clothed with the same garment, with practically no traces of regionalism. The schools of thought of every country are formed from writers of different regions, coming sometimes from the

remotest corners of the Arab World. Modern literature is read with equal eagerness all over the Arab countries; whether of Egyptian or Syrian origin, of moslem or christian authors, the literary works written in Arabic are awaited with equal thirst, and touch millions of Arabs who taste them and share the hopes and aspirations of their writers.

The same thing may be said of music: contemporary Arabic music is tasted and enjoyed everywhere, whether it comes from the instrument of an Egyptian musician or the mouth of a Syrian singer. Thus, in music and literature, and more generally in culture and civilization the Arabs are the same and belong to the same national group.

To the above mentioned factors, which contribute to form the Arab Nation, should be added the element of geography, because of the close relationships which usually exist between the physical environment and the people who inhabit it. To form a nation, it is necessary for human groups to have a distinct and definite territory on which to establish and continue their existence. On such a territory grow up the traditions, culture and religion, which compose the nationality and give it a distinctive individuality. The Arabs have lived in the Peninsula since time immemorial, but with the rise of Islam and the conquests which they made to preach the new faith, they came to settle permanently in regions many times the area of the Peninsula. The Arab World came therefore to include the countries of the Near and Middle East as well as those of the North African coast. But with the course of time the Arab East, composed of the Peninsula, Iraq and Syria in its natural frontiers,

played a much greater role in the formation of the Arab Nation than did the other parts.

The general configuration of the Arab East is marked by peculiar conditions which make out of it a kind of geographical unity, and it is surrounded on all sides by common and well defined frontiers. Within the borders of that extensive area, elementary but very practicable means of communications have always brought the different parts of the country into contact with each other. Long caravans of indefatigable merchants have held to maintain that contact, both within that area as well as with the outside world. The use of the same language by the inhabitants of that area and the community of interests gave birth to the same culture and traditions ^{which in turn} spread gradually to the other parts of the Arab World. The geographical situation of the North African countries stood as an obstacle to the homogeneity of the nation, but language and culture had such a great influence that they reduced to a large extent the differences coming from geography. Thus it is the Arab East more than the rest, that contributed essentially to the formation of the Arab Nation, and thereby to the creation of an Arab culture and civilization.

We come finally to the subjective element, the corporate feeling, the "will to live together" Mas Renan calls it, and here too we find that this element enters to a large extent in the formation of the Arab Nation.

Ever since the beginning of Islam, that corporate feeling has been existing among the Arabs, and the coming of the Prophet

gave it a new vitality which manifested itself in the conquests and invasions made to spread the new faith. Those conquests gave their results in the formation of the huge empire the Arabs have built and maintained for a considerable period of time. Ever since those days, the feeling of the national unity of the Arabs has remained among them in various degrees. It has weakened in some parts of the Arab World, remained asleep in others, practically disappeared in others, to take a religious form. Egypt evolved in this way a national feeling of its own, and so did Lebanon. The Peninsula, which was the cradle of Arabism, came to be a purely religious country, and almost the same thing may be said of the North African countries.

But, if the will to live together has weakened there very much, it has remained in the other countries in a much greater degree. As a matter of fact the birth, development and culmination of the national movement in the Arab Revolt of 1916 constitute but a small manifestation of that will in modern times. In its far-reaching influence on the Arabs, that revolt contributed in turn to strengthen that will and spread it in the Arab East; even the nomads of the desert came under its effect and felt the national duty to fight for the liberation of their country from the foreigner. In the Post-War period, this feeling gained ground in practically the whole of the Arab East so that Arab Unity came to be a part of the programs of most governments, political parties and the like.

In the preceding pages, we have tried to study some of the essential elements of nationality in their application to the Arabs. The only conclusion one can draw from this study is that the Arab nation is a living reality, but suffers some weaknesses from which it has to be cured. It still lacks strength, homogeneity and national consciousness in some of its parts, and needs therefore a whole reorganisation of the different phases of its life. That is what is expected from the present and future generations to achieve.

CHAPTER I

THE ARAB NATIONAL MOVEMENT

The study of the Arab National Movement calls from the start for a delimitation of both the Arab World and the Arab Nation. Such a delimitation would enable us to analyse systematically the course which led to the Arab national movement in the last century and to indicate the general trend of its development up to the present day. We shall thus naturally understand how the problem of Arab Unity evolved into a reality.

1. Arab World and Arab Nation:

A historical definition of the two expressions "Arab World" and "Arab Nation" takes us back to the early days of Arab expansion. The birth of Islam and its spread in the peninsula brought the Arabs to the conquest of the neighboring countries. To the North they conquered Syria ^{overran} and Anatolia, to the ^{they invaded} East, Irak and Persia and were as far as Turkestan; to the West they occupied Egypt and the whole of the North African coast, and reaching the shores of the Atlantic turned northwards at Gibraltar, Spain and Southern France. A vast Arab and Islamic empire had thus been formed which, even though subject to gain and loss at its extremities in the centuries which followed, maintained itself long enough within its broad frontiers for the Arabs to have left their permanent impress upon it.

In those vast areas, extending without a break from the Iberian peninsula in the West, along the southern shores of the Mediterranean, to the banks of the Indus and the Aral Sea in the East, the Arabs set in motion a cultural evolution which was the product of two different processes, the one purely religious and the other essentially social. The religious process was islamisation, whereby the new faith transformed the spiritual life of millions of new adherents; the social process was arabization which, in turn, had two forms: linguistic and racial. The linguistic was the gradual acquisition by the inhabitants of the conquered countries of the Arabic language as their mother tongue, while the racial was the gradual absorption, by fusion and intermarriage, of the masses of new immigrants of Arab stock, by the inhabitants of these areas.

The two processes, islamization and arabization were now at work together, but did not halt at the same frontiers. Islamization, which was a spiritual force, progressed much deeper than arabization and thus, broadly speaking, every country which became permanently arabised became, ipso facto, permanently islamised.

Similarly the two aspects of the process of arabization were not of equal importance: unhampered by any material obstacle, the Arab language succeeded in completely enthroning itself in the greater part of the Arab Empire, ^{while} ~~where~~ the tide of racial penetration found itself dammed within narrower limits.

With the course of time, the life of the conquered countries was completely transformed: with the Arabic language the inhabitants adopted Arab manners and ways of thought. Two worlds, one considerably more extensive than the other were thus created, the Moslem World and the Arab World, of which the first contained the second. By their tolerant attitude towards the non-Moslems, the Caliphs allowed large communities of Christians and Jews to retain their old faith, but these groups were nevertheless deeply impressed by the cultural and social influences of the Arabs.

The Arab World of to-day is therefore constituted by those countries in which the process of arabization had progressed so deep as to have achieved the lasting enthrone-ment of Arabic as the sole language, and the introduction of Arab manners and ways of thought. It includes that continuous chain of countries, stretching from the Atlantic seaboard in the West, along the southern shores of the Mediterranean, to the Persian border in the East, thus including what is now Iraq, Syria, Lebanon, Palestine, Transjordan, the whole of the Arabian Peninsula, Egypt, and the whole of the North African coast. The Arab Nation, on the other hand, is constituted by the inhabitants of that extensive Arab World, not indeed by all of them, but by that great majority whose racial descent has become submerged in the tide of Arabisation, whose manners and traditions have been made in an Arab mould, and most decisive of all whose mother tongue is Arabic.¹

¹ Antiquities pp. 18-19

2. The National Movement Before 1914:

The wave of nationalism which swept over Europe in the XIXth century and characterized its history came to the East in a relatively recent time, and is still affecting the destinies of its peoples. In the case of the Arab World, the story of the national movement begins towards the middle of the last century, but it is in the latter part of that century, and especially in the present one that the movement has taken the dimensions of a really Western form of Nationalism.

The rule of tolerance, established by Ibrahim Pasha, son of the great Mohammed Ali of Egypt, opened the door to Western missionary enterprises which soon invaded Syria in the form of educational activities. American, French and British missions opened schools in the different parts of the country and began to work with great enthusiasm. This movement of education spread little by little, and the youth of the country was soon attracted by its teachings. Thus the life of the nation was greatly affected, its history and literature studied by new intelligentsia and the cultural movement was given a fresh life. The beauty of the buried literature awakened the Arab feeling in some scholars who thus took an interest in the past and felt a certain responsibility in reviving it. They began addressing themselves to all creeds, to Christians as much as to Moslems, and preached a return to the Arab heritage and its revival. Others, feeling the antagonism between the different religious groups and their

1. Antonius: Arab Awakening p. 35

consequences in the encouragement of sectarian divisions, preached concord between the different creeds and took it as a duty to weaken as much as possible this cause of discord and to work for the union of all the Arabs. This is the first sign of the awakening of the Arabs to their political situation and of the feeling of the necessity of their union into one single organisation. Early in 1847 the first learned society was formed in Beirut under the name of Society of Arts and Sciences.

It was a fruitful innovation in the life of Syria because many other societies were formed after its pattern, and they turned out to be a primary factor in the growth of the Arab national movement. In their multiform activities, they used to stress the achievements of the Arab race, the glories of Arabic literature and the future the Arabs might fashion for themselves by going to their own past for inspiration. They used to call upon the Syrians to bound together and shake off the Turkish yoke, and then to help the other Arab communities in their movements of liberation. Thus the seed of patriotism was gradually sown and the Arab National movement was born.

That literary revival, which came as a result of the spread of education and of the activities of missionary enterprises, proved to be the decisive factor of the awakening of the Arabs. It defined ^{for many years to come} ~~the~~ the goal which the

2. Antunius: ~~The~~ Arab Awakening p. 52.

Arabs should strive for, and towards which all their efforts and energies should converge, and it showed them the road by which to reach that goal, namely organisation of their efforts thru societies of all sorts. In the years which followed, up to the World War, their activities therefore took the form of secret societies all over the Arab countries.

Under the Hamidian regime, the development of the national movement could not take place in the open because of the persecution of all nationalistic activities. It shifted therefore to the only channels where it found a possibility of work, namely underground channels. Secret societies were formed in many places, the first one in date being the Beirut Secret Society of 1875. Its aim was frankly revolutionary and it had branches in many other cities of Syria. Its influence was very great upon the people, and it was soon to have, as a direct consequence, the formation of other secret societies and the increase of underground activities. Its very existence and work meant that the national movement has become so strong that those who were earnest about the future of the Arab cause were ready to sacrifice their personal safety and lives for it.

When the revolution of 1908 took place in Turkey and the Young Turks came to power, there was a kind of honeymoon between Arabs, Turks and the other nationalities of the Empire, and everybody thought that the new regime would be liberal enough to allow the various national groups to live their

national life and to have their autonomy within the framework of the Empire. Thus an Arab Society was founded in Constantinople under the name of "Ottoman-Arab Brotherhood" and its object was to protect the new constitution, unite all races in loyalty to the Sultan, promote the welfare of the Arab provinces on a footing of equality, spread education and foster the observance of Arab customs. Its membership was open to Arabs of all creeds and religions, and in order to increase and spread its activities, it opened branches in many centers of the Arab World.¹

But the new era, which was thought in 1908 to be one of understanding and liberalism, soon proved to be far otherwise to the non-Turkish elements of the Empire. The Young Turks followed a policy of "Osmanization" towards the different national groups, and they did not hesitate to use the ways and means followed in the previous regime to reach their aim. The Arabs were thus disappointed in their hopes and aspirations and came ultimately to detest the new regime more than they did the Hamidian. They were brought back to the policy of secret societies for the realization of their aims. The "Ottoman-Arab Brotherhood" was ^{banned} ~~burned~~ with the other societies opened in that era, but this led to the formation of new ones in the open as well as secretly.

Among the most important secret societies, two deserve special attention because of the role they played in the shaping of Arab destiny: these were Al-Kalstaniat, transformed later on into al-Ahd, and Al-Fatat Society.

¹. Antonius pp. 102-103

Al Kahtaniat was a secret society, founded in 1909 with the definite object of turning the Ottoman Empire into a dual monarchy. According to its programme, the Arab World would form a single kingdom, with its own parliament and local government, and with Arabic as its official language. The Sultan would be at the same time the king for both the Ottoman and Arab kingdoms, or better the Ottoman-Arab Empire.

Al-Fatat was another secret society founded in Paris in 1911 with the definite object of working for the independence of the Arab countries and their liberation from Turkish domination. It started with a small group of young men who were studying in Paris and soon developed into a widespread and well organised political party with members and centers all over the Arab countries. It is the Al-Fatat members who were responsible for the Arab congress held in the French capital in June 1913 which was attended by representatives of most Arab provinces. The proceedings of that congress amounted to a statement of the claims of the Arab peoples for full political rights and an effective share in the administration.

Al Kahtaniat was soon found by its leaders to be disintegrating in strength and vitality, it was therefore turned into an association for military officers only under the name of Al-Ahd. It had the same object, namely the creation of an Arab kingdom within the Ottoman Empire, and thus became for the

soldiers what Al-Fatat was to the civilians, and both worked separately without knowing of the existence of each other till 1915 when they established contact and planned the Arab Revolt.

Such was the state of feeling in the Arab lands at the eve of the World War: secret societies among civilians and officers of the army, planning here and there a revolt or the creation of troubles to the Turks or the division of the Empire. The national feeling had been developing for a long time through all these activities and its aim was frankly Arab. It is true that these activities had been taking place mainly in Syria and the Lebanon, and not in every Arab country, but it is equally true that those who worked for the cause always had in view all the Arab provinces of the Ottoman Empire and not any one single province of ~~it~~ ^{them}.

3. The National Movement After 1914:

At the beginning of the World War, the Arabs had to follow one of two ways: they could either rise in an open revolt against the Turks and try to get a foreign assistance, or to stand by the Turks in their hour of distress and adjourn their claim till the close of hostilities. Faisal, son of the Sherif Husain of Macca, favored the latter solution because he feared the realization of French plans and ambitions in Syria. He was not yet acquainted with the underground forces at work and consequently did not believe that Arab forces were capable of

undertaking any successful action against the Turks. Further the lack of any tangible promise or pledge from the side of the Allies and especially from France, whose intentions towards Syria were known by every body, made him fear that the Arabs would be left alone to face the Turks and would receive no help from the Allies. For these various reasons Faisal preferred to stand by the Turks and to deserve their sympathy when the war was over. His brother Abdullah was of the opinion that the Arabs should rise against their oppressors because this was the only opportunity they could ever get of fulfilling their aspirations to complete independence and unity. He was well-acquainted with the readiness of the British Government to help militarily and financially any rising of the Arabs against the Turks who constituted a common enemy for the British and the Arabs as well. Further he was better acquainted than his brother Faisal, with the underground activities of the nationalists and their secret societies.

When the Sherif Husain, in his capacity of governor of the Holy Places, was asked by the Ottoman Government to endorse the call to "Jihad" or Holy War against the enemies of Islam, he was still hesitating between the two roads to follow. The aim of the Constantinople Government in the endorsement of the Holy War was to win the sympathies and help of the Moslem communities under British rule and in the Arab World itself. The Sherif wanted to feel the pulse of the national

movements

feeling in Syria; he made some manœuvres with the Turkish Government to hide his intentions and sent his son Faisal to Constantinople, ^{in March 1915} apparently to confer with the Sultan, but in reality to examine the possibility of an open action in a combined form. Faisal thus succeeded in getting in touch with the two secret societies in Syria through some of his acquaintances in the country, and for the first time Al-Fatat and Al-Ahd established contact and concerted action. When Faisal was back from his journey to Constantinople, a plan of action was prepared by the two societies and a definite program was sketched to serve as a basis of negotiations with Great Britain. The main points of that programme were:

1. Recognition by Great Britain of the independence of the Arab countries lying within the following frontiers:
North: the line Mersin-Adana-to parallel 37° N. and thence along the line Birejik-Urfa-Mardin-Midiat-Jazirat Ibn Omar-Awadia to the Persian frontier.
East: the Persian frontier down to the Persian Gulf.
South: the Indian Ocean (with the exclusion of Aden whose status was to be maintained).
West: the Red Sea and the Mediterranean Sea back to Mersin.
2. The abolition of all exceptional privileges, granted to foreigners under the capitulations.
3. The conclusion of a defensive alliance between Great Britain and the future independent Arab State.
4. The grant of economic preference to Great Britain.

These were the conditions upon which the two societies and their followers were prepared to support an Arab Revolt to be proclaimed by the Sherif of Macca and to do everything in their power to help the Allied cause. These conditions embody the aspirations of the Arabs not only in Syria but also in the other neighbouring countries.

Negotiations were opened therefore on this basis between the two parties concerned, in the persons of Husain as spokesman of the Arabs and Sir Henry Mc-Malson as representative of the British Government in Cairo. In a series of letters exchanged all through the winter of 1915-1916 and known as the Husain - Mc-Malson Correspondence, the two parties reached a virtual agreement on the main points of the negotiations and pledged themselves to work for the common cause. From the military side, the Sherif promised to bring all his power and influence and his resources to bear on the task of defeating the Turks. Similarly the British Government promised to help him with material as well as technical help. From the political side, the Sherif committed himself to the proclamation of an Arab Revolt and to the denunciation of the Turks as enemies of Islam. Great Britain agreed to recognise the Arab ^{if one were proclaimed,} caliphate and to recognise and uphold Arab independence in a certain area. The extent of that area was open to controversy as regards Palestine: the Arab view is that Palestine did fall within the promised areas, while the British hold that it did not, and that it was a part of those strips of land of Western Syria excluded from the scheme.

The progress and development of the national movement had thus culminated in an official pledge from the side of Great Britain to uphold the independence and integrity of the Arab countries. The Arab Revolt took place accordingly and the forces of Amir Faisal, composed of Syrian, ^{Hedjazis,} Iraqi and other officers and men coming from the other Arab provinces, fought side by side with the Allies and helped efficiently in the liberation of the Arab provinces of the Near East. ~~from the Turks.~~

But when the war was won, and it came to a reckoning at the Peace Conference, there was a wide divergence between what the Arabs claimed and what Great Britain was willing to recognise as her share of the bargain. In spite of long and difficult negotiations, of protests and risings, the Allies divided the Arab provinces among themselves on the basis of secret agreements which they had concluded during the course of the War. The mandate principle, a new form of colonization under the attractive guise of humanitarian principles was applied. The Supreme Council of the Allied and Associated powers, meeting at San Remo on April 25, 1920, decided that the Arab Rectangle, was to be placed under mandatory rule. Syria, in its natural frontiers was to be divided into three parts: Palestine, Lebanon and political "Syria", consisting of ^{Iraq was to remain undivided.} what was left. Lebanon and Syria were to be placed under a single mandate entrusted to France; Great Britain was to hold a mandate for Iraq and another ^{and Transjordan} for Palestine. The latter would carry with it an obligation to apply the Balfour Declaration, ^{in Palestine.} 1

1. Antonius: Arab Awakening p. 305.

One of the last manifestations of the feeling of Arab unity before the application of the mandates was the holding of the general Syrian Congress of March 8, 1920 where the representatives of Syria, Lebanon, Palestine and Transjordan, meeting all together to express their claim as to their political aspirations, passed a historical resolution proclaiming the independence of Syria in its natural frontiers, that is including Lebanon, Palestine and Transjordan, as a sovereign state and a constitutional monarchy with Faisal as King. A meeting of Iraqi representatives passed a similar resolution concerning Iraq and chose Abdullah for the throne of the new kingdom. But these resolutions did not have any effect on the intentions of the Allies: the fate of these and the other Arab provinces had been settled a long time before and the only effect these manifestations could have was to hasten the partition and to start the mandate regime.

4. The National Movement Under the Mandates:

The disappointment of the Arabs at the Peace Conference and the allocation of the mandates to Great Britain and France did not put an end to the growing Arab nationalism. On the contrary it gave it a new stimulus and a new vitality, but it constituted at the same time a turning-point in its history. Its new form and manifestations were bound to differ with the change of enemy: before the peace settlement, the Arabs were working for their liberation from Turkish yoke; now their aim was to liberate their different countries from the new masters, the

French from Syria and Lebanon and the British from Iraq, Palestine and Transjordan.

The unified Arab feeling of the pre - 1920 period becomes thus divided into several "branches", so to speak: we see from that time on a Syrian nationalism, an Iraqi nationalism, a Palestinian nationalism. The Arab national feeling becomes thus mainly expressed in these divided forms because of the pressing need for liberating each of these countries. Every individual becomes in this way Syrian or Iraqi or Palestinian and feels at the same time that moral or national bond which unites him to the larger Arab nation. We witness therefore in this period different national movements, the immediate aim of each of them being the liberation and independence of its particular country. At the same time we feel the existence of another movement, common to all of them, unified in its purpose which is the union of all the Arabs, and to which every country is contributing in its own way. Far from going against each other, or from overlapping on each other's field, these two movements are complementary and constitute in the last analysis a common and all-embracing struggle: the fight for the union of the liberal^{led} Arab countries into one political entity.

The different national movements went therefore their own way, developing with the march of time and manifesting their existence at every opportunity. In Iraq, it was by the revolution of 1920-1921 that the people of the new ^{state} kingdom manifested their

national feeling and their love for freedom and independence. In Syria the revolution of 1925-1927 and the interminable troubles which took place in almost every year of the mandate regime were sufficient proofs for the restless situation of the country. In Palestine the rebellions of 1922, 1929, 1936 and 1938 gave the best evidence to the world of what the people of Palestine feel and want in the field of national life. In this special instance the national feeling was increased and stimulated more than in the other Arab countries by the presence of Zionism and the immediate danger it constitutes to Palestinian nationalism and independence. Arab feeling and solidarity were increasing at the same time and manifested themselves on various occasions, and especially in the numerous Pan-Arab conferences, held periodically in the different capitals and centers of the Arab countries. The presence of King Faisal on the throne of Iraq was always considered as the symbol of that unity which, even though still unaccomplished on the political field, was nevertheless deeply felt and firmly rooted in the heart of every Arab.

The sudden death of the indefatigable king, which came as a big shock to all Arabs, caused a certain cooling down in the movement for unity and delayed considerably its realization. The lack of leaders of the same caliber as Faisal made the movement grow very slowly, but nevertheless the idea of bringing the Arab countries nearer and nearer to each other was spreading steadily and shifting at the same time from the theoretical to

the practical field. The bonds and relations between the Arab countries were thus gradually strengthened and serious attempts were made on the initiative of one or the other governments to take the first step. Countries which hitherto have been very keen to keep as far as possible from even the Arab idea such as Egypt, have become in recent years ^{very famous for their} ~~cradles of~~ Pan-Arabs.

The last few years have witnessed some events of primary importance in the Arab World: after Iraq, which won its independence in 1932, Egypt became independent and was welcomed like the former into the League of Nations. Syria and Lebanon followed in ^{negotiating for} ~~wining~~ their independence, and while all these countries were marching on the road of freedom and unity, Palestine was the only spot where troubles and riots characterized that period, where the question of independence was far away and where the future was dark and grim.

It is not difficult to imagine the repercussions of these events in the larger Arab World. In case of a victory over the foreigner, such as the gaining of liberty and independence the joys and satisfactions of one people were at the same time those of the whole Arab nation, because they ^{were} ~~would be~~ considered as a step forward toward the realization of the ultimate goal. As to the event of Palestine, they offered the best of possible evidences of the solidarity and unity of all the Arabs. Thousands and thousands of pounds Sterling came to Palestine to encourage and help the Palestinians, from their brothers, the Arabs of Syria;

Lebanon, Transjordan, Irak, Egypt and even as far as the Yemen and Hejaz. Monster demonstrations were staged in Damascus, the windows of the British residency were repeatedly broken in Baghdad. Hundreds of young men from Syria, Transjordan and Iraq brewed the border patrols to join their brothers of Palestine in their holy war; the coming of a Syrian revolutionist to lead the rebellion was in itself a ringing manifestation of Arab Solidarity.

Such was the development of Arab nationalism from its early days till the present time. How will it develop in the future and what shape will it take after this war? Nobody can tell. But one can say and even assert that it is now so firmly rooted and determined to carry out its aims that it promises to overcome every obstacle in its way.

The Arab nationalist of to-day is conscious of the responsibility which lies upon ~~upon~~ his shoulders towards his nation, the Arab nation at large. He knows very well that a noble and glorifying heritage has come down to him from his ancestors, from those Arabs of the early centuries who conquered a great part of the known world, who built one of the largest empires the world had ever seen and who reached such a high degree of civilization at a time when Europe was still in the darkness of the Middle Ages. He realizes that a nation which reached that stage of supremacy and glory cannot and should not remain under foreign domination. The past, which caused our subjection is not in our hands, but the present and the future are; and if our

fathers and forefathers have missed their opportunity and caused the Arabs to sleep in a state of ignorance and social darkness, the Arab nationalist of to-day realizes that the time has come for the Arab nation to rise from its sleep because it is a time when to sleep means to give up one's right to life and freedom.

We are living in an age when the destinies of nations, and of the world at large, will be settled for a long time to come. The war which we are witnessing is a war of life or death, and the very existence of the nations depends on its issue. Thousands and thousands of men are dying everyday in the service of their nation and their fatherland: is the Arab nationalist indifferent towards these events? Does he not see in them a stimulus and an incentive to work and fight for his national existence and the welfare of his nation?

It is to be deeply regretted that the West has not yet come to have an exact idea of the present form of Arab nationalism. To most of its people, the word "Arab" is still associated with the idea of a wandering bedouin who understands nothing of a national life, ^{and} who is in a situation of complete ignorance and backwardness. That opinion, which may be true of some parts of the Arab World, is fundamentally untrue if applied to the greater number of the Arab countries where political consciousness and social evolution are fully developed. To take only one section of the population, one can say that practically the ^{vast} ~~most~~ majority of the educated youth of Syria, Iraq and Palestine is constituted of nationalists whose only hope in life

is to contribute their share to the common effort and to help building the Arab nation on a modern basis. The meaning of the word "Arab" is therefore completely different. To the nationalists of all Arab countries, it is associated with many concepts such as pride, responsibility, duty and struggle. The Arab nationalist is proud of his being Arab, and of the glorious heritage which his ancestors have left him. He feels the responsibility which he has towards that heritage and towards the nation which it represents, and he spreads that feeling of responsibility among those upon whom lies the task ^{of} and building the future. The feeling of pride and responsibility create in him the notion of duty, that is an obligation laid by his conscience upon himself to make it his primary concern to work for the welfare of his nation. Struggle for him becomes thus a philosophy of life because the task of working for the unity, independence and progress of one's country is a life-time undertaking which needs continuous and uninterrupted efforts.

The Arab Nationalist has the ambition to resqueitate an Arab civilization based on the genius of his nation and nourished by its ideals, and not to copy blindly the Western civilization and western manners and ways of thought. We need to understand the West in order to build the new civilization, we need to digest those basic principles which constitute the corner-stones of each civilization and to go deep into the foundations of Western science and thought so as to start our work on a firm basis. But that does not mean that we should throw away all our heritage and forget our past: our history and

culture offer a very interesting field of investigation. We can modify those institutions which need some modification, change others completely, reorganize the rest and thus reconsider every aspect of our national life in the light of modern society. There is no harm in doing that; on the contrary it is desirable that nations should always benefit from each other's experiences and help one another so that a new era of understanding and cooperation should reign over the world.

That is the state of feeling of the Arab nationalist of to-day: he is definitely Pan-Arab, believes in the necessity of unity and acts for its realization. Arab unity is not desired for emotional considerations only; it serves material as well as moral ends. It offers to each individual Arab the necessary environment in which to develop his personality and capacities, and it offers to the nation as a whole the necessary elements for the evolution of its culture and civilization. Thus united, the Arab nation would be able to contribute once more to the progress and well-being of mankind.

CHAPTER II

FACTORS OF ARAB UNITY

The study of the possibility and chances of success of Arab Unity requires a detailed analysis of the factors which help to bring about that unity and of those which stand as obstacles to it. The purpose of this chapter will be to analyse the factors on the positive side while the next will have to deal with the obstacles, and the way they should be overcome.

Broadly speaking the factors of Arab Unity may be classified into three major categories: political, economic and social. The first category deals with the size of the Arab countries, the requirements of their defense and the role they would be called to play in the Post-War World. The second category includes the economic potentialities of a united Arab front as opposed to the difficulties encountered by each of them in the present time; and the last category deals with the forces that are working within the Arab nation and increasing the feeling of Arab nationalism which has been described in the previous chapter.

Political Factors

In its present conditions, the Arab World is composed of numerous countries of different sizes and of small populations, the largest of which being Egypt with a population of nearly sixteen million inhabitants. Considered separately, these countries are on the whole very weak and doomed to a minor role

in international life. The influence of any country is usually measured in terms of financial, economic and man-power considerations, and each of the Arab lands is too poor in these respects to live a secure, peaceful and prosperous life, and to collaborate actively in world politics. The unification of the Arab countries in one form or another is therefore of primary importance for the future of the nation and of each one of its individuals. It would make out of it a cohesive and homogenous unit which, by the union of the energies of its individuals, would achieve far more than ever before. The world of to-day is a world of "cartels" and "trusts" to use economic terms, and just as in such cartels and trusts large capitals are brought together to increase the production and conquer the markets of the world, so it is with the nations: the present and the future belong to those nations which are superior to the others both by their number and creative energies, and who secure to themselves a respectable place among the nations of the earth. It is by the union of the Arab countries that national life would improve in every one of its phases, and that the material and cultural well-being of the individual would be raised to the standard of a highly evolved community. ~~What are~~ the creative activities of the peoples of Syria would thus become a part of the larger creative activities of the Arab nation at large, and the potentialities of one country would be multiplied by their union with the potentialities of the other Arab Countries. In a world of power-politics such as ours there is no more place for small states. It was thought at the end of the last war that

the League of Nations would have as a primary function to preserve the safety and independence of the small nations. But the peace-makers of 1919 were soon disappointed, and the present conflict comes once more to prove that small nations or rather small states should disappear from the map. If that is so of Europe, which is supposed to protect the weaker of its peoples more than any other continent, it is obviously true of the world at large, and it is up to the small states to benefit from the lessons of history if they want to safeguard their independence and well-being.

From the military point of view, Arab Unity is still more necessary than for political considerations, because of the geographical situation of the Arab lands. A map of the Mediterranean basin shows that the Eastern and southern shores of that sea are all inhabited by Arab speaking peoples. That means that the doors to Africa and Southern Asia are constituted by Arab lands and that conquests of, or routes to the over-seas empires of the leading European Powers should necessarily go through these lands. In addition to their weakness as small states, the Arab countries have to take the necessary precautions to face this danger, and it is not difficult to imagine the consequences of such a situation on their respective finances. Their unification would not be artificial in any way because the Arabs have most of the time lived united in the past, and been citizens of the same empire. It is only at the close of the World War that such separate entities as Syria and Palestine and Iraq have been created.

The Arab countries will therefore continue to be threatened with invasion unless they unite into one strong political unit. Syria alone cannot do anything in defense of its territory against the Turks, that is why she lost the Sanjak of Alexandretta; Palestine alone is too weak to face Zionism and British imperialism, and that is why almost half the country has become a Jewish land. The same thing may be said of the other countries in case their security is threatened by a foreign power, but if all of these countries were united, they would constitute a large front, strong enough to defend any of the threatened spots of the Arab World. The enemy would then have to think twice before undertaking any aggressive action.

Once unified, the Arab front would be admirably situated for purposes of defense. The only land frontiers the Arabs would have to worry about become those of the north, with Turkey, and those of the East with Iran, for the rest of the Arab lands are either bounded by sea or by the desert. As a result of this situation, great reduction of military expenditures may be made and instead of spending large parts of the revenues of each country for the purposes of defense, a relatively small army will be needed to defend the whole of the Arab World, smaller in number than the sum of all the armies required in each country. Thus the finances of each particular region would be eased, and the money which used to be spent for military purposes would be used in other constructive activities.

As to the role the Arab countries would be called to play in the Post-War World, it is inextricably connected with their unity and cannot be performed without it. From the evolution of international organisation and the shape the world will have at the close of the present conflict, one can safely say that the problem of war and peace will be solved in one form or another for a long long time to come. Even though the dream of a world federation is still far away, the organisation of the international community has got to be built on a firm basis, and in this way the principle of large federations to include those countries which have some interests in common is very likely to be recognized as the necessary condition of a lasting peace. The Arab World would thus constitute by itself one of those large units which, by their cohesion and consistency would have to play an important role in the organisation and security of this part of the world.

Economic Factors

Much more important than the political factors are the economic, which usually determine the wealth of the nation as a whole and the standard of living of the single individual. The situation which the war has created everywhere has shown the true conditions of each of the Arab countries and the difficulties they would always have to face in cases of emergency, if such divisions were to continue. Taking a very simple example in Lebanon, we realize the situation which this country would face in case of a sudden cessation of exports of wheat from Syria.

Lebanon cannot live alone because it does not produce enough wheat to feed its own people, and the same is true of Syria and Palestine and the other Arab countries for the other food-stuffs. Thus these countries need each other's products and markets to get the foodstuffs necessary for their peoples and to export the surplus of their produce. That leads us to the study of the advantages the Arab countries would obtain in case they were united and made one single economic unit, and in case customs barriers were removed with every other obstacle to the free movement and exchange of goods and labor and capital. It is true that these advantages can be secured by a mere economic union, which does not necessarily mean a federation, but these constitute the economic aspect of the problem only, and ^{unity} ~~federation~~ _{considerations} is desired for political and social factors as well as economic.

The first advantage which should be mentioned in this respect is the intensification of the trade movement within that vast economic unit. It is generally agreed that the larger the economic area, the greater the internal exchange of goods and commodities. Once all obstacles to exports from one country to another are removed, people would send all kinds of goods and import others which are not found in their country, to the mutual benefit of both countries and of the individual consumer himself. The intensity of the movement of exchange would be increased by the movement of specialization, because when a region specializes in the production of one commodity, it has to export to the other regions that commodity, and thus one center may

have to distribute to all other centers the products of its specialization. When the trade movement is increasing the country itself will prosper and get richer and richer. The economic importance of the United States of America comes thus to a certain extent from its internal markets, and so is the case with most countries of a considerable size.

Another advantage is the possibility of specialization in the different countries, according to the natural resources and the diversity of economic potentialities peculiar to each. This would be determined by the nature of the soil or the aptitudes of the land, so that each region would produce those things in which it has the greatest comparative advantage, with a resulting greater and better production. The large extent of the Arab countries and the vast possibilities they offer, would thus secure a greater and more abundant variety of commodities which would be offered for consumption in the internal as well as the external markets. The cost of production of the commodities would be lower than that of the production of the same commodities in countries which have not the same aptitudes, and the standard of living of the ordinary person would be higher, because he would be able to enjoy a greater variety of commodities at lower prices. When the cost of production becomes thus lower than elsewhere, the country would be in a position to compete for the surplus of its produce on the international market.

Once unified and well exploited economically, the Arab countries will have a very promising future because of their wide areas and their agricultural aptitudes. For those parts not

well suited for agriculture, there are other natural resources to be developed and exploited. To give a typical example, we shall mention the case of Lebanon again. This country is not well suited for the cultivation of wheat, it can succeed much better in an intensive cultivation of citrus fruits and the development of its summer and winter resorts. When this country becomes a part of a much larger Arab state, it would serve better its interest and the interest of the other countries to develop fully its resources along these lines and to get from the other countries what it needs at lower prices than if it had produced those very foodstuffs in Lebanon itself.

The free movement and circulation of labor and capital constitute by themselves a factor of progress of major importance. The movement of capital is of great importance because it is the keynote to every economic enterprise. There are many economic opportunities which, if they had an adequate capital to be exploited with, would be of inestimable value to the life of the country. The political divisions of the Arab World as they exist to-day constitute no doubt great obstacles to the exploitation of such enterprises and the abolition of these divisions would open the door to new horizons and larger fields. The same importance should be attached to the free movement of labor because it is as important a factor of production as capital. The possibilities opened by the free movement of capital and labor can solve ^{most of the} ~~every~~ economic problem and overcome ^{the} ~~every~~ economic obstacle which might stand in the way of the development of the

Arab countries. They can contribute effectively to the development and full exploitation of their resources, and offer the best guarantees and safeguards for work, and prosperity and material well-being of all classes of the nation.

A unified Arab state has further the advantage of insuring to the nation a greater degree of self-sufficiency. In spite of the benefits which every country ^{the} and world at large get from free-trade, there is always the danger that some states might follow a policy based on economic nationalism. The world has witnessed a large movement of this type of nationalism in the last twenty years, and even though the present war is being fought for political and ideological causes, yet the economic factors resulting from an extremist view of nationalism have played a role of primary importance in its preparation. In spite of the common belief that the future world order would be based on a better distribution of raw materials and a better understanding of the economic realities, nations might always adopt policies of self-sufficiency to protect themselves and their economic structure. Under such conditions the wider the territory of the nation and the variety of its products, the greater is the degree of self-sufficiency that can be attained and the less harmful it is likely to be.

A last advantage from the economic unity of the Arab countries is the possibility of their industrialization because industry is essential for a well balanced economy and can easily be developed when there is a large home market. Such a market

ensures the consumption of those commodities produced on a large scale when the necessary raw materials are there.

The unification of the Arab countries is therefore a vital necessity if these countries are to improve their economic conditions and to prosper materially and socially. It would be ^{to} their detriment to leave them divided as they are and to adapt their economic organisation to those divisions. The experience of the Post-War period has shown that the interests and economic conditions of the countries of the Near East are so inter-connected that the result of their separation is the poverty and weakness of each of them. To insist therefore on maintaining these divisions means condemning these countries to a perpetual state of inferiority and poverty in the economic field, and thereby in the social and cultural matters as well.

Social Factors

The social factors of Arab Unity are those elements, psychological and cultural, which by their union form modern nationalism.

Language is to be considered first because of the prominent place it occupies in the formation of most national groups. The Arabic language is the most uniting and lasting element which binds the Arabs of all countries and of all religions and creeds. It is the stronghold of Arab nationalism, and its classical form has come down to us almost unchanged from the early days of Islam till the present day. It is spoken in

every part of the Arab World and it makes the Arab feel# always at home when he travels within the borders of that extensive area.

Nothing can give more unity to a nation than a common language, because the community of thoughts and ideas which it brings ~~weakens~~ always what may be an obstacle to their unity. It is the most direct expression of national character and its unity is a binding force of the utmost importance, especially because the quality of the ideas and ways of thinking of those who speak it are drawn from the quality and colour of the language itself.

The Arab language has come down to us with its original purity and strength because of the Koran. Being the language in which the Holy Book was written, it found its basis and foundations almost definitely settled for all times, and whenever there was a controversy about any of its rules, the Koran was always there to give the final decision. Thus the Arabic language has been able to enthrone itself wherever Arab customs and thoughts were prevalent; for the succeeding generations ~~of its original founders~~, it enjoyed always the honour of being the connecting link between one generation and the other, and in this way the Arabs of to-day feel, by the use of the language of their fathers and ancestors that the rich heritage which their language keeps in its vast treasures belong to them. Proud of it, they strive to unite themselves again and renew the glories of their fathers so as to be worthy of them. In this sense, language becomes a unifying factor of the utmost importance.

Side by side with language comes history. The role played by history in the formation of any nationalism is too well known to be explained here. We need only mention that in the case of the Arabs, the history which their ancestors have left to them ^{is} ~~is~~ so rich in glories and conquests that it offers to the individual Arab unlimited material for pride and inspiration.

The history of the Arabs cannot be separated from that of Islam. They are so interrelated that the ordinary individual may be at a loss as to whether such a history should be called Arabic or Islamic. As a matter of fact ~~Islam~~, in ~~its~~ early years ~~and later development~~ ^{Islam}, was purely Arab in nature in that it was preached by an Arab Prophet, in an Arab country, through Arab people and with the Arab sword. The Arabs, on the other hand, have built their large empire and carried their banner to the remotest corners of the world of their time because they were inspired by the new Moslem religion and because they wanted to preach and spread the new faith. Thus in its early life the Arab Empire was an Islamic Empire, and the two elements could not be separated.

It is later on, when the empire of the Caliphs came to include other populations with different languages and religions, that a distinction began to assert itself. The countries where the Arabic language was spoken and where the Arab manners and thoughts were enthroned began by a slow process of evolution to constitute what we now call the Arab World, and with the course

of time this world came to have its own history and culture as a distinct unit from the larger Islamic World. But whether in the early days of the Empire or in its later phases, Arab history is one, and as such it works as a positive factor in the unification of the Arab countries.

Closely related to Arab history is the culture the Arabs have evolved through their contacts with other peoples, and which came to be clothed in an Arab form. This culture has been the product of the flourishing civilizations ^{the Arabs} met during their conquests, to which they have added some of their own institutions and mores, and given their own character so that it came to constitute a real Arab culture, and a direct expression of their life as a distinct group. Literature is of course a constituent part of culture and plays as such, a similar role in welding together and inspiring the members of a national group. Arabic literature which is one of the most radiant remnants of the past, strengthens the sentiments of the Arabs and instils national enthusiasm into their hearts. It voices their hopes, and inspires them with the ambition to further the interests of their nation. No wonder therefore if the main course of the awakening of the Arabs, after their long sleep under the Turkish domination, be a literary revival followed by a political movement.

Language, history, culture, literature and the other elements of nationalism are combined in such a way among the Arabs that they produce an emotional force of major importance

and to disregard such a force would mean to underestimate the driving motive behind the national feeling of the people. It is in this sense that this emotional force constitutes a social factor of Arab Unity.

Such are the various factors which we have enumerated at the beginning of this chapter: the political, economic as well as the social aspects of our life show the necessity of the unification of the Arab countries if the world at large really seeks a new era of peace and cooperation. Nations should be allowed to live their own life when they do not constitute a danger to the peace and tranquility of their neighbours, and the only way in which the Arabs want to live is to be free and independent within the large borders of their united fatherland.

CHAPTER III

OBSTACLES TO ARAB UNITY

The factors making for Arab Unity, as examined in the previous chapter, show the necessity of the unification of the Arab countries for the welfare and development of these countries as well as for the world at large. But conditions in the Arab World are not so simple as one is led to think from the reading of the previous chapter. Side by side with the factors making for the unity, there are obstacles standing in its way, and which it is necessary to overcome. These obstacles may be classified into two major categories: external and internal. The external are those coming from outside and the overcoming of which depends ~~on~~ international as well as national circumstances. The internal, on the other hand, are those existing among the Arabs themselves as a result of their present conditions and the overcoming of which depends first and foremost upon them.

1. External Obstacles:

The external obstacles consist essentially in the imperialist ambitions of the European Powers, on the one hand, and the ever-increasing danger of Zionism on the other.

A. Imperialist Ambitions.

The presence of the Great Powers in most of the Arab countries has been and is still to a certain extent the main obstacle to Arab Unity. Few Arab countries are completely independent in the management of their affairs, and almost

everywhere one or the other of the European States has acquired the power of governing them and holds the highest authority into its hands. Apart from Saudi Arabia and the Yaman, all Arab countries are subject in one form or another to the hegemony of one of these powers. For some of them, the ties between the dominating and dominated peoples are so slight that one can safely say that these countries enjoy a "qualified independence." Egypt and Iraq are in this case: they have a complete autonomy in the management of their own affairs, but are tied with the dominating power, which incidentally is called an ally, in such a way as to direct their foreign relations within the orbit of the policy of the latter.

For those countries under the mandate regime, or better those whose independence has been proclaimed nominally but are still legally under the mandatory rule, the situation is somewhat different. Even though parliamentary institutions have been recently reestablished, and popular governments have come to power, yet these governments have none of the prerogatives which make the independence of a country. Everything in the field of internal as well as external policy is still in the hands of the foreigner, and thus they are so limited in their powers that they cannot make any real contribution to the formation of Arab Unity.

The essential idea behind the mandate system was in itself disinterested and humanitarian: a European Power chosen among the most civilized nations of the world, was mandated to

give the "backward" peoples of the Near East the blessings of Western civilization and to help them to stand alone in the strenuous conditions of modern life. But what was the result of the experiment of this new invention? Another form of colonisation under the cover of an attractive name. The mandated territories became in fact very similar to the protectorates and ~~only~~ differed from them in very slight aspects: they enjoyed the exercise of some self-governing institutions but their local governments were ^{were} tools in the hands of the foreigner, unable to do anything which conflicted with his interests.

The situation of the North African countries is still worse than that of the Near-East in the sense that its peoples were and still are completely unable to do anything in the field of Arab Unity. Some of them are even under a regime of assimilation with the inhabitants of the colonizing power and their country constitutes merely some administrative units of the latter's territory.

As a first result of the presence of such imperialist ambitions, the subject peoples of each country have to strive for their own liberation and independence and thus to divert their mind and energies from the ultimate goal. Then, whenever an attempt of unity is in the air, the conflicting interests of the powers come in, and cause its failure before it has even had time to materialize.

The policy of "divide and rule" has become the guiding principle of modern colonial administration and as a result of it the colonial powers have always created dissensions and divisions and strengthened the differences already existing between the inhabitants so that the people of the same country became divided among themselves. That explains why even those countries under the same colonial power have not been united in any way.

B. Zionist Danger.

Apart from the presence of the foreigner in most Arab countries, the Zionist danger constitutes by itself one of the greatest obstacles to the unity and future of the Arab Nation. The problem of Palestine will not be studied in this chapter: it will be the subject of a special chapter where the whole question will be discussed thoroughly both in its international aspect as well as in its relation to the Unity. All we need mention here is, that the prospect of the union of the Arabs frightens the Zionists because of the danger it presents to their schemes in the Holy Land. In this sense they will always continue to stand as an obstacle in the way of the completion of the Unity.

2. Internal Obstacles:

Side by side with the external obstacles, there are internal ones and the overcoming of these is as important for the success of the unity as that of the external. These obstacles consist essentially in the diversity of religions, in the local nationalisms, racial minorities and the differences in the social

development of the different countries.

A. Religious.

By far the most important of the internal obstacles in the "religious question" arising out of the existence of more than one religion in the Arab countries. The population inhabiting these countries is composed of peoples practicing the three main religions, namely, Islam, Christianity and Judaism. Among the followers of each of these, there are divisions of such a nature that in the last resort one might safely say that the Near Eastern part of the Arab World is one of those spots of the earth where religions and creeds are most numerous.

But the religious question is not the mere existence of so many creeds in these countries, it is rather the consequences of such a diversity from the political standpoint. The Moslem element constitutes the great majority of the Arab population and is prevailing in almost every country except Lebanon. The religious spirit is so deeply rooted among certain communities of these vast areas that it is by far stronger than any feeling of nationalism. Such is the case for instance in the countries of the Peninsula and the North African coast, that is Soudi Arabia, the Yeman, Lybia, Algeria, Tunisia and Morocco. The vast majority of the population there is still conservative to a very large extent, and the Christian population of the other countries have always looked on that conservatism as a potential source of trouble and uncertainty to their future in case these countries would join the other Arab countries and form one unity. As they view the situation, the independence of a country where the

majority of the inhabitants profess a religion different from theirs, would mean their subjugation by the majority. Arab Unity is to them a Moslem Unity where the teachings of the Moslem religion would be applied to the letter to the detriment of the non-Moslem populations. That is why they are not so keen about independence and not willing to make sacrifices for a cause from the benefits of which they are likely to be excluded.

The role which the Christians have played in the political life of the different countries has consequently been of a secondary importance in the constructive field. In Syria, the few leaders whom they offered to the national cause have worked no doubt with a great zeal and sincerity, but ~~it was these~~ ^{the} elements opposed to the idea of independence ~~that~~ ^{to a certain extent} overshadowed the work and endeavours of those few, and helped the foreigner in many circumstances against the interests of the country. In Lebanon, their attitude toward the political issues of their country was very injurious too. Unworried by any feeling of national pride, they were pleased with the French mandate and willing to have it on a permanent basis. It is only in the last few years that their attitude towards the other sections of the population has changed, and their present cooperation with them for the freedom and independence of the country gives promise for still greater cooperation in the future. In Palestine their attitude was on the contrary very honorable: they realized from the outset that their interest was to cooperate with the Moslem elements and that the future of the whole country depended upon their mutual understanding and help, that is why they stood side by side with the Moslems against the

Zionist danger and opposed the Jewish invader with the same determination. They proved to the whole world that, what unites the peoples of Palestine was more their Arab nationalism than the bond of religion, and they gave ample proof of the fact that when the foreign power does not interfere to create divisions and hatred in the country by its various imperialistic manoeuvres, the various elements of the population can live smoothly and cordially with each other and work together for the welfare of their country.

From the standpoint of Arab Unity, the fears of the Christian elements, increased by the intrigues of the foreigner, have led to the creation of a kind of local nationalism in certain areas. Such is the case for instance in Lebanon where the people claimed at one time to be Phoenicians rather than Arabs and asked therefore for the complete isolation of Lebanon from the Arab countries because historically they form a nation different from the Arab Nation!

What should be our attitude toward the religious question in general? and how should we build mutual relations for the achievement of our aspirations?

One fact should be recognised from the beginning, that is the Christian and other minorities are in their full rights to be anxious about their future when Arab Unity comes. Their fears are justified if the prospective government would be theocratic and would draw its basic principles of government from the Moslem teachings. But is it conceivable that, in the present age, we go back to the days when religion used to be the final

authority in politics? We are living in an age when the influence of religion is shifting gradually from the national to the individual field. The time when it used to be the strongest bond which united the individuals of the same community is over, and to-day it is the national feeling, based on the community of language, history, traditions, homeland and common interests, which is taking its place. National feeling does not belong to the Moslem alone or to the Christians alone; it is a common bond which does not differentiate between one religion and the other, and which consequently puts all the members of the nation on the same footing of equality. ~~That will be the basic principle of our future unity: no distinction whatsoever between Moslems or Christians or Jews.~~

B. Local Nationalism

A second major obstacle we have to face when speaking of Arab Unity is the existence of "local nationalism" in some parts of the Arab World. It is a feeling which exists in some countries and makes its peoples more attached to the independence of their country than to the future of the Arab nation at large. Such a feeling exists in Egypt and in Lebanon, and while in the former it has no religious basis at all, in the latter, religious considerations play a primary role in its shaping. Apart from these two nationalisms there is a third one of similar nature, but of different origin, and it aims definitely at the creation of a Syrian nationality, Syria being understood in its geographical meaning and including therefore Lebanon, and Palestine and Transjordan.

Egyptian nationalism is of a peculiar character in the Arab World. While the national feeling in the other countries is very influenced by the Arab idea, and while in some of them the Arab feeling is much stronger than the local, the great majority of the population of Egypt is concerned only with the affairs of their country with almost no regard for the affairs of the Arab World. This situation has its historical justification, which we shall try to explain at length in the next chapter, but it has produced some persons who are so enthusiastic for the Egyptian, as opposed to the Arab cause, that they invented some years ago a new theory of Egyptian origins. They considered that Egypt was more Pharaonic than Arab and that it should therefore trace its future development and progress along those lines. However the idea of Arab rather Egyptian character is being spread more and more, and the influence which the former movement has had at one time is vanishing rapidly. The Egyptian intellectuals and politicians are realizing that their nation is so impressed by Arabic culture, Arabic history and the Arabic language that ^{they are bound sooner or later to adopt the Arab idea and develop their life on its basis} ~~it is not possible to hesitate one moment as to whether they are actually Arabs or Pharaonics.~~ They are realizing, with the course of time, that they are bound to live as Arabs and to cooperate with the Arab countries because it is their interest to do so; that is why they played such an important role in the problem of Palestine.

In Lebanon, on the other hand, local nationalism is the out-product of religion more than any thing else. As we

have already mentioned, the feeling of difference from the Moslem elements, encouraged and given a new scientific basis by the foreigner, has created the "Phoenician theory" and with it a movement similar to the Egyptian as to its reach, but much weaker as to its effect and followers. The maronite element of the population has always stood for the isolation of Lebanon and its complete independence from any constructive collaboration with the Arab countries. In a relatively recent speech delivered in commemoration of a Maronite feast, the Maronite Patriarch declared: "Lebanon has always lived an independent life in the past centuries; it has to continue this life in the future. Do not talk to us of either unity or Federation: all we seek is to cooperate with our neighbours as neighbours only, but let each stay in his own house."

That is the kind of local nationalism which a considerable part of the Lebanese population feel and believe in; there is, side by side with it, another nationalism, purely Arab and anti-regional, felt by the whole majority of the Moslem population and an appreciable part of the educated Christians. That Arab part of Lebanon does not believe at all in the isolation of the country; on the contrary they believe that its future is bound up with that of its neighbouring Arab countries and that it lies therefore within the framework of Arab Unity.

The recent political developments following the general elections of the country have taken a course definitely favorable

to the Arab cause. The new chamber of deputies brought to power a President of the Republic and a Prime Minister both of them well-known for their Arab feeling and for their dispositions to cooperate actively with the other countries, and thus defeated the separatist group on an unprecedented ^{scale} side in the history of Lebanon.

A third and last kind of local nationalism is the one represented by the Syrian Popular Party and which claims that Syria in its geographical meaning is a historical as well as ethnical unity and ought to be a nation, different in its political as well as cultural development, from the rest of the Arab nation. This movement is not based on purely religious considerations even though such considerations might have played a certain role in the original conception of the idea. Both in its influence and expansion, it is limited to some elements of the Lebanese population, and has practically no influence whatsoever outside that country.

These local nationalisms constitute, with the religious question, the major internal obstacles to the unity. They are not completely distinct from each other, nor are they separate from the obstacle of colonial ambitions; they are so interrelated that one cannot mention the one without mentioning the other. Thus the local nationalism in Lebanon is an outproduct of the religious question and the latter is in turn influenced and encouraged by the foreigner. What then should be our attitude toward them?

There is no doubt that something has got to be done in order to improve the situation; where there is a need for the explanation of the problem, such an explanation should be made and put in a form within the reach of every individual. It is undoubtedly the cause of many a misunderstanding that a great part of those who stick to their local nationalism do not know what is meant by Arab Unity. This unity is to the ordinary man in those movements so vague and far distant, that he believes from the outset, it is not desirable because he is going to be dominated by a majority professing a different religion, or that it is a dream and vision, based on wishful thinking rather than realism.

Explanation and rationalisation of the goal are therefore necessary if we want to weaken these nationalisms. To show the public the interest which each of the members of the community and the nation at large would get from the unity, is another means which might have far-reaching results. In the field of government the safeguards of the rights of the national and religious groups should be translated into realities by being embodied in the clauses of the constitution of the state; that is, the equality of all sections of the population as to the full exercise of their political and religious rights, whether through elections or accession to the different governmental offices, or the free exercise of their religions, should be among the most important and outstanding features of the constitution. The organisation of the prospective Arab State

should be made in a way which ensures the safeguarding of the rights of the countries where local nationalisms are still strong, or where religious difference are very marked. Another safeguard for their rights would be to grant them a definite number of public offices of high rank or a ministry in the Cabinet so that their contribution to public life would be active and their interest in the future of the country be increased. It is by similar means, especially studied to remedy the situation, that one can change the attitude of these peoples and turn them towards a cause which is their^s as well as that of their fellow citizens.

But one should always bear in mind that these are temporary measures which cannot solve the problem of religious differences; the only solution is that mentioned in the introductory chapter, namely the separation of religion from state.

G. Racial Minorities.

Another obstacle which should be mentioned in this respect is the existence within the Arab nation of some racial minorities. The problem of the Kurds in Iraq is a typical example of this obstacle. Even though they profess the same religion as that of the majority, yet the fact that they speak Kurdish and feel as a distinct group from the majority of the nation constitutes a question which needs serious consideration. This obstacle is not of major importance as its remedy lies in an adequate policy towards such minorities. The granting of local autonomy for instance may be a sufficient measure, or if the feeling of separation is more deeply rooted, other means would be used, according to the needs of the situation. But the fact remains there, that to neglect such questions and to offer them the opportunity of growing and developing without a serious attempt to settle them, would be the very warrant of failure of the unity.

The same question is raised when the Berber population of the North African countries is considered. Of much greater importance than the Kurdish question, this problem needs a careful study and a well adapted remedy.

D: Difference in Social Development.

The differences in the degree of social development in the different Arab countries stand also as an obstacle in the way of unity. Some of these countries have a population with an advanced social evolution, because of their geographical situation or the spread of education among its different classes; others have a smaller degree of such a development and their contact with the West has been rather on a reduced scale. Still others are in a very elementary situation of social development, the tribal nomadic life being a normal feature of their life, and the false understanding of religion which has a great influence upon their mentality has stood as a handicap to their progress and development. These differences will create constantly causes of conflict and misunderstanding because of the lack of common social back-ground among the different peoples.

The right method to overcome such an obstacle is in preparing the way for the social evolution of those peoples. Here, the element of time has to take its course more than in any other thing, because the social evolution of a people is not something which can be done in a few days. All that can be done in this field is to encourage the spread of education, the introduction of all kinds of social reforms, the emancipation of the woman, the gradual industrialization of the country, the raising of the standard of living of the masses and the

undertaking of other similar steps to foster that evolution. But the fact remains there that the differences in the degree of social development will continue to stand for a time as an obstacle in the way of unity, until such time come when the Arab State would have reached such a degree of consolidation that no obstacle of this kind can shake its foundations or handicap its work.

These are, on the whole, the major obstacles standing in the way of Arab Unity. There are still others, of rather a secondary importance if compared to these, and which need nevertheless a close study and understanding before any attempt at their solution is made: the existence of a number of royal families and ruling dynasties in the different Arab countries, the lack of general agreement about the extent and form of Arab Unity and lastly the lack of an adequate administrative capacity in our statesmen are all questions which need careful attention if the unity isto be successful.

CHAPTER IV

EXTENT AND FORM OF ARAB UNITY

The aim of Arab nationalism is the liberation of the Arab countries and their unification in one form or another. The story of the national movement, as described in the first chapter, is the narrative of the efforts which the Arabs have made in the past and are still making in order to build the Arab nation on a firm and progressive foundation. Let us see now the extent of the territories to be included in the Unity and the form of their gathering.

There is no definite scheme agreed upon by those interested in the future of the Arab nation. Different opinions are given in this respect: some would include in the unity such countries as Syria, Lebanon, Palestine, Transjordan, Iraq, Egypt, Saudi Arabia and Yaman. Others believe in the necessity of including the North African countries, that is Lybia, Algeria, Tunisia and Morocco and propose therefore the formation of two large conglomerations, one including the countries of the North African coast and the other those of the Near and Middle East. Even among those who believe in the exclusion of Lybia, Algeria, Tunisia and Morocco, there is no complete agreement: while some want to include Egypt and the Peninsula in the unity, others want to restrict it to Iraq, Egypt and Syria, the latter being understood in its geographical meaning. A third group believes in the necessity of excluding Egypt and ~~still a fourth would go as far as doing without Iraq~~, thus restricting the unity to Syria proper, Lebanon, Palestine, and Transjordan, and Iraq.

Nor is there any kind of general agreement about the form in which that unity should be materialized. Some would ask for a unitary form of government with a large degree of centralization, and others would be satisfied with a unitary decentralized government. At the other extreme there are people who want it a very loose unity, a kind of an Arab League of Nations where each country would retain its sovereignty and independence, but would agree to conform its acts and decisions to the broad lines of a unified policy accepted by all the countries concerned. Between the two extremes there is a third group of people who believe in the necessity of the federal form of government for the unity, or any similar form under which each country would be able to maintain its internal autonomy and give up its sovereignty and the management of matters of common concern to a central authority.

In spite of this diversity of opinions as to the extent and form of the unity, there is however an evident conclusion, which it is possible to draw, and that is, almost everybody concerned with the future of the Arab nation believes in the necessity of one form or another of Arab Unity and agrees that the Arab peoples should be united in certain aspects of their life at least. The difference which exists between these opinions is a difference in the degree rather than in the end itself. Even in the countries where local nationalisms are strong, there seems that the necessity of coming closer and closer to the other Arab countries increases everyday, but the form of that

'rapprochement' is understood in different ways according to the countries and the people. In the 'particularist' circles of Lebanon for instance, this necessity is economic, and cooperation in this field is desired more than any other thing. In the 'educational' circles of Egypt and among the leaders of the cultural movement, this necessity should translate itself in a kind of cultural unity where the educational systems would be unified or at least inspired from the broad lines of a general programme of education for the Arab countries. In Syria and Iraq, it is the Arab national feeling which ^{is} stronger than any material interests and ^{which} it asks for a political unity rather than mere cooperation in the various fields. In Palestine, the problem of the Jewish National Home makes it a problem of life and death for the Arabs to unite politically with the other Arabs so as to oppose the common danger with a united front. Thus the ^{greatest part} ~~whole~~ of the Arab East looks ^{to} at Arab Unity with ardent hopes.

Extent

Leaving aside the different opinions about the extent of that unity, let us try to examine what is possible and necessary to achieve, and form our opinion on the realities of the situation.

We hardly need to say that the Arab considers as a part of his fatherland every country where Arabic is spoken as the mother tongue, and therefore he desires whole-heartedly that all the Arab lands would be united at once. But considering the

situation as it is, and realizing the obstacles which would ^{de}increase its chances of success in the future, we come to the conclusion that it is not possible to unite all the Arab countries at once. What is possible then?

First of all, the prospective Arab unity cannot include the North African countries that is Cyrenaica, Lybia, Tunisia, Algeria and Morocco, because of the large geographical distances which separate them, their political status and the great differences which exist, at the present time at least, between their social development and that of the other Arab countries. The political development of the Arabs of North Africa is bound to be separate because their life and conditions are so different. That does not mean that no cooperation whatsoever should take place between them and their other fellowmen: on the contrary the Arabs have a duty to help themselves and their brothers whenever they be; and if we ask for the formation of Arab Unity without including North Africa in it, it is because the interests of the Arabs themselves dictate, so to speak, such a reservation. It is obvious that the degree of political emancipation of the North African countries is so limited that the probability of their complete liberation in the near future is very small. Further their inclusion in the Arab Unity at the very beginning is not desirable because it would be too vast and extensive an area for a young state. The possible solution would then be to form gradually a North African Unity when their independence comes, and the union of the two would be a very possible and desirable thing in the future.

Putting therefore aside the North African countries we come to consider the situation of the countries of the Peninsula. The social conditions and the political development of the peoples of Saudi Arabia and the Yaman present the same difficulties as those of the people of North Africa. Religious feeling among them is far stronger than the national, and the possibility of a common government and a harmonious political, economic and social life with the peoples of the Near East, is unrealisable for a long period to come. Saudi Arabia and the Yaman cannot therefore become parts of an Arab State and cooperate smoothly with its other parts, but they can on the other hand give it elements of strength and prestige if their relations are regulated in a certain definite way. Such a regulation should secure their active contribution for the success of the Arab cause and lay the foundation of a deep understanding between them and the other Arab countries, so that their future union would be possible.

Of a somewhat similar nature is the situation of Egypt in its relations with the Arab World. The people of Egypt have been developing a kind of Egyptian nationalism since the days of Mohammed Ali. The country has lived ever since that time a different life from that of the Arab provinces of the Ottoman Empire, and the national feeling of the people has been given ample opportunity to develop, in the period following the British occupation of the country in 1882. That is why Arab feeling is much weaker in Egypt than in the other neighbouring countries, and

the attitude of the masses towards the problem of Arab unity is one of indifference rather than of keen interest. In the last few years this attitude has begun to change and the government and the people have begun to develop a friendlier attitude towards the Arab World. Some of their eminent leaders have even become ardent Pan-Arabs and worked hard for the Arab cause. The present head of the Egyptian Government has distinguished himself in this field: in a recent speech to the Senate about the government's attitude toward the problem of Arab Unity, he said: "I have always been interested in the conditions of the Arab World and I actually made practical efforts to help reestablishing popular governments in certain Arab countries. I studied seriously the question of Arab Unity ever since the British Foreign Secretary made his famous declaration about it and I reached the conclusion that the best method to follow in order to reach practical results was to put the matter in the hands of the Arab Governments themselves. I believe it advisable for the Egyptian Government to take the initiative and confer with each of these governments representatives separately, so as to know their views about the problem and try to harmonise these views as much as possible. Once that stage is reached, the government would invite them all to a conference to be held in Egypt, so as to take practical steps in the realization of the hopes and aspirations of the Arab people."

In fact the negotiations which are taking place at the present time between the Egyptian Prime Minister and the repre-

representatives of the different Arab countries have been initiated by him and are developing in a satisfactory way. Thus the Egyptians are quite prepared to help in the solution of the problems of the Arab World and are ^{making} ~~working~~ sincere efforts along these lines. But they are not yet ready to enter in a kind of a federation or to sacrifice any bit of their sovereignty and independence for the sake of a larger Arab state. That is why Egypt is not expected to enter any such state and its relations to the countries of the Near East are bound to compromise between the safeguarding of its independence on the one hand, and active collaboration with the Arab countries on the other.

Arab Unity should ^{in the opinion of the writer} ~~therefore~~ consist ^{first} at first of a large and loose confederation which would give birth in the future to an Arab State of ^{more} limited nature. The confederation should consist of the existing Arab states of the Near and Middle East, including Syria, Lebanon, Palestine, Transjordan, Iraq, Egypt, Saudi Arabia and the Yaman. The reason why the unity should be a confederation rather than a federation is that these countries are not yet prepared to enter into any form of unity with stronger links than the loose ones offered by the confederation. Further the differences in the social evolution, political development and attitude toward the unity which exist between these countries are so great that any stronger form of unity might turn out to be more harmful than useful for their future.

As to the Arab State which in the future, would come out of this confederation, it should be restricted to Syria, Lebanon,

Palestine, Transjordan and Iraq. The similarities in the modes of life, the common national aspirations, the economic conditions and the political status of these countries are so similar to each other that their unity is quite conceivable and its chances of success are very great. There are ~~obstacles~~ to the formation of this state, no doubt, but these obstacles can be overcome by a careful choice of the form of government. This Arab state would become at the same time a member unit in the confederation and would continue to collaborate with the other members for further developments of the Arab World. But as a first step the Arab State should not extend to more than those countries, otherwise it would be too weak and its future growth and development might become greatly hampered.

Even the formation of the Arab State out of the initial confederation ^{should} ~~might~~ not take place at the same time. It might need to pass through those phases necessary to make out of it a viable entity once it is done. When the countries ^{of the} ~~to form this~~ Arab State are ^{still in this preliminary stage} ~~in the stage of confederation~~, their relations with each other and with the other members of the confederation should not differ ~~in any way~~ from those of Egypt, Soudi Arabia and the Yaman. The links between themselves should be made gradually closer ^{only} in the future, and the obstacles removed with great tact and skill; ^{should be} ~~and~~ their general conditions prepared in such a way that when federation comes, it would be a natural conclusion to that long preparation. The particular conditions of a country might need some more preparation and efforts than the others, in that case such conditions should be given full

consideration. The whole point is that the maximum of statesmanship and foresight is needed to achieve such an important result and to bring the federation to its final form. It would then be the task of this federal state to help the subject peoples of the other Arab countries to free themselves from the foreigner and to constitute little by little independent countries which would unite ultimately to this nucleus of Arab Unity. The unity would thus be constituted in its final stage of all the Arab countries united together on a federal basis and constituting from the international standpoint one of these large federations which, it is hoped, would form the new world of the future.

Form of the Unity.

What now would be the form of government of the future Arab state? Should it be ^{un}unitary or federal. In case it is to be unitary, should it be centralized or decentralized? In case it is to be federal, how should the distribution of powers be made between the federal government and the member units?

A close examination of the factors making for Arab Unity and of the obstacles standing ^{in its way} against it show the existence, within the Arab nation, of elements which are not quite homogenous. The existence of racial as well as religious minorities, the existence of local nationalism in some parts

of the different countries and especially the differences in social and cultural development of the peoples inhabiting each country, all of these factors ask for a wise distribution of powers in the future Arab State. The organisation of the government should be made in such a form as to allow the different communities a large share in the management of their own affairs. The legislative power should not be vested in one organ only because legislation cannot be the same for all communities: the differences in religion makes it difficult to apply the same laws to all the inhabitants in matters of personal status for instance. There must be a division of this power which fits with the conditions arising from the differences in religious beliefs, and the same thing may be said of the executive and judicial powers. Thus the organisation of the new state has to take into consideration all such vital problems and adapt itself accordingly.

How can we compromise between this situation and the necessity of having an efficient government, able to secure a good administration of the new state, strong enough to work for the progress of the countries in the different fields, and especially to set on the task of the complete realization of Arab hopes and aspirations?

Before deciding upon the suitable form of government, we shall try to review in brief the various forms among which our choice has to be made.

The Arab State has to be either unitary or federal. In case we choose it to be unitary, it means that it should have

one legislature, capable of making laws of universal validity for all its citizens, one executive to apply and one judiciary to interpret these laws. In case we choose it to be federal it would be made up of several individual states; each of them preserves in principle its internal sovereignty, its own laws and government. But the nation as a whole, comprising the total population of the individual states, forms a united or federal state of which the citizens of the individual states are also citizens.

In the unitary as well as the federal systems there are various degrees of distribution of powers, so that to be limited to the above mentioned definition is to be misled.

In the unitary form, the constitution of the state delegates all governmental powers to the central government, which may create such subdivisions and delegate to them such powers as it sees fit, changing their boundaries or their powers at its pleasure, by ordinary legislative enactment. Thus there are highly centralized unitary states such as France, and highly decentralized unitary states such as England. In the first case the central government retains a large measure of control over the local districts and grants to them limited powers of local self-government, while in the second the local areas are given large and independent powers.

In the federal form, on the other hand the constitution definitely provides for both a national government and the main subdivisions, dividing the powers of government between them: all depends therefore on the nature of the constitution, and neither the national nor the state governments can change the other or legally interfere with the exercise of powers that belong to it.

From this explanation we conclude at once that the Arab State has to be either federal or a unitary decentralized one. The two forms offer the necessary guarantees for a large share in local governments, and the different communities find in both what they would like to retain in matter of freedom and liberty. But the unitary form, which is adopted for the small states would not be successful for a large country of the size of the Arab State, nor for a nation including racial and religious minorities which would be a handicap for any kind of uniform legislation.

Federalism seems to fit much more with our present situation than a unitary system. In the federal form the central government secures the control of general interests and leaves the control of matters that differ with the different countries to the peoples of those areas. It is especially convenient for us because of the vast areas of our future state and the diversity of their conditions. It also enables a growing spirit of nationality and unity to manifest itself and helps to weaken the differences that are already existing. Such a *form*

is desirable therefore because it offers the necessary compromise which we seek for our future state.

Arab Unity, thus defined as to its extent and form of government, offers a satisfactory solution to all the obstacles which otherwise would handicap its realization.

In our study of the obstacles that stand in the way of Arab Unity, we differentiated between the external and the internal. The Arab State, as it is defined, would offer a possibility for the solution of those obstacles which come from within. Since the colonial ambitions and the Zionist danger concern our relations with the outside world, the extent of the federation and its form of government as described above would help in as much as they would facilitate the union of our efforts towards an internal unity and enable us to present a solid front to the foreigner. The liberation of a country does not usually come as a gift from the colonising power: as the late ~~King Faisal~~ said ^{Jaffar Pasha} "Independence is always conquered, never given" and in this struggle all our efforts are needed so as to get the best results with them. Arab Unity obviously helps the Arabs in this question and liberates them through their mutual solidarity. The initial steps towards complete liberation may be the conclusion of treaties of friendship and alliance with those powers to guarantee their major strategic interests for a certain period of time, or any other kind of agreement safeguarding the mutual interests of both sides.

1. Letter of Gertrude Bell p. 460

The Zionist problem would not be solved by such a Unity if Jewish dreams are to be realised with the support of the European powers. Without entering into the details of this problem here, we can say that the federal form of government of the future Arab State would be the best ^{form which would go with the decentralized organization of Palestine} ~~solution of the problem~~ ^{when} ~~if~~ the Jewish danger is removed from the scene. Arabs and Jews would find in such ^{this organization} ~~a~~ form of government the necessary guarantees for their prosperity and the development of their communities. The Jews would not have to fear the Arabs as long as they would enjoy a complete autonomy in their internal affairs and the Arabs would not have to worry about their future because of the removal of the danger of the Jewish expansion. This is what the federal form of government offers to the solution of the problems of Palestine, and no other form offers such a compromise for the benefit of both elements.

In the internal field, such a delimitation of the extent and form of Arab Unity removes any obscurity and vagueness as to the meaning of the expression. There are many people who have stood as opponents to the unity because they used to fear the contents and the intentions hidden behind those terms. The religious problem which constitutes one of the major, if not the major obstacle, lies partly in the misunderstanding of what is meant by unity. We have seen in the study of the obstacles that the religious obstacle consists mainly in the opposition of the Christian elements of the population to unity. Such an opposition

comes from the confusion which is usually made between Pan-Arabism and Pan-Islamism, and the fears the Christians have about their future as long as that confusion is not dissipated. Now that Arab Unity is clearly explained and delimited, and that they are secured autonomy in their internal affairs and a complete freedom of religion and thought, they would have no reason to oppose it and would willingly work for it.

Local nationalisms find also in the federation their proper remedy. In the prospective Arab State as limited above, local nationalism would easily be harmonised with the wider Arab nationalism because the essence of the federal system is the existence of a state within a larger state. Thus the psychological satisfaction of belonging to Lebanon, in case such a psychological desire ever remains, would still be abundantly fed in the federation because Lebanon would continue to be a state within that federation. As to Iraq, Syria and Transjordan they will certainly not present such an obstacle when unity comes. There are certain communities which, if judged from their previous conduct under the mandate regime, might make some opposition to joining the unity. The Alacuites and Druzes of Syria have at certain times refused to be considered as parts of the country; but the real cause behind their attitude was more the intrigues and manœuvres made by the foreigner than a real desire to have an independent status. Further the new regime would allow each community a

certain degree of local autonomy in the management of its internal affairs, a fact which is the adequate remedy for situations of that kind.

The obstacles constituted by the differences of social development would be overcome too by the federal system, and its effect would be decreased very much in the sense that it would not stand any more as a handicap for the success of the Arab State. The legislative powers being divided between the federal and state authorities, the degree of social development in each component unit would, no doubt, be the first thing to be considered when the legislature is to perform its functions. Thus, reforms of every kind would be introduced in the proper way, and the mentality of the people would not be hurt by drastic changes and innovations. Not only the movement of reforms would be accepted easily, but the machinery of the state would go more efficiently and smoothly.

These are, in broad lines, the delimitations of the extent and form of Arab Unity: a loose confederation of the existing Arab countries at the very beginning, and out of this confederation a Federation limited in extent and federal in form. The goal of the new Arab State would not be a mere name which, once the first step towards unity is made, would consider itself as having achieved its purpose and being entitled therefore to rest; it would have to be conscious of its duties and responsibilities towards the Arab cause and recreate, so to speak, the Arab Nation on modern foundations by improving its political, economic ^{and} social conditions. *The final form of Arab Unity ~~would~~ be a very extensive country including all the Arabic-speaking territories united on a federal basis.*

CHAPTER V

ORGANIZATION OF ARAB UNITY

The conclusion reached in our study of the extent and form of Arab Unity is that it is necessary to begin this unity by a kind of confederation including all the Arab countries, and that out of this confederation should emerge an Arab State constituted of Syria, Lebanon, Palestine Transjordan and Iraq, and built on a federal basis. Let us try to study in this ~~last~~ chapter the organisation of both the confederation and the federation and draw the general lines of their constitution.

1. Confederation:

Since the main purpose behind the idea of confederation is to start the unity with very loose bonds between the different countries, the confederation should therefore be ^{an} association of states for the sole purpose of uniting the control of some activities in a definite organ or agency. The different states should retain intact their sovereignty and with it their governmental autonomy, and a definite organ should be instituted, consisting of an assembly of delegates representing these various states.

The governmental organisation of this confederation should not operate directly upon individuals but reach them only through the medium of the separate states. The will of the confederal organ should not be expressed in laws framed by

a legislative body, but in resolutions framed by the congress of delegates, these voting according to the instructions they would receive from their governments rather than according to their own will. These resolutions should be inoperative until adopted by the different governments and given the force of law within their jurisdiction. The only force the confederation should have to enforce its resolutions should be moral in nature, because the association being purely voluntary, its success depends only upon the willingness of the member states to enforce the commands of the confederal organ.

The powers conferred upon the confederal organ should be very limited in the beginning, and then go on increasing with the march of time. The first object of the confederation should be to provide common protection for its members against any attacks coming from outside, thus preserving the external security of the different states from foreign ambitions. The confederation should have power to work for the unification of the educational systems of the different countries, or rather drawing the broad lines from which these systems should be inspired. It should have power to plan the economy of the whole confederation so that the economic structure of each country would be organised according to these plans.

Such matters are of common concern to all Arab countries and it is in the interest of each of them to have them coordinated and brought under a single organ. Further

it is necessary that the powers of the confederation should not extend to other fields in this first phase because there might be some reactionary feeling in those countries not yet fully prepared for unity.

However, when the confederation would have worked successfully for some time, and when its foundations would have been firmly consolidated, it should look for further extension of its powers. It has to be considered as the necessary machinery which would have to work out the destinies of the Arab nation and lead it always on the road of progress and development. Even when the Arab State, after ample preparations, would have emerged out of it as a federal entity, the confederation should continue to exist and the new state should be considered as one unit in the confederation.

2. The Federation:

The organisation of the federation should be inspired ~~from our attitude~~ from the particular conditions of the Arab countries. The fact that most aspects of our life need complete reconsideration and that dangers of all kinds are threatening our nation, makes it a matter of vital importance to give our governments so strong and wide powers that they would always be able to make swift decisions and to execute them without finding much obstacles or opposition in their way. Our need for large scale reforms is so urgent and pressing that we cannot afford to lose time in those intricacies of the parliamentary institutions which make the weakness of so many states and

which would be very harmful to our young nation. We need to have parliamentary institutions both in the federal and state governments, but what we need more is to organise these parliamentary governments in such a form that they would not stand as handicaps in the way of development and progress; It is from this general idea that the division of powers between the federal and state governments would be drawn and that the internal organisation of the different states themselves would be inspired.

Division of Powers.

Governmental powers in any federation have to be divided between a central or federal agency and local or state units: whatever concerns the nation as a whole should be placed under the control of the federal government while all other matters of special interest to the different units should remain in the hands of the states governments; in other words the affairs which are of a common interest to the whole federation and which require uniformity of regulation should be placed under the control of the federal government while all other matters should be left to the care of the different states themselves.

The division of powers between federal and state governments differ in general from one federation to another: it cannot obviously be the same for every country because it has to be adapted to the needs of every society. In the case of the future Arab State the division of powers has also to be

adapted to the particular conditions of the Arab nation and has to take special care about the social differences arising out of the existence of so many religions and creeds in the country. The religious question being the most important obstacle in the formation as well as in the actual running of the unity, the powers of the federal government have to be such as not to interfere in any way ^{with} in the religious question, and to leave the largest possible amount of liberty to the people in this matter.

Federal constitutions are usually of two types: either they express the powers and prerogatives of the central government, leaving thus all other matters to the individual states, as in the case of the United States of America and Australia, or they express the powers and prerogatives of the different states member in the federation, as in the case of Canada. The former type of constitution is based on the idea that the federal government should not go always increasing its powers; it is the individual states which should have that advantage. The latter, on the other hand, looks for the constant increase of the powers of the federal government and the strict limitation of that of the individual states. It is the latter form which best suits the Arab Federation because it leaves all the residue of functions to the national government: all the spheres of activity which are newly created by the development of modern life would thus enter directly within the competence of that government.

Since it is difficult to study in details how the division of powers should be made in the future Arab Federation, we are going to draw the broad lines from which such a division should be made and this, on the basis of the special conditions of the Arab countries.

The powers of the federal government being based on the necessity of administering the matters which are of common concern, it logically follows that the first would be that of the defense of the federation, which means a power of control by the central government of all the army, navy and air forces of the nation. Usually it is an exclusive power of every federal government, and the individual states have no right to organise an army for themselves, except within the final limits set usually by the constitution. The control of foreign relations is closely connected with the defense of the country, and all the states of the federation should be represented by the federal government which would conduct itself as a unit. Foreign relations embrace such activities as declaring war, concluding peace, negotiating and ratifying treaties and leaving ordinary diplomatic relations with the other members of the family of nations. The federal government must also have a certain power of taxation in order to meet its expenditures, whether on foreign relations or on other branches of its activities. When its revenues are not adequate, the federal government should be given the right to levy a certain sum from the component units, proportional to the wealth and capacity of each.

Apart from defense, foreign relations and taxation, the ^{federal} central government should have the control of coinage, the conduct of postal service, the control of the great transportation facilities, the regulation of the banking system and the establishment of a general tariff. The control of inter-state commerce is also one of the main functions of the federal governments, and it includes the control of the means of traffic transportation and intercourse in the different states.

Such are the major powers the federal government should have in the early years of the federation. With the course of time and the development of the life of the country, larger and larger powers would be needed, which the federal government would automatically have if the constitution of the federation leaves the residue of powers to the federal authorities.

Education should belong to both federal and state governments because of the special cultural characteristics of certain countries, and in this sense it is called "concurrent power." A whole series of functions should come within this class and fall within the jurisdiction of both federal and state authorities, such as the power to enact a minimum of social legislation, to secure public order and security and the power to mediate and solve constitutional conflicts within a unit or political conflicts within the various units of the federation.

As to the powers of the component units, besides the share they exercise in the concurrent powers, they should enjoy some in which they would be independent from any interference by the federal authorities. Each unit should have the right to evolve its own constitution, which becomes valid when it is accepted by the federal government. Once that condition is fulfilled, the different units should exercise all the powers, legislative, executive and judicial, which pertain to the organisation of their governmental structure. Finally the different states should exercise all those functions which are primarily of local interest such as public works of local scope, the administration of the public schools and other similar functions in the different fields.

Form of the Federal Government.

From the division of powers, we pass now to the form of the federal government and the determination of the relations between its different organs. The form of government in any federation falls into one of the three main types: the presidential system, the parliamentary system and the executive council system.

The essential characteristics of the Presidential System, represented at its best in the U.S.A. is that the constitution makes the executive independent of the Legislature, both in tenure and prerogatives, and furnishes it with sufficient power to prevent the legislature from trenching upon the sphere marked out by the state as executive independence and prerogative.

The main features of the Presidential System are: 1. an executive head of the state irresponsible to the legislature and irremovable by it except by impeachment, 2. a group of ministers appointed and dismissible by the president, acting under his authority and responsible to him and not to the legislature, 3. A legislature elected by the citizens for a term of years and not subject to dissolution by the chief executive, but whose power of passing law is subject to a veto by the Chief Executive.

The Parliamentary System, on the other hand, is that form of government in which the constitution confers upon the legislature unlimited legislative powers as well as the ultimate control of the administration of law. The legislature, under this form, originates the tenure of the real executive and terminates it at pleasure, and the exercise of no executive prerogative, in any sense and manner unapproved by the legislature, can be successfully undertaken.

The main features of the parliamentary system are:

1. The existence of a titular executive head of the state either elected for a term of years or hereditary, 2. the existence of a group of ministers selected and dismissible by the representative legislature and responsible to it, 3. The existence of a legislature of one or two chambers, elected for a term of years, but in some countries liable to be dissolved by the executive head.

The parliamentary system has been evolved by England and is still to the present day best represented and applied in that country.

The third type of federal government is the Executive Council System which has evolved in the Swiss Confederation and which finds still its best application in that country. It borrows elements from the Presidential and Parliamentary forms of governments and adds to them some new elements derived from the nature of the people of that country.

In the Executive Council System, there is a small administrative council, chosen by the legislature for a short term of years to carry on the executive business of the state. It works under the direction and control of the legislature, but cannot be removed by it. The legislature consists of two houses, elected for short terms and not subject to dissolution by the executive. A new element is introduced in the system: the people can influence politics directly through the use of referendum and the initiative.

From the preceding brief review of the three forms of governments, we realize at once that the parliamentary system fits more the conditions of the Arab countries and the degree of evolution of their peoples. It is inconceivable to have the supreme head of the state elected by popular vote, as in the case in the Presidential System, or to have the executive organ work under the complete direction and control of the Legislature, as is the case in the Executive Council System. The Arab State needs a strong and vigorous government, especially in the first years of its establishment, and the chances of having such a government are much greater with the Parliamentary system than with the other two.

Whether the Arab Federation will become a republic or a monarchy, nobody can tell; both of these forms have their merits and weaknesses, and each one of them has chances to be adopted. The merits of monarchy are those associated with the principle of hereditary tenure in the organisation of the executive. This principle tends to secure an uninterrupted and orderly succession in the executive office without the recurring dangers and inconveniences, the tumults and disorders which are almost inseparable from the method of popular choice. These merits, characteristics of the monarchical form of government, constitute the inherent weakness of the republican form as to the continuity of the executives office. The dangers, of monarchy, on the other hand, are that it affords no guarantee that a strong, vigorous or trained person will succeed to the office, but allows the succession to be determined by the accident of birth: to entrust one man with the government of the people, not because he is the wisest or the best, but because he is the son or heir of another person is a principle of politics which has little to commend it. History affords numerous examples of immature, feeble-minded and incompetent rulers succeeding to thrones under the operation of such a principle. The republican form of government removes such risks from the scene and secures the choice of the wisest and ablest person existing in the country to hold that office.

The existence in the Arab countries of too many ruling dynasties, and the ^{need} use of a strong government, composed of the

ablest statesmen of the land, make it preferable for the Federation to be a Republic rather than a monarchy: If this was to happen, the President should not be directly elected by the people, but by a joint session of the two houses of the legislature so as to get the best possible head for the state. If monarchy was to be adopted, the king should be constitutional; but whether the head of the state becomes a president of a republic or a king, he should have very reduced powers so that the cabinet becomes the real executive organ.

The Cabinet

* The necessity of having a strong executive calls for a careful consideration of the relations between the Cabinet and the legislature. The practice of the parliamentary institutions of the West does not always succeed in countries not yet fully ripe for such governments, and while it is very useful in the West to confer upon the legislature unlimited powers for the control of the administration of law, it would turn to be very harmful, in the Arab federation, to have so powerful a legislature.* The responsibility of the executive to this organ should not stand as an obstacle to its strength and vigor and should therefore be limited in nature.

The Prime Minister should be appointed by the head of the state from among those persons who, by their popularity and ability, can get the confidence of the legislature and insure a steady cooperation with it. In the formation of his ministry, he should be allowed a complete freedom of action so

as to select the best persons with whom he can work; the ministers should be responsible to him alone so that any or all of them can become subject to dismissal if he realizes it to be necessary. Once the Cabinet is formed it should face the legislature with a definite programme and get a vote confidence on its basis for a definite period of time. During that period the executive would have ample opportunity to carry its programme into execution without much opposition by the legislature. The term of office should be long enough to enable the execution of a stable and continuous foreign and domestic policy, and at its expiration, the Cabinet should have to face the legislature once more to renew its confidence. The latter would judge the Cabinet at the light of that experience and would act accordingly for the renewal or withdrawal of that confidence.

The Legislature

Just as the responsibility of the Cabinet should be adapted to the special conditions of the Arab countries, so is the legislature for both its composition and powers. Like all other federations, the Arab State has to have two houses, one composed of the representatives of the different component units and the other of the representatives of the population; but the basis upon which the delegates should be elected must be drawn from the general situation of the country.

a. House of States

As a general rule, it is not essential for the federal governments that the member states should all have the same number of delegates in the Upper House; the constitution usually assigns to each unit the number of its representatives according to its size and population. But the fact that there are differences in religion and social development in the different Arab countries, makes it desirable to have all states send the same number of representatives, so that they should all stand in exactly the same relation to the federal government, as regards their respective autonomous powers, or of their citizens to participate in the control and management of the general government. It would constitute another safeguard for the preservation of the rights of the small states.

The component units of the Federation should have complete freedom in determining the manner of the election or appointment of their representatives in that house and the term of their tenure, but these should all be remunerated from the national treasury. Further, it should not be necessary for the representatives of each unit to agree and follow a common policy according to the instructions they receive from their states; on the contrary, they should be independent in their opinions and act as they think best, both for the interest of their component units as well as that of the Federation as a whole.

b. House of Representatives

Unlike the Upper House, the Lower House should be elected in a uniform manner, determined by federal law, through-

out the whole country. Because of the ignorance of the masses of the population, it is desirable that the elections be in two degrees so as to get a better quality of delegates. It is necessary also that all candidates should at least read and write, if not have a minimum amount of education and experience. The term of office should be four or five years because elections recurring at shorter intervals keep the country excited and in turmoil, while a longer tenure may place the representatives out of touch with their electorate and make them careless about their responsibilities.

The number of representatives which each component unit would have, should depend upon the size of its population, and scrupulous care must be made to give a just representation to those groups differing from the majority in creed or religion. As in the case of the Upper House, the representatives should not depend upon the instructions which their governments might send; they should act as reason dictates and work with a great zeal for the progress and development of the whole nation.

Powers of the Different Organs.

It is the constitution which should organise in details the powers of the different organs of the government and their relations with each other; all ^{what} that we can see here is the broad lines from which such a detailed organisation should be derived.

The head of the state, whether a king or president of a republic, should be the supreme representative of the executive power but should have very reduced powers as a chief executive, just like the President of the French Republic or the King of Great Britain. His main functions should be, to choose the right man for the position of Prime Minister with the consent of the legislature, to summon the two chambers of parliament, to appoint the higher officials at the proposal of the Cabinet, and the consent of the Senate, to see that the laws are executed, to send and receive ambassadors, and other diplomatic officials, and to have the power of pardon. These are the powers that belong usually to the heads of states having parliamentary institutions, and in the Arab Federation the head of the state should not have larger powers because the Cabinet is meant to be the real executive.

It is the Cabinet which should conduct the affairs of the country. Once it gets the confidence of the legislature, it should have a free hand in carrying its programme both in its external as well as internal aspects. It should have the right to determine and conduct foreign policy, to negotiate political and commercial treaties which become valid with the assent of the Upper House. In the internal field the Cabinet should have a wide range of ordinance power to carry on administration of the country; it should promulgate the laws, control the army and execute the budget as enacted by the Legislature. The members of the Cabinet should be

allowed to appear before either of the two houses to address them, initiate or defend their measures, answer questions raised by the representatives and do everything in their power to secure a greater degree of cooperation and integration between the executive and the legislative organs.

As to the Legislature, the two houses should be equal in power and coordinate. They should have the right to deal with any subject requiring legislation unless it is included in the ordinance power of the Cabinet. The initiation of legislation should be permitted in either house and every bill should require a majority vote in each house in order to become law. Either house should have the right to interpellate the Prime minister or any of his ministers on any question and ask for information. While in ordinary legislation the powers of the Senate should be coequal with those of the Lower House, measures for raising revenue must originate in the latter only. In case of disagreement between the two houses, a conference committee, representing both chambers, should attempt to reach a compromise. In the executive domain, no treaty should be made with the foreign powers before the consent of the Senate is secured, and no appointments of high officials in the federal government should take place before the advice and consent of the Upper House is obtained. Apart from those legislative and executive functions, the Senate should have the power to try all cases of impeachment preferred by the other house against high officials and to settle by compromise constitutional disputes within the units provided an appeal has been made to it.

The Judiciary.

The Federal courts of the Arab State have to be adapted to the conditions arising out of the existence of different religions in the country; as a result of this situation there will not exist a uniform system of civil and criminal law applied to all the population, and this characteristic must be taken into consideration in the delimitation of the functions of that organ. Federal judges must be nominated by the executive organ with the consent and approval of the legislature, and all the safeguards necessary for their independence must be secured. Their jurisdiction should extend to all cases in law and equity arising under the constitution, the laws of the Federation and treaties made under their authority. It should extend also to all cases to which the Federation shall be a party such as suits between the Federation and the local units or conflicts of jurisdiction between federal and local authorities. Constitutional controversies between two or more units, conflicts between citizens of different units, controversies between a unit or its citizens and foreign states, cases affecting ambassadors or consular agents etc., all of these should come under its jurisdiction. The latter should also cover the following subjects: cases of high treason against the state, crimes and misdemeanors against the law of nations, political crimes which occasion federal intervention, crimes against the safety of public credit and the national currency.

The Constitution.

The supremacy of the constitution should be a principle governing all the activities of the state. This principle means that the federal constitution, once evolved and adopted by the different units, should be equally binding upon them and the federal government. It follows that neither the central government nor the local units should be able to change it by themselves without the consent of the other party concerned.

From the principle of the supremacy of the constitution follows the consideration that it should be a written one, otherwise any component unit would be liable to claim privileges, rights and powers, which it thinks have been given to it by the constitution while the other units may deny its claim. In such a case the conflict would be grave because no one party would be able to determine exactly what the constitution established, since the act is not written in one document, or is not written at all, but constitutes only a general practice. Thus the absence of a written document would be a constant source of trouble and friction at a time when federation needs most the understanding and cooperation of all.

Side by side with the constitution, the federation needs a body to safeguard it and to interpret it in case of necessity; that body should be a neutral party and enjoy the necessary authority to declare whose interpretation is right in case of misunderstanding between federal and local authorities.

The only organ which can perform this function without partisanship is the Federal Court, and the latter must therefore be looked upon as the guardian and interpreter of the constitution in addition to its ordinary activities.

The constitution should be rigid, that is amendable only through a special procedure provided for in the document itself, and not through the ordinary process of law-making, but it should always be understood and interpreted in a liberal way. If it were flexible, that is amendable through the ordinary procedure of law-making, the federal legislature would always be able to amend it according to its own will, without paying enough attention to the interests of the component units. The different states may thus be dissatisfied and ultimately disintegrate, which is the last thing to be done in the Arab Federation. The only disadvantage, very important no doubt, is that changes in the competence of the government, rendered indispensable by new economic and social conditions would not be taking place quickly enough to satisfy the growing needs of the community. But, as mentioned already, this disadvantage would be greatly decreased when the principle of liberal interpretation of the constitution is accepted. Thus, even though the language of the constitution remains fixed and its concepts the same, the facts and conditions to which they apply would be subject to constant and vital changes, with the necessary effect that the application of the old concepts to new situations would bring new and different results.

The constitution should provide the means of its own change. The proposal for the amendment might come either from a certain number of the states legislatures or from the federal legislature itself; but whether it comes from the one or the other, the adoption of the proposal by both sides is necessary before the amendment proper becomes operative. Once the proposal is accepted, the amendment should be made by a joint session of the two Houses, and become affective only after it receives the consent of the majority of states legislatures. This method gives complete satisfaction to the local units because their action is required twice in the process of amendment, through their representatives in the Upper House and directly by the vote of their legislatures.

State or Local Government.

The division of powers between federal and state governments which we have seen already, calls for a short study of the organisation and machinery of the different component units of the federation.

The different states should be left completely free to choose their own constitution and their own form of government, on the condition that the central government gives its assent to that choice and makes it effective. In this way each of the component units may contrive^{inve} to have their present institutions and machinery or make some slight changes in them or even adopt totally new ones provided they fit within the framework of the

federation, and do not conflict in any way with its constitution. The same thing may be said as far as centralization and decentralization are concerned. Some states may see the necessity of a strong and centralized government because of the homogenous population they have; others may have to grant local autonomy to their provinces. In certain countries the autonomy of some provinces is not only necessary but dictated, so to speak, by the general conditions of the country. In the case of Palestine for instance, the existence of two elements of completely different nature as to social development or religious differences or cultural background makes it impossible to have a centralised form of government. Under these circumstances each of the two elements should have very wide autonomy in the management of their own affairs within the unity of the state. Again the existence of too many kinds of minorities in Syria makes it necessary to have some degree of decentralisation, but that necessity is not as imperative as in the case of Palestine. Thus each of the component units has some characteristics peculiar to itself, and in the determination of the internal organisation of the state as well as in the choice of the form of government, these characteristics should be given full consideration.

The organisation of the Federation, as outlined in the preceding pages, aims at fulfilling the requirements of stability with flexibility in the relations of the different organs with each other, and of strength and efficiency needed by the federal

government to carry into execution the affairs of the state. The establishment of a rigid constitution, allotting to each authority its own sphere of functions, achieving stability in the relations of the central government with the states units, and guarantees the freedom of action to each of them in its own field. The fact that the residue of powers in the constitution is left to the federal government insures flexibility because it would enable it to assume the new functions necessitated by the changing conditions of the country, without friction with the local units. Further, the fact that the Cabinet has a "limited" responsibility towards the legislature and is secured tenure of office for a definite period of time gives it the elements of strength and efficiency which it needs to put into execution the programme it assigned to itself. It gives the Arab Federation the merits of the parliamentary system of government and removes its main weakness as to the instability of the Cabinet.

A last point should be raised in respect to the government of the Arab Federation: the present conflict has proved that there is always danger to the peace of the world, in allowing the governments of the different countries ~~of the world to have~~ a completely free hand in the management of their internal as well as external affairs, as a consequence of the principle of absolute sovereignty of the states. It is very likely that the future League of Nations would have to ask its members to consent to a certain limitation of that sovereignty, for the sake of preserving the peace and security of each of them. The government of the Arab Federation would then have to give, like the other members, effective guarantees of its sincere

intentions to observe its international obligations, and accept such regulations as may be prescribed by the League in regard to its armed forces or the exercise of its powers both in the internal and external fields. It may be interesting to mention here the general conditions which the League of Nations used to ask from the countries under the mandatory regime for the termination of the mandate and their admission as members into the League. These conditions fall into two categories:

1. The existence in the territory concerned of "de facto" conditions which justify the presumption that the country has reached the stage of development at which a people has become able, in the words of Art. 22 of Covenant, "to stand by itself under the strenuous conditions of the modern world."
2. Certain guarantees to be furnished by the territory desirous of emancipation, to the satisfaction of the League of Nations, in whose name the Mandate was conferred and has been exercised the the mandatory. These guarantees are: effective protection of racial, linguistic and religious minorities, the privileges and immunities of foreigners as well as the interests of foreigners in judicial, civil and criminal cases, freedom of conscience and public worship and the free exercise of religious, educational and medical activities of religious missions of all denominations, with due regard to the needs of public order.

In addition to the possible limitation of sovereignty common to all states the Arab State might be called to give

similar guarantees to the future League because of the existence of racial and religious minorities among its populations. There is no harm in giving such guarantees provided they would not stand as obstacles to the equality of the Arab State with the majority of the members of the future League, or would not constitute pretexts for foreign interventions in the affairs of the Arab Nation.

CHAPTER VI

PALESTINE AND ARAB UNITY

The problem of Palestine is the most difficult question which the Arabs have met so far in their movement of national revival, and with which they would have to deal much in the future. It is a problem which has come to take an international dimension, because of its relation with the Jewish question, and the importance of which will be greater at the end of the present conflict. In that sense it will stand, no doubt, as one of the biggest obstacles in the way of the completing^{on} of Arab Unity.

The purpose of this chapter is not to study the question of the Jewish national home from its beginning to the present day, nor to discuss the rights of the Arabs and Jews in the promised land: such questions have been so much discussed and written about that it is scarcely possible to add anything new to the subject. The aim of the thesis here is to study the possibility of Arab Unity with respect to Palestine as it stands to-day, that is by taking things as they are, and looking to the future of the problem in its relation to Arab Unity.

The Palestinian question calls from the start for a close distinction between two points of major importance:

1. whether the policy of Jewish National Home will come to an end or not.

2. whether the country will get its independence or not.

It is from these two angles that this problem will be dealt with in this chapter, and it is at the light of these two points ^{that} the relations of Arab Unity and Palestine will be analysed.

The future of Palestine depends first and foremost on the policy which will be followed in the country during the post-war period, that is, on the continuation of the "National Home policy" or the change of attitude toward the problem and the consideration of the wishes and aspirations of the majority of the population. The experiment of the last twenty years has shown that it is possible to create a Jewish national home in Palestine and to disregard the interests of the Arabs, but it ^{showed} should at the same time ~~show~~ that what has materialized of the long-cherished dream of the Jews has cost them, with the mandatory power and the inhabitants of the country, so much riots and blood-shed that it would be far more useful to think twice this time before continuing the same policy.

The beginnings of the Jewish National Home, and its development under the protection of Great Britain and the League of Nations, coincided with the first phase of the Arab national development. Arab nationalism was still in a rudimentary form, and it was almost the task of the Palestinians alone to stand in the way of the execution of that policy. But conditions have changed nowadays, and the responsibility of the

problem shifted from the shoulders of the Arab peoples of Palestine to those of all the Arab countries. Jewish immigration has taken place on a very large scale before the present conflict, and with the skill, energies and financial resources the Jews have at their disposal they threaten to convert ^{the whole country into} ~~it altogether~~ in a Jewish home, in a land which, in the words of their spokesman Weisman, should become "as Jewish as England is English". It is now the duty of all the Arabs to save what has remained of Palestine, if they do not want to see it a Jewish home land, and of that duty, they are fully conscious and aware. That is why any further continuation of the former policy would mean the opposition of all the Arabs, and the consequences which such an opposition would have would be deplorable indeed. The only condition therefore which can eliminate the real cause of past troubles and future revolts is to put an end to the policy of the Jewish national home, that is to stop immigration and land sales which are its most important foundations. As long as these questions are not settled to the satisfaction of the Arabs one should not expect peace and tranquility to reign over Palestine. On the other hand when the Arabs can look to their future with a certain security and hope, there are reasons to believe in the return of an era of understanding and cooperation for the welfare of the country.

Of equal importance than the question of the Jewish national home is the problem of the political status of the

country. Palestine has been under the British mandate ever since the end of the last war, and all the efforts made by its people to put an end to that regime have been in vain. The Balfour Declaration, which has been embodied in the documents of the mandate for Palestine, seems to have brought with it the condemnation of the country to remain for ever under foreign domination. All the Arab countries which, like Palestine, have been put under the mandate regime, have gained their independence and freedom: the Palestinian alone are to-day as they have been at the close of the last war, under the mandate regime and the direct administration of the British Government. The argument of the latter has always been that it was bound by the Balfour Declaration and that the problem of independence could not be solved while the other was binding. It is true that the problem of constitutional government is bound up with that of the establishment of the Jewish national home, but it is also true that the British Government is equally bound to give the native population self-governing institutions and independence. Should the execution of the Balfour Declaration always stand as an obstacle to the independence of the country and should the British Government continue to use it as a pretext to keep the Arab population perpetually under its rule?

The Arabs of Palestine have always claimed their right to live as an independent people, and their different revolts during the period 1920-1939 were only small manifestations of that ardent love of their freedom and independence and an

open revolt against the rule of force and injustice. Thus, just as it is not possible to solve the problem of Palestine without putting an end to the policy of Jewish national home, so it is for the question of independence: the country cannot regain permanently peace and tranquility unless the political aspirations of its people are fully realized.

To bring the application ~~of~~ the Balfour Declaration to an ^{and} end to grant the people of Palestine freedom and independence, are therefore the keynotes to any lasting peace in the Holy Land. After a long period of hesitation and doubt, of errors and submission to Zionist pressure, the British Government has at last come to evaluate the situation at its real importance and to recognise openly that the underlying causes of the anomalous situation of Palestine are completely different from those which used to inspire its policy so far. As regards immigration, it realized finally that: "if immigration is continued up to the economic absorptive capacity of the country, regardless of all other considerations, a fatal enmity between the two peoples will be perpetuated, and the situation in Palestine may become a permanent source of friction among all peoples in the Near and Middle East. His Majesty's Government cannot take the view that either their obligations under the mandate or consideration of common sense and justice require that they should ignore these circumstances in framing immigration policy." "As far as land sale is concerned, ^{is taken} the white paper from which we took the preceding statement, reads:

"The report of several expert commissions have indicated that, owing to the natural growth of Arab population, and the steady sale in recent years of Arab lands to Jews, there is now in certain areas no room for further transfers of Arab land, whilst in some other areas such transfers of land must be restricted if Arab cultivators are to maintain their existing standard of living, and a considerable landless Arab population is not seen to be created."

These are the words of the British Government itself as expressed in the Statement of Policy of May 1939, better known as the White Paper of 1939. They give ample evidence of the change of attitude of His Majesty's Government toward the question of the Jewish national home and the adoption of a realistic policy dictated by the course of events in the country itself. This change of attitude embraces the second major question, namely that of the grant of self-governing institutions and independence to the Palestinian people. Instead of stressing, as usual, the obligations of the government towards the Jews and disregarding those of the Arabs, the White Paper gives full regard to the rights of the Arabs: "His Majesty's Government is charged as the mandatory authority to secure the development of self-governing institutions in Palestine. Apart from this specific obligation, they would regard it as contrary to the whole spirit of the mandate system that the population of Palestine should remain for ever under mandatory tutelage. It is proper that the people of the

country should, as early as possible, enjoy the rights of self-government which are exercised by the people of neighbouring countries."

Thus the White Paper, which is the last statement of British Government's policy in Palestine, constitutes a definite break-up with the former policy and opens a new era of realistic outlook toward the forces at work in the country. The government's proposal envisage the creation of an independent Palestinian state in treaty relations with Great Britain at the end of a period of ten years. Five years after the restoration of peace and order, an appropriate body representative of the people of Palestine and of His Majesty's Government should be set up to make recommendations with regard to the constitution of the new state. During the transition period, Palestinians would gradually be given an increasing part in the government of their country, acting as heads of certain departments with British advisors and becoming members in this capacity of an Executive council. The powers of local government bodies would, at the same time, be increased. The land regulation indicate that there would be eventually three clearly defined areas in Palestine, Arab, Jewish and Mixed, since from the moment of publication onwards land sales would be prohibited in certain districts and restricted in others at the direction of the High Commissioner. As regards immigration, approximately 75,000 Jewish immigrants are to be admitted into Palestine during the next ^{five} ~~three~~ years of the publication of the White Paper, and included in this total would be the number of illegal immigrants who entered the country in the period. At the end of five years further Jewish

immigration would be subject to Arab consent.

Such are, in their broad lines the contents of the White Paper which constitutes the future policy of the British Government in Palestine. Without approving or rejecting them, we are going to assume that they will be applied to the letter and we are going to consider consequently the future relations of the Arab and Jews on their basis.

Is it possible to foresee a time when the relations of the two elements would be on a basis of understanding and cooperation for their mutual interest and for that of the whole country? And would it then be possible for Palestine to be included as one unit in the prospective Arab ^{State} ~~Unity~~, and to go on, just like any other unit, working whole-heartedly for the common goal and without creating any difficulty or friction?

The experiment of the last twenty years proved that such an ideal could not be reached in Palestine, and many writers and politicians drew the conclusion that the country would never enjoy the blessings of a peaceful and prosperous life as long as the Jews and Arabs are living side by side. But, judging the situation from an impartial angle, one would attribute such an interpretation to a complete misunderstanding of the actualities of the situation. There is a great deal of hatred between the two elements, there is no doubt about it, but the real motive behind it is less a hatred for the sake of hatred than a fear from the sides of the Arabs towards their future and that of the country. It is the ever increasing

danger of immigration and land sale, with the open support of the mandated power, that transformed that fear into a bitter hatred against the Jews. That hidden psychological force is the real motive behind the attitude of the Arabs towards the Jews, and it is only by removing the cause that one hopes for the effect to be removed. Once the danger of any further establishment of the Jews is removed, then the Arabs can change their attitude and even their emotions towards them. Thus the solution of the psychological aspect insures the removal of a very big factor of past troubles.

In the economic field, the cooperation of the two elements would naturally take place and grow very quickly because their material interests are so linked together that the one cannot do without the other. Such a cooperation would help to bring about soon a general reconstruction of the country.

As to the political aspect, both elements can be partially satisfied if an appropriate form of government is found for the particular conditions of Palestine. The existence of two elements in the population would not stand as an obstacle to their future development if the necessary steps are taken to prepare a cooperative and harmonious life. A unitary but decentralized form of government seems to be the right one for Palestine: Arabs and Jews would each have a complete freedom of action in the management of their own affairs.

while the matters of common concern to all sections of the population would be left in the hands of the central government. A compromise would thus be reached, whereby both would be satisfied and both would be able to go in a peaceful reconstruction, where the efforts of all would converge to the welfare and prosperity of Palestine.

Once that stage is reached, the inclusion of Palestine in Arab Unity would be a relatively easy matter. The Holy Land would be considered as one unit, entitled to the same rights and subject to the same obligations as any other unit. Difficulties and obstacles will no doubt rise, from time to time, in the way of its development, but with some foresight and statesmanship, Palestine can, in the long run, cooperate with the other member-units for both its own interest as well as that of the unity.

That is how Palestine can find a peaceful and prosperous life within the framework of Arab Unity. But that, of course, needs the realization of those basic conditions which we have mentioned already at the beginning of this chapter, namely, the cessation of the Jewish national home policy and the grant of freedom and independence to the country. Once these two conditions are fulfilled, one can safely say that there are great chances of success for the Arab Unity to live as described already.

Unhappily, the Jews are not willing to accept that basis and to cooperate along these lines. They are still obstinate in their demands for the application of the Balfour

Declaration and they openly refuse even that minimum which can offer a solution, that is the White Paper of 1939. Unlike the Arabs, who cannot do any political activity in war time, they are working day and night in pursuit of their goal of defeating the White Paper. They are carrying their activities in Palestine, England and the United States of America. These activities have been continuous, without a break, from the beginning of the war till the present day, and they will continue without any doubt till the end of the conflict. The leaders of the Zionist movement are organising periodical meetings and conferences and congresses in the different parts of England and the U.S.A. to win over public opinion in both countries and prepare for the peace conference at the end of the war. Here is an example of the speeches delivered in these activities: in the concluding session of the national conference for Palestine, held on May 13, 1943 in Philadelphia, Dr. Weizman concluded his address by the following words: "Let us refuse to be frightened out of these legitimate demands by so-called diplomatic advice to be quiet until a more opportune moment. We are told that victory is the thing, as if there were a single people which has as much to dread from defeat, or one which is prepared to make greater sacrifices for victory. We certainly do not wish to embarrass our friends, and we have many both here and in England. But we cannot stand fragmentated and reduced to a patchwork of title charitable proposals. We are too weary, our suffering is too great to be satisfied with palliatives. We want evidence

of a generous understanding and a will to action. We will not be diverted from our last and greatest hope. We do not accept the White Paper, we never shall accept it as the last word of British statesmanship or the last answer of the civilized world. Remember that there were not always White Paper governments in Palestine. Those years will return. We will hasten the return if we remember that either we shall build Palestine or we shall go under."

These are the words of the President of the World Zionist Organisation and of the man who has always been the spokesman of the Jewish people both in Palestine and abroad. They clearly define the attitude of the Jews toward the problem and their intentions about it. That means that the Arabs should not expect under any circumstances to have the Jews come to reason by themselves or to accept of their own accord to put an end to their ambitions in Palestine. The only other alternative is for the British Government itself to coerce them and to enforce its proposals in spite of their opposition.

If the British Government fails to succeed in this matter and if it chooses once more to alter its proposed policy under Zionist pressure, as it did in 1930 and 1935, then it would be the lot of the Arabs, both in Palestine and the rest of the Arab World to take the problem in their own hand and to act accordingly.

It is high time for the Zionists to realize that Palestine does not solve their problem. There has been and there is still a great deal of persecution of the Jews, and their tragedy is a world tragedy indeed. There is a certain responsibility, a heavy responsibility even, laid upon human conscience and upon the civilized world to come to the rescue of the persecuted Jew, and the Arabs are quite conscious of that fact. But Palestine is not and cannot be the land of salvation. There are still plenty of uninhabited lands on the surface of the globe. Africa, Australia and America offer vast opportunities for Jewish settlement and welcome the wonderful constructive abilities of this people. Nobody would stand in the way of their endeavours and nobody would suffer from their presence in those lands.

Palestine does not offer any prospect or even any hope for the salvation of the Jews. It is a country which has its people, and a people who know how to defend their sacred land. It is in the interest of the Jews, more than that of any other people, to begin building cordial relations with the Arabs before it would be too late, and before the sentiments of the Arabs would have had time to crystalize into a permanent and even increasing enmity. By persisting on the execution of their ambitions in Palestine, the Jews risk to endanger the safety of what they have already achieved of their dream of national home, and would give birth to more suffering and misery than those which they themselves have seen in the worst days of their persecution.

The defense of Palestine is no more the lot of the Palestinians alone; it is now the sacred duty of every single Arab individual. If the Jews do not put an end to their ambitions and if the British Government does not enforce its decisions and free itself from Zionist pressure, then all we can see is a dark future for this part of the world; a future full of troubles and unrest, of riots and revolts, a struggle for existence where human life would be generously offered for sacrifice in the defense of a noble cause and in an open revolt against the reign of force and injustice.

C O N C L U S I O N

The problem of Arab Unity has been discussed in the preceding pages in its main aspects, and the obstacles to its realization have been analysed and evaluated as much as possible. A last point deserves a careful consideration before this study comes to a close: should Independence or Unity come first? Should the Arab countries set on the task of the realization of the unity right now, or should they postpone these efforts till they get and consolidate their independence? And if Unity is to come first, what are the ways and means to follow in order to put into execution this long-cherished desire?

To get and consolidate the independence of each country is no doubt very important both for the peoples of these countries as well as for the Unity itself. When the member-units of the confederation are completely independent from the foreigner, the confederation itself would have a greater power and the Arab State which would come out of it in the future, would be very strong. Further ^{if} the internal problems of each country are not settled before it joins any unity, the country would become a constant source of trouble and worry for the other members of the unity, and would itself be hampered in its work of internal stability and the consolidation of the independence. But to put aside the question of Arab unity for the time being, and concentrate one's efforts on the question of independence would offer to the already existing obstacles the time and opportunity to develop into permanent ones; and thus what seems possible in the present time might become very difficult to achieve in the

future. Another point to be considered is that it will take a long time before Arab Unity can acquire the elements of stability which would enable it to stand firm against any possible dangers in the future, and the element of time is of primary importance in the acquisition of these elements. For these and other similar considerations, it is necessary to start Arab Unity right now and to form the confederation as soon as possible. The loose ties of this form of Unity offer the necessary compromise to reap out its benefits and to remove the risks of its weakness.

What are now the ways and means which help to make out of it a living reality?

A voluntary union of the Arab countries is, to be sure, the best way of realizing that desire. Most of the countries which are going to participate in the unity enjoy a large share of independence and have popular governments in power. Since the will and preparedness to be part of a larger unity is common to all, there is no reason why these governments should not appoint each, a committee to meet together and study the problems arising from their union into a confederation. This act would have a great chance of success because it would prepare the conditions of the unity for the coming Peace-Conference and would give it a beginning of life. Since the settlement of the Post-War World would have to be made on firm and lasting foundations, and since it will have to deal not only with the European affairs but also with those of any other part of the world, the problem of Arab Unity will no doubt receive the approval and recognition of all the powers concerned. This is most probably the basis upon which

the Arab governments are negotiating the problem of unity under the direction and initiative of the Egyptian government. It is hoped that these consultations, which will be followed by an Arab Conference to be held in Cairo, will result in the Near future in the formation of the confederation so much awaited.

A last word should be said in conclusion. The realization of Arab Unity is not an easy undertaking. It will prove to be far more difficult than one thing^s, and even when it is accomplished, we shall have to face difficulties and hard trials which may be greater than those of unity itself. But one should always have in mind that the building of a nation is not an easy matter, and that years and years may pass before everything would take its lasting shape. That should in no way weaken our faith in the success of our cause nor decrease our energies in its realization.

It is perhaps useful to remind the reader that it took more than a hundred and fifty years and the waging of several wars before the U.S.A. reached a national unity and cohesion, and that is only one example among many others covering the history of most federal states. Would it be astonishing to see the Arab Federation find difficulties and obstacles in its preliminary stage and go through hard trials in its period of reconstruction?

Tawfic Hineidi.

B I B L I O G R A P H Y

1. Carlton G. Hayes: Essays on Nationalism.
New York, the Mac Millan Company, 1926.
2. E. Barker: National Character, and the factors in its formation. London, Methuen 1927.
3. B. Joseph: Nationality: Its nature and Problems.
London: G. Allen & Unwin Ltd. 1929.
4. Buell: International Relations.
New York, Henry Holt and Co. 1925.
5. W. Hooking: Spirit of World Politics.
New York, the Mac Millan Company, 1932.
6. W. Willoughby: The Fundamental Concepts of Public Law.
New York, the Mac Millan Co. 1931.
7. G. Antonius: The Arab Awakening.
Hamish Hamilton, 90 Gt. Russel St. , London 1938.
8. Arnold J: Toynbee: Survey of International Affairs 1925,
Vol. I, Oxford University Press - London 1927.
9. Eugene Jung: La révolte Arabe.
Paris 1924.
10. Mme Berthe B. Gaulis: La question Arabe.
Editions Berger, Paris 1919.
11. H. S. Bustani: Liban d'abord.
Imprimerie Angellil, Beyrouth 1924.
12. E. Rabbath: Unité Syrienne et devenir Arabe.
Librairie Marcel Rivière & Co. Paris 1937.
13. B. Akzin and A. Rihani: Pan-Arab Nationalism, is it a myth
or a reality. Asia, August 1939.
14. A. Viton: Can the Arab peoples unite?
Asia December 1941.
15. A. Hart: Introduction to the study of Federal Governments
Gim & Co., Boston, U.S.A.
16. W. Wilson: Constitutional Government in the U.S.A.
Columbia University Press, New York.
17. J. A. Howgood: Modern Constitutions since 1787.
Mac Millan and Co. Ltd. London 1939.

Bibliography (Contd)

18. Carnegie Endowment for International Peace: The declaration of independence, the articles of confederation, the constitution of the U.S.A.
Oxford University Press. New York, 1917.
19. G. Strong: Modern Political Constitutions.
London, Sidgwick 1930.
20. A. Hamilton: The Federalist.
London, Dent and Sons Ltd., New York, Dutton & Co.
21. Rappard, Harper, Gooch, Schneider, Sharp and Pollock: Source Book on European Governments.
D. Van Nostrand Co. Inc. N.Y. 1937.
22. Max H. Boehm: Federalism
Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences. Vol. VI, p. 169-172.
23. A. W. MacMahon: Federation
E.S.S. Vol. VI. p. 172-177.
24. Royal Institute of International Affairs: Great Britain and Palestine, 1915-1939. London 1939.
25. The Balfour Declaration: An Analysis
Published by the paper "Falastin" Jaffa.
26. Arab Higher Committee: A memorandum submitted to the Royal Commission. Modern Press, Jerusalem, 1943
27. J.M. Jeffries: Palestine the Reality.
Longmans London 1939.
28. W.F. Bustani: The Palestine Mandate Invalid and Impracticable.
American Press, Beirut 1936.
29. J.L. Magnes: Like all nations
30. N. Bentwich: England in Palestine
Kegour Paul & Co. Ltd. London 1932.
31. H. L. Weisman: Future of Palestine, and examination of the partition plan. New York, Lincoln 1935.
32. G.B. Philby: The Arabs and the future of Palestine.
Foreign Affairs October 1957.
33. R.G. Woolbert: Pan-Arabism and the Palestine Problem.
Foreign Affairs, January 1958.

To this list of sources should be added the numerous articles and comments which appeared in the local papers on the problem of Arab Unity and a number of interviews made by the writer with some of the eminent personalities of the country.