Inter-Communal Conflicts in Palestine Between 1917 And 1948: Zionism Versus Arabism

[1]kulpunai Barakanova

[1]MasterDegreeStudent at Middle East Studies/ Sakarya University, Turkey
Corresponding Author: 1kulpunai Barakanova

ABSTRACT: *This paper is dedicated to the conflictual situation in Palestine between 1917 and 1948 years. It's supposed that human agency-led causes as exclusive nature of Zionism and internally fragmented Arab nationalism had triggered a myriad of internal conflicts in Palestine. A bulk of academic works have been written on this theme, however, this paper unlike others' focuses much on nationalism as one of the pivotal reasons of multiple clashes and as the main impetus for the creation of Israel. Additionally, the contribution of foreign states in conflict and formation of Israel also has been mentioned throughout the paper. In regards with the theoretical framework, Stephen Van Evera hypotheses on nationalism and war correlation have been utilized. The nature of nationalist ideology and structural causes are emphasized to explain relations between nationalism and war. Conclusion completes the work with precise results of the research and emphasizes the grave nationalism hazards for heterogeneous nations within a state.*
KEYWORDS - *Palestine, Zionism, Arabism, War, Stephen van Evera, inter-communal conflicts*

I. Introduction

The First Arab-Israeli conflict had appeared in the wave of growing tension between thriving Zionism and fragile Arabism since 1917. All the violence that took the start at the 1880s and has continued till today has to do with ruthless idea of nationalism that has exalted a nation-state beyond the human lives causing thousands of casualties and hostility between ordinary human beings. The importance of carrying out research regarding the early Arab-Israeli conflict is paramount to unravel today's plight of Palestine. Knowledge about the political history of both Palestine and Israel could prevent people to trust to the widespread myths regarding the conflict. Secondly, awareness of the roots of the conflict might help to reach a reasonable and/or beneficial solution to this continuing conflict. Third, this conflict had influenced the fate of the whole Middle East. A significant number of innocent people till today are forced to seek "safe haven" as refugees, many were killed, massacred, raped, tortured and many still suffering from famine, discrimination, alienation, marginalization, and segregation on the basis of national identity and sectarian politics. Most of these human catastrophes could be considered as a result of unsuccessful nationalist politics in the Middle East led both by Arabs and Jews.

Given paper aims to analyze a character of Arabism and Zionism as types of nationalism and seeks to advocate excessive elements in them. Moreover, the paper examines Stephan Van Evera nationalism and war hypotheses on intra-state conflict. There are three hypotheses on remote causes and four on immediate causes of conflicts based on nationalism. The first part of the article is devoted to nationalism characteristics. The second part examines hypotheses on remote and immediate causes of the conflict. Conclusion summarizes all findings. The introduction of the paper should explain the nature of the problem, previous work, purpose, and the contribution of the paper. The contents of each section may be provided to understand easily about the paper.

II. Characteristics Of Zionism And Arabism

In order to test Stephen Van Evera hypotheses on nationalism and war, basic features of Zionism and Arabism needed to be identified. For these end characteristics of nationalism that have been determined in Van Evera*Nations and War*, is going to be examined. First of all it examines "if national statehood is attained or unattained?". It's worth to note that stateless type of nationalism is hazardous in a question of war and peace. Commonly spread strives for freedom could trigger a war and hurt the interest of other communities for example by causing a great number of refugees. So that refugees acquire resentment feeling this might transform into a greater and durable hatred. Precisely, such scenario happened in case of the Palestinian issue. Having not a state as well as having too many states is a problem due to both of situations could lead to a war/conflict. To have equal rights and to be secure of persecution Theodor Herzl came to the conclusion that "Jewish question" could be solved solely by establishing the Jewish state (Herzl, The Jewish State, 1989). Starting with peaceful settlements in 1881 it has been completed with the durable and harsh Arab-Israeli inter-communal conflict and

the major war of 1948. On the one hand, the problem had to do with secular Zionists migrants who were ideologically motivated to establish a state within the state. On the other hand, adamant nature of Arabism also presented a great problematic issue and generated tragic consequences. Arab leaders' objection of 1922 and 1939 White Papers was vital for the fate of Palestine as well. The Arab Gulf countries' leaders opposed both British and Zionist plans in Palestine (Zahlan, 2009).

As for Arabism it is also a part of the problem of Palestine. Palestine under Ottoman state used to be a district not a separate province in Iraq, Syria or Lebanon. Three latter nevertheless had achieved an independent statehood. As for Palestine, it stayed for a long time as a British mandate. It seems that British were not clear in their plans regarding the future of Palestine. It was partly due to Balfour Declaration of 1917 that gives the word to Jews to establish a national home in Palestine without hurting Palestinians rights that were living there (Trueman, 2016). Another important occasion was a correspondence between Sharif Husain, the governor of Mecca and Medina and McMahon, British commissioner in Egypt. In the wave of this correspondence Arab revolt was declared against Ottoman state in 1916. Sharif Husain expected British would implement given word to him to empower him to rule over Arab kingdom which was Saudi Arabia, Iraq, Syria, Lebanon and Transjordan and Palestine in his understanding. However, history went in another way so that in result of San Remo Conference Iraq, east and west sides of Jordan River were referred to British mandate whereas Syria and Lebanon to French mandate. Finally, Sharif Husain received control over Saudi Arabia and his two sons Feisal and Abdullah were appointed as kings in Syria (later in Iraq) and Transjordan, respectively (Lost Islamic History). Since 1921 Palestine had been referred as a mandate of Britain according to the League of Nations article 22. The first part of article states following:

"Certain communities formerly belonging to the Turkish Empire have reached a stage of development where their existence as independent nations can be provisionally recognized subject to the rendering of administrative advice and assistance by a Mandatory until such time as they are able to stand alone. The wishes of these communities must be a principal consideration in the selection of the Mandatory…"(The Covenant of the League of Nations)

From the text, it's obvious that Britain being a mandatory state was responsible for bringing Palestine as well as other post-Ottoman territories in the Middle East to the point of self-governance. However, from practice, it's apparent that Britain was far from such idealist purposes and instead of that Britain was busy with how to set Jewish state in Palestine. Hence, British pre-mandatory "agreements" with Zionist and Sharif Husain had a great impact on further clashes and formation of political and inter-communal stalemate in Palestine by 1948.

To sum up, the obviously Zionist movement hadn't got statehood but was eager to acquire it in Palestine (gradual and systematic migration waves confirms that). As for Arabism particularly Palestinian nationalism we see weak incomplete local establishments under tight British control. Speaking of other Arab countries such as Egypt, Iraq, Syria, and Jordan they had acquired their independence before 1948 but despite this fact, these countries were in pursuit of grabbing land for themselves as 1948 war later indicated it (W.Burton & M. Cleveland, 2009). Hence, the initial problem was with eagerness to attain statehood by stateless Zionism and incomplete statehood of Palestinians.

The second characteristic is about whether nationalist movement cares of a total or partial national unity and if it does care of unity is a way of unification of dispersed members? Is it expansionist or "immigrationst"? Talking about Zionism it seeks a unity of diaspora due to its' stateless condition. Migrants from all corners of the world still migrate to Palestine. In regards to the way of unification it took place by mass migration, waves called aliyah (Itamar Rabinovich, 2008). Jews used to annex Palestine territories but the majority of people who lived there were Palestinian Arabs (G.Kramer, 2008). This created a big problem to Zionist Jews.

Having explored Arabism in Palestine we can come to the conclusion that Arabs have lived in Palestine for centuries so that Palestine land was deemed as their own. Also, major ethnicity in Palestine was Arabs. Thus, Palestinian Arabs hadn't got such a problem as the national unification of diaspora in Palestine; rather they wanted independent Arab state in Palestine (Fromkin, 2001).

The third feature tests the position of Zionism and Arabism towards other independent nations/communities and if they are tolerant or "hegemonic". Tolerant treatment implies a respect to other nations and hegemonic treatment means "a right/duty to rule over others" (Evera, 2001). According to Theodor Herzl diary in his writing of 12 June 1895 it is said:

"When we occupy the land, we shall bring immediate benefits to the state that receives us. We must expropriate gently the private property on the estates assigned to us. We shall try to spirit the penniless population across the border by producing employment for it in the transit countries while denying it any employment in our own country" (Herzl, Jodenhaat).

As it is apparent from Herzl's diary writing Zionists on the onset of migration in Palestine denied Arabs' right to live within the land acquired by Zionist Jews. However, Herzl's gently calls for "spirit Palestinians across the border" were ended with the myriad of massacres and bloodsheds (Garaudy, 2000).

The prominent facts regarding aggressiveness of Zionists towards other communities such as Palestinian and to some extent British had been uncovered by anti-Arab and anti-British terrorist movements' actions (Hagana, Irgun, Stern Gang or Lehi, Bar Giora are the main of them) (W.Burton & M. Cleveland, 2009). Irgun was known by the killing of British personnel in 1944. Indeed, such revisionist Zionist groups had labeled as an "enemy" anyone who was against Jews and "enemies" seemed as an obstacle to establishing a Jewish state in Palestine. Another terrorist group was Stern Gang (Lehi) it had assassinated British minister of state for the Middle East, Lord Moyne. Hagana during 1948 war was accepted officially as Israeli military force by the Zionist establishment (W.Burton & M. Cleveland, 2009). As for Bar Giora Zionist movement, it had a motto that was: "In blood and fire Judea fell in blood and fire Judea will arise". Another supporting fact is that Jewish landowners and employers indicated a great allegiance to Jewish labor initiative and Zionism so that they discriminated and/or marginalized Arabs by do not take them as labors (G.Kramer, 2008).

Empirical analyses of Herzl's diplomatic efforts indicate that Zionism being a nationalist entity treats other nations in a pragmatic way. All in all, Herzl used to say that Jews couldn't be compatible with any nation due to constant possibility of persecution by non-Jews. He attempted to turn Jewish enemies to friends via skillful diplomacy. This implies Zionists treated other nations in pragmatic style negotiating and cooperating when the situation requires this and vice versa by fighting when plight requires this. Close relations and collaboration with Britain at the beginning and constant attacks on British personnel in 1944 by militant Zionist's bright examples of flexibility and pragmatism of Zionist ideology in regard to "non-Jewish" nations (W.Burton & M. Cleveland, 2009). Its worthy to point out Zionists didn't damage rights of other nations in Europe but vice versa Europeans did. Arab-Jewish relations were reciprocally negative due to the mutually opposing goals.

To sum up, Jews had lived under pressure due to the isolation of Jews in Europe from the social life and constant persecution. With the advent of Zionism Zionist Jews embarked on migration to Palestine where the indigenous population was primarily Arabs. Zionists attitude towards Arabs particularly in Palestine indicates «hegemonic» rather than "tolerant" position.

Having analyzed a background of Arab nationalism particularly Palestinian nationalism and how it was appeared it becomes obvious that

"The Arabs, like their Turkish rulers, disliked foreigners. Aliens embodied the threat of Great Power penetration, a foreign culture, and a hostile religion. They were envious of the rights by Europeans by virtue of the Capitulations, and both Muslims and Christians, nurtured on the Koran and the New Testament, respectively, were predisposed against Jews. The Christians, a drop in the Muslim ocean, emphasized their anti-Zionism as a way of highlighting their common Arabism" (Morris, 2001).

Gradually Arabism in Palestine had come up as a response to the rising of Jewish illegal settlements in Palestine. Previously Arabs were in relatively peaceful conditions with local Jews under the Ottoman state's millet system (Öztürk, 2014). There were different initiatives against Zionists in Palestine to protect them and to cease systematic land redemption. Arabs rose up a statement of "sacred trust" regarding Palestine and that Palestine is of Muslims in the 1930s. As a reply to disregard by Jewish for Arabs' call to stop migrations and land acquirements, Arabs embarked on attacking Jews (G.Kramer, 2008).

Moreover, it is of utmost importance to mention the prominent phrase by Israeli statesman Moshe Dayan who was a known general and minister of foreign affairs in Israel. He asserted: "It is not true that the Arabs hate the Jews for personal, religious, or racial reasons. They consider us-justly, from their point of view-as westerners, foreigners, invaders who have seized an Arab country to turn it into a Jewish state" (Walz, 1977). Moshe Dayan's words also indicate that Arabs' hatred against Jews started to thrive as Zionist embarked on invasion the Palestinians' land so that Palestinians perceived them as other western colonizers. As it was mentioned before diverse communities curbed to live side by side thanks to millet system so that there wasn't the systemic hatred and actions against Jews in Ottoman history. The newcomers were different from those of local Jews (G.Kramer, 2008).

As soon as Young Turks openly had embarked on Turkish nationalism propaganda Arabs in the Middle East also started to search a way to establish an independent Arab unity including Palestine. The First Arab National Congress took place in 1913 in Paris. In 1914 Arab National Manifesto was arranged and called all Arab people to unite in front of enemy's face and do not be divided among themselves (Scott-Baumann, 2007). At the same time, Britain, in order to preserve oil supply from Persia, was anxious about Turks that were in alliance with Germany at the onset of World War I. Such priority as oil pushed Britain to cooperate with Arabs against Turkey. In the wave of Hussein Sharif of Mecca and Sir Henry McMahon correspondence, an anti-Turkish uprising took place. It is known that Hussein Sharif agreed with Britain for exchange Arabs' independence. This is a fragment from mentioned correspondence: "Great Britain is prepared to recognize and support the independence of the Arabs. When the situation allows, Great Britain will assist the Arabs to establish what may appear to be the most suitable forms of government in those various territories" (Scott-Baumann, 2007). However, due to the implicitness of promised area to Arabs, it's difficult to answer the question which places were aimed in correspondence (Bard, 2012).

Dramatic unfolding in Palestine accompanied with Jewish migrants' rise was associated with frequent clashes between Arabs and Jews. So that in 1918-1919 Muslim-Christian Association was set against the uncontrolled influx of Jews from all over the world. The focal event had happened in Jaffa that used to be the main port for migrants to come to Palestine; Arabs had attacked a number of Jews. As a result, 200 Jews and 120 Arabs were killed. It had happened after White Papers led by Winston Churchill had appeared (Morris, 2001). In regard to other nations, Arab Palestinians were in close relations with Kuwait, Syria, Iraq, and Saudi Arabia governments. As other Arab countries, Palestinian Arabs were against any colonizer power in Palestine.

The fourth characteristic is about the level of respect towards minority groups and their rights that are within a state. In order to answer a question how Palestinian Arabs treat and look at minority groups in Palestine, it is of utmost importance to have a look at Palestine within Ottoman Empire. Such research and its conclusion might be much sound due to the fact that Arabs attitude towards Jewish minority worsened under the pressure of migration and systematic labor politics and land redemptions in Palestine in pursuit of statehood by Zionist Jews in Palestine. Another focal point here is that Palestine didn't acquire the full state status at that time but was a mandate which future was being debated. Thus, during British mandate over Palestine, the issue of the attitude of Arabs towards minority groups couldn't be applied. However, its worth to point out here that Arabs had a tolerate relations towards local Jews and Christians rather than to British and Zionist Jews from Europe.

In regards with Ottoman Empire and Palestine territory the Arabic term *arazi-i muqaddese* meaning "holy land" had been utilized for Palestine. Administratively Palestine was not a separate province rather it was a part of Syrian province, Syria encompassed modern Syria, Lebanon, Jordan and Palestine (Muslih, 1988). As a result, present-day Palestine was referred to Southern Syria that was a great province in Ottoman Empire and was referred by a number of scholars as *bilad al-sham* (G.Kramer, 2008). It is worth to note that Palestine was divided into two large provinces in 1864 by *Wilayet* Law. According to that Law Palestine was divided into so-called *Panaji* (districts): Jerusalem *sanjak* in the south that included Jerusalem, Jaffa, Gaza, Hebron, Bir al-Sab' and al-Hafir. Since 1887 Jerusalem *sanjaq* gave account directly to Istanbul due to religious significance. In the northern part of Palestine, Acre *sanjaq* was set. This *sanjaq* comprised of Acre, Haifa, Tiberias, Safad, Marj Ibn 'Amir. A central part of Palestine was within Damascus *wilaya*. Al-Balqa *sanjaq* made up of Nablus, Jenin and Tulkarm was within Beirut *wilaya*. Hence, modern Palestine was separated between different *wilayat* (Muslih, 1988).

Taking into account such administrative conditions it's rational to do research on Palestinian Arabs' attitude toward non-Arab minority groups through Ottoman Empire's civil social affairs that had been practiced all over the empire including Palestine.

Regarding politics and attitude towards minority community, there was a *millet* system that empowered major religious communities with a separate representative and administration. Muslims, Christians, and Jewish had lived in totally separate or in intermixed districts all over the Ottoman Empire (Quataert, 2005). Non-Muslim communities used to pay an exemption tax for Ottoman Empire's protection of their lives. It is known that women, children and elderly were free of jiziya, a form of tax for people from other religion paid for their protection by the Ottoman Empire. Men from these communities were not obliged to serve in the army but could also. Such communities were delegated by their religious leaders obedient to Istanbul governance. Representatives of diverse religions could freely practice their spiritual rituals due to the no interference from central administration. It is fair to state that such organization of social life of various groups in Ottoman Empire had guaranteed a relative harmony between religions and people and saved them from interreligious or interethnic massacres that took place more frequently at that period of time in Europe. However, with an advent of westernization politics in Ottoman Empire millet system was canceled. In 1939 Tanzimat Declaration that guaranteed equal rights and obligations towards law was accepted. In order to satisfy and please Britain, France and Russia that were eager to liberalize East European nations, Ottoman Empire admitted Islahat Declaration in 1956 (Öztürk, 2014). This declaration empowered non-Muslims more than Turkish civilians in sense of rights. For instance, instead of army services, other nations could pay tax and they could be a parliament member. Foreigners' right for estate acquisition was revised as well. Hence in such a way, Western countries were able to interfere with the Ottoman internal regulations (Hakkinda Bilgi). Finally, in 1876 with an adoption of Constitution Ottoman Empire took direction on establishment nation-state and secularism standards thanks to French Revolutions and its consequences that intensified nationalist mood in Europe (Öztürk, 2014). After all these fateful occasions in 1908, the first coup in the Middle East took place when Young Turks frankly asserted about the superiority of Turkish identity so that nationalist trend embarked on spreading all over the Middle East (Muslih, 1988). The final fall of Ottoman Empire left Arabs fortune to British and French. The fate of Palestinian Arabs remained in the worst state. The previous practice of harmony within intermingled society had been lost and instead of that, a number of "interethnic" conflicts emerged particularly in Palestine.

III. Examination Of Stephen Van Evera Hypotheses On Immediate And Remote Causes

To analyze Arab-Israeli conflict Stephen Van Evera conflict approach has been deployed to explicate immediate and remote causes of multiple conflicts. Such approach is deemed to be the most appropriate to investigate a numerous and small scaled clashes and struggle between Arabs and Zionist Jews since 1917 till 1948 when Palestine was under British mandate. The peculiarity of this conflict is in the absence of established state within the Palestine territory and a suspense regarding the Palestine's fate. In one word, British had an intention to set "Jewish national home" in Palestine however, they had underestimated and/or neglected the presence of non-Jewish people there. In 1918 Muslims estimated in 618 000 people presenting the major community in Palestine. As for Christians and Jews, they were around 70 000 and 59 000 people relatively in 1918 presenting minority communities (Morris, 2001).

Remote (underlying) causes are those that create fertile ground for immediate causes for a number of inter-communal conflicts between Arabs and Zionist Jews. The remote causes are based on the structural, political-environmental and perceptual factors. As for the immediate causes, they are causes that lead to the conflict. re are four essential causes for conflict inside a state. However, despite the fact, Palestine hadn't got statehood it was some kind of political entity under the British rule. Hence, Britain had played a role of the central state that is responsible for the inner affairs particularly between different ethnic and religious groups in Palestine.

The hypotheses on immediate causes are following: 1. "The greater the proportion of state-seeking nationalities that are stateless, the greater the risk of war (conflict)", 2. "The more state seeking nationalities pursue the recovery of national diasporas, the more they pursue annexationist strategies of recovery and consequently the greater the risk of war", 3. "The more "hegemonic" are goals the greater the risk of war", 4. "The more severe is oppression of minorities living in a heterogeneous state, the greater the risk of war" (Evera, 2001).

Having analyzed all these four hypotheses regarding immediate causes of internal conflicts the second and third hypotheses are assessed as ideally suited for Arab-Israeli conflict. The second hypothesis asserts that more nationalities are eager to gather diaspora the more they pursue expansionist methods and the risk of conflict is greater. This assumption more fits Zionist Jews who were greatly motivated ideologically to achieve the establishment of "Jewish national home" in the territory of Palestine. Theodor Herzl being an architect of such nation-state idea states that "the Jews wish for the state-they shall have it and they shall earn it for themselves" (Herzl, The Jewish State, 1989). In his diary, on 12 June 1895 Herzl "teaches" the major method to occupy land and how to expel Palestinian Arabs from their homes in "benign way". As it should be expected military branch of Zionists such as Irgun, Hagana, Stern and many others embarked on "terrorist" actions killing people deliberately to acquire livable places. For instance, while Ben-Gurion, the first Israeli president apologized toward King Abdullah of Jordan because of the Deir Yassin massacre, Menahem Begin being the leader of terrorist organization Irgun firmly defended the necessity of this bloodshed. Deir Yassin massacre had happened on 9 April 1948 in Palestinian settlement called Deir Yassin. Zionist extremist forces had annihilated the settlement with Palestinians just after British withdrawal from Palestine. Irgun chief asserted that Deir Yassin was very important for setting up Israeli state so that he said that if there wasn't a victory over Deir Yassin there wouldn't be Israeli state (Garaudy, 2000).

The third hypothesis claims that "the more «hegemonic» goals the greater a risk of conflict". This hypothesis exactly suits to Arab-Israeli case due to the adamant ideological and political ideals in both sides. At the start of Jewish migration to Palestine and with the onset of the early clashes between two sides Zionists despite British prohibitions and limitations didn't stop to flow in Palestine. In the case of Arabs, their leaders and elites had rejected a number of political plans to establish autonomy or federation or double-national state in Palestine. Both sides deployed all efforts to prevent the establishment of nor Jewish neither Arab state within Palestine. Arabs were not prone to any decision proposed by Britain for their absolute rejection of Belfour declaration. In other words, Balfour Declaration was a major obstacle for Arabs to embark on constructive negotiations. Surprisingly Zionist Jews had accepted White Papers (W.Burton & M. Cleveland, 2009). At this point, it is worth to mention that Palestinian imam Amin Hajj Al- Hussayni even negotiated to Hitler to prevent the influx of Jews and set of "Jewish national home" in Palestine (United States Holocaust Memorial Museum). Herzl used to motivate Zionist Jews to expel Arabs from their homes and help them to transit to the neighbor countries (Herzl, Jodenhaat). Following such policy, both sides encounter great "unresolvable" hostility and harsh struggle for the nation-state. To sum up, empirical analysis indicates that both Palestinian Arabs and Zionist Jews possessed «hegemonic» national goals.

To sum up, two factors such as the growth of expansionist strategies by Zionists in Palestine and "hegemonic" nature of Arab nationalism and Zionism inevitably led to frequent conflicts and finally to 1948 the first Arab-Israeli War.

IV. Hypotheses On Remote Causes

In regard to remote factors, there are structural, political/environmental and perceptual conditions. In case of the structural factors, they are embedded in demographic, geographic, security conditions within political unit/state. There are three pivotal assumptions in regard to structural conditions that could constitute a ground for conflict on the basis of nationalism. The first one sounds like "stateless nationalism poses a greater risk of war if it has the strength to reach for freedom and if central state able to resist attempts of stateless nationalism to achieve freedom". Given hypothesis is relevant for both Zionism and Arab nationalism in Palestine due to fact that both of them were struggling for an independent state.

First, looking at Zionists a sound plan called "Jewish state" since 1896 that was elaborated by "father of Zionism" by Theodor Herzl. It was a strong ideological motivational tool that targeted a creation of Jewish state in Palestine. Hence it is could be argued that Zionist movement in Palestine indeed had a potent financial, diplomatic and ideological capability to establish a sovereign state in Palestine. As for Great Britain that possessed mandate authority in Palestine at that time, between 1917 and 1921 she didn't oppose vice versa was strongly for "Jewish national home" in Palestine. However, after dramatic interethnic bloody events in 1921 such as bloodshed in Haifa port in the result of clashes between Arabs and Zionist Jews British took the decision to introduce White Paper plan in 1922. Given White Paper aimed to appease Arabs and balance between two ethnic groups in Palestine: Arabs and Jews. Winston Churchill issued White Paper that guarantees equal "religious and cultural" rights to all population in Palestine. Moreover, it had asserted inclusion of Arabs in governance together with British and Jews. Most importantly Jews had British support and word in form of Balfour Declaration accepted in 1917. However, despite a great effort by Britain to placate Arabs and promote a diverse version of future for Palestinian like autonomy within Israel, the situation around become chaotic soBritain since 1930s embarked on advocating the idea of "double obligation" that would provide equal rights either for Arabs and Jews in Palestine. Such unfolding frustrated Jews so that aggressive actions against Britain had been taken in Palestine since 1930s in form of aggression by revisionist Zionists like Irgun (Scott-Baumann, 2007).

As for Arabs in Palestine, a blurred promise by Britain to Sharif Hussein in 1916 in the wave of prominent correspondence between him and British High commissioner of Egypt sir Henry McMahon and Balfour Declaration had played some crucial role in determining Palestinian Arabs fate (Fromkin, 2001). Such short-sighted plan by British as setting up of a Jewish state in Palestine where more than 600 000 Arabs had lived for a centuries is to be critiqued. Arabs' reaction was quite natural because any inquiry had been conducted concerning Arabs opinion about this plan. In one word Arabs had to obey and join in a Jewish state. Left aside Arabs embarked on demanding a sovereign state in Palestine solely to Arabs due to Jews were determined to establish the state in that land that "was lost in a far past". Any proposal couldn't placate Arabs to cooperate with Jews whereas Jews in some cases were eager to cooperate with Arabs. Another important question is whether Arabs had the capacity to establish a state. As for British, they hadn't got a plan to establish an Arab state in Palestine till 1947 and resisted Arabs (G.Kramer, 2008). Hence, nationalism that already had attained statehood or not capable to attain it is deemed to be dormant.

The second hypothesis states that if diverse ethnics are intermingled then a conflict risk is greater. Looking at a map of Palestine between 1920 and 1948 it becomes visible that Jews settlements were dispersed in Palestinian areas. Jews settlements were not compact (See Appendix 3). Due to such mixed settlements clashes happened so frequently and brought about great causalities (Map of Jewish Settlements In Palestine In 1947 - Palestine Maps).

The third assumption regarding borders' defensibility, international legitimacy of national borders and degree of correspondence of political and ethnic borders play a great role in questions of peace and war. For the first time, internationally recognized borders between Palestine and Israel was set in 1947 by the UN Partition Plan. Despite the fact of international recognition of this plan Arab side didn't recognize that whereas Jewish side did (Ma'oz, 2002).

With relate of borders correspondence to ethnic borders, 1947 UN partition plan somehow underestimated the possibility of chaos that indeed took place in Palestine just after recognition of UN partition plan by a majority of the international community in 1947. According to Cleveland& Burton's *History of Modern Middle East*in regard to the partition and borders issue is stated following:

"In the months between the announcement and the final British withdrawal, Palestine was plunged into chaos. This was the period of inter-communal war during which the Jewish forces sought to secure the territory allotted to the Jewish state in the UN resolution. Since most of that territory was still inhabited by an Arab majority, there was quite naturally Arab resistance. However, the scattered Arab bands were no match for the disciplined Haganah forces, and by spring 1948 the major centers of Arab population that fell within the proposed Jewish state were in Jewish control and the Arab inhabitants, about 400,000 Palestinians, had fled…" (Telushkin, 1991)

According to the partition plan, 55% of Palestinian land was to be referred to Israel whereas left part that is 45% of Palestine remained to Palestinian Arabs (Fincham, 2015). Such sudden geopolitical shift in Palestine could be explained by several unfolding in the world and in the Middle East. With the intensification of genocide against Jews in Germany since World War II, Jewish influx into Palestine increased dramatically. Zionist Jews achieved firm support from American Jewish community and the bright example of such bilateral rapprochement became 1942 Biltmore Program that frankly advocated further migration of Jews in Palestine and an establishment Jewish commonwealth in Palestine (Morris, 2001). Another pivotal fact was that Britain abstained from voting for 1947 Partition Plan, such attitude could be explicated by the loss of "double obligation" balance in Palestine and fear to loose Arab oil-producing allies (G.Kramer, 2008). The third focal point was an inflexibility of Arab leaders such as Al-Husaini who had a strong allegiance to Arab states that were pro Pan-Arabism (Ma'oz, 2002). As a result just after the announcement and recognition of partition plan by UN Palestine turned into chaos. Because Arabs were so against the plan and Jewish with all strength were so eager to build a Jewish state in given area the war became inescapable (Fincham, 2015).

The second underlying condition for conflict is presented by political/environmental factors. There are two primary presumptions: "the greater past crimes between diverse nationalities the greater is a risk of war" and "the more severe are oppressions on minorities the greater is a risk of war". With related to the first presumption mass murders, both land theft and expulsions are deemed to be the trigger of future conflicts (Evera, 2001). The great bloodsheds are the consequence of a number of shallow grievances that had been gained on both sides since the 1880s. Among the first reasons of hostility between Arabs and Zionist-oriented Jews were redemption and issue of demarcation of land. Jews used to rent land from Arabs who had lived there before the acquisition of land by Jews. The second, Zionists who were prone to socialist ideology considered that "working the land was seen as giving the cultivator rights over it" (Morris, 2001). Thus, due to this reason new Jews didn't like to hire Arab as an employee. According to Benny Morris, the third stage of violence development is tight with a national question. The first Arabs protest against Jews took place in 1891. At that year's Arab peasants used to attack Zionist Jews.

Amidst the major conflicts of Arab versus Zionist Jews is an Arab-Jewish clash of 1921 in Jaffa. Initially, the struggle had begun between Jewish Communists who were marching from Jaffa to Tel Aviv and another Jewish group. However, due to chaotic situation Arabs joined conflict as well so that it turned to inter-communal clashes. The conflict occurred in the Jewish quarter of Jaffa so that Jews suffered from damages both human and material. In the wave of randomly happened conflict 48 Arabs and 47 Jews were killed and hundreds had been injured on both sides (G.Kramer, 2008). Jewish settlements' rapid growth and their exclusive economic development had frustrated Arabs. In 1928 Arabs had legally acquired Wailing Wall and place where Jews prayed as well in the result of British permission. After such unfolding Arabs interfered Jewish pray places within the Wall. As a reply to the insulting actions by Arabs, Jews demanded the right to own the Wall from British by means of riots. All in all, those days' events ended with massacres in several cities like Jerusalem, Tel Aviv, Jaffa, Hebron, and Safad. Clashes ended up with 116 Arab and 113 Jews casualties on both sides (Morris, 2001).

It's interesting to note every new conflict resolution paper had brought about the new conflict. The same had occurred in case of Wailing Wall event. British had conducted an inquiry and adopted the Passfield White Papers that recommended three pivotal measures such as British "dual obligation", Opportunity to settle Arabs and restriction on Jewish migration into Palestine. However, due to the domestic pressure of Conservatives, this plan hadn't been implemented. Instead of so-called "black letter" had appeared that recognized British obligation to establish Jewish center in Palestine (W.Burton & M. Cleveland, 2009).

After this event new youth resistance party Istiqlal came forth within Arab community challenging British mandate rule in Palestine and conservative Arab leaders. This youth group saw other Arab states as pivotal allies of Palestinians. Briefly, Black Letter was of utmost importance in inducing 1936 popular Arab revolt generally against three: "Zionism, British imperialism, and entrenched Arab leaders". It had started by Jewish bus passengers' murder by Arabs and further involved terrorist groups like Haganah. Arabs' aim was to keep on striking till British restricted Jewish migration and granted opportunity to establish a democratic state in Palestine. In relating with casualties it was catastrophic: about 3000 Arabs, 2000 Jews and 600 British were murdered during mass conflicts (W.Burton & M. Cleveland, 2009). Relations between Arabs and Jews had been escalated too much so that in 1941 Hajj Amin Al-Husayni had a negation with Hitler in Germany regarding the establishment of the Arab state in Palestine. In 1942 via America's support, a Biltmore Program was set demonstrating the US interest in maintaining Jewish migration in Palestine such sense was easy to promote in the West due to the holocaust of Jews in Europe. Finally, coming to Britain's state in Palestine she was frustrated by bloody uncontrolled riots and so frequent massacres around in Palestine, seemed that British couldn't cope with "double obligation" towards both Arab and Jew. Hence, the US-led UN took a responsibility to finalize this issue. The UN solution was a 1947 partition plan according to which both Arab and Jewish states were to appear. Aftermath of plan recognition unseen chaos took place all over Palestine causing great human and material damages.

To sum up, incompatible maximalist goals and lack of consensus between two parts induced suspicion and hostility at the first stage. Further small local land theft occasions and trials between two sides had happened. Furthermore, relations came to the division of ritual places and intolerant actions regarding each other in a massive way. Finally, the escalation had reached its peak after UN partition plan recognition. Hence, since 1881 till 1947 (almost 56 years) Arab-Jewish nationalist unrest grew and exploded in 1948 in form of the Great War that caused more deaths and refugee issue.

The last but not least important factor is a perceptual one. Here it's essential to learn to which extent their "mutual history" where divergent. "The greater the divergence the greater is a risk of war" (Evera, 2001). In the prominent work about nationalism and war by Stephan Van Evera, it is noted fairly that nationalism depends on "historical image of its neighbors". Nationalism could survive peacefully with other nations in case of the existence of points of convergence than points of differences. Relations between nations get worse in case of the existence of "self-justifying" historical myths and/or adoption of distorted images on others to gain legitimacy to own cause (Evera, 2001). Having investigated Arabism and Zionism the differences are considered to be prevailing. Arabism primarily calls for Arab unity and rely on Islamic legacy of Palestine. As for Zionism it strongly advocates "save heaven", "Jewish national home" in Palestine referring to the ancient historical background and religious importance of this land. However, it's interesting that both nationalism types. Image of Arabs in Jewish eyes was "cunning primitive" people and Zionist Jews were "European" colonists for Arabs (Morris, 2001).

V. Conclusion

The paper has investigated Arab-Israel conflicts between 1917 and 1948 from an inter-communal conflict perspective. As a result of a long inquiry over nationalism and war hypotheses and characteristics of Arabism and Zionism as types of nationalism, most of the hypotheses were found suitable for Arab-Israel conflicts at 1917-1948 periods. All in all, the results of research are following.

First, conflicts between two communities were so frequent due to the stateless nationalism characteristic of both Arabism and Zionism in Palestine. Zionism is depicted as diaspora gathering nationalism whereas Palestinian Arabism was already united in Palestinian geography. The main strategy to collect diaspora for Zionism was a migration. As for an attitude to other nationalities abroad Zionism and Arabism behaved much in a pragmatic way "enemies could turn in friends" (Herzl, The Jewish State, 1989). There wasn't any tough principle like in Nazism to hate some particular nations. Hence, hostility and hatred between Arabs and Jews have been due to the unattained statehood.

Second, from four immediate causes, the second and the third hypotheses are deemed to be suitable to the case. The more some nationalism search for diaspora recovery the greater risk of annexationist strategies and the greater is a risk of war. This hypothesis on immediate causes fits Zionism. With the rise of the migrant waves, Jews started to acquire more land by redemption from Arabs and considering that land as their own in Palestine. Thus, Arabs witnessing the dramatic rise of Jews population embarked on the severe mass struggle. The third hypothesis is "the greater hegemonic ambitions of nationalism regarding each other the greater is a risk of war". Both Arabs and Jews sought for the state. The problem was that Jews at the beginning relying on Balfour Declaration saw Palestine as a Jewish state intact. Arabs having understood such Jewish calculations and required from Britain an Arab state in the whole territory of Palestine. In this way, maximalist demands of both Zionism and Arabism in Palestine led to the escalation of the conflict and to the stalemate.

Third, underlying factors such as structural, political and perceptual have been examined. As a result of inquiry structural factors such as population intermingles and an absence of definite borders between Arab and Jewish communities are seen as a reasonable reason for the conflict deterioration. Political factors like past crimes and brutality of oppression took place in Palestine as well. Thus, elements of divergence regarding history rather than convergence are prevailing. Different look at Palestine's history also had played a crucial role for the conflict process.

References

[1].   Anderson, B. (n.d.). *The Nationalism Project*. Retrieved 12 25, 2016, from http://www.nationalismproject.org/what/anderson.htm
[2].   Bard, M. (2012). *Myths and Facts: a Guide to the Arab-Israeli Conflict.*American-Israeli Cooperative Enterprise.
[3].   Cuff, M. (2013, October 9). *Nationalism Studies: Monitoring the Changing World*. Retrieved 12 25, 2016, from https://nationalismstudies.wordpress.com/2013/10/09/ernest-gellner-2/
[4].   Evera, S. V. (2001). Hypotheses on Nationalism and War. In M. Brown, *Nationalism and Ethnic Conflict* (pp. 26-61). The MIT Press: Cambridge.
[5].   Fincham, D. G. (2015, August 2). Retrieved 01 04, 2017, from http://mondoweiss.net/2015/08/independent-sovereign-palestine/
[6].   Fromkin, D. (2001). *A Peace to End All Peace: The Fall of the Ottoman Empire and the Creation of the Modern Middle East.* New York: Henry Holt and Company.
[7].   G.Kramer. (2008).*A History of Palestine: From the Ottoman Conquest to the Founding of the State of Israel.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.
[8].   Garaudy, R. (2000). *Siyonizm Dosyasi.* Istanbul: Pınar Yayınları.

[9].   *Hakkinda Bilgi*. (n.d.). Retrieved 12 31, 2016, from http://www.hakkindabilgi.biz/islahat-fermani-onemi-amaci-nedenleri-ve-sonuclari/

[10].   Herzl, T. (n.d.). Retrieved 12 31, 2016, from Jodenhaat: http://jodenhaat.nl/DagboekenHerzl.pdf

[11].   Herzl, T. (1989). *The Jewish State.*

[12].   Hobsbawn, E. J. (1992). *Nations and Nationalism since 1780: Programme, Myth, Reality.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

[13].   Itamar Rabinovich, J. R. (2008). *Israel in the Middle East.*Brandeis University Press.

[14].   John Hutchinson & Anthony Smith.(1994). *Nationalism.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

[15].   Kayalı, H. (1997). *Arabs and Young Turks: Ottomanism, Arabism, and Islamism.* California: University of California Press.

[16].   *Lost Islamic History*. (n.d.). Retrieved 12 26, 2016, from http://lostislamichistory.com/the-arab-revolt-of-world-war-one/

[17].   Ma'oz, M. (2002). *Palestine-Israel Journal of Politics, Economics, and Culture*. Retrieved 01 04, 2017, from http://www.pij.org/details.php?id=104

[18].   *Map of Jewish Settlements In Palestine In 1947 - Palestine Maps*. (n.d.). Retrieved 01 2017, 03, from http://mapsof.net/palestine/map-of-jewish-settlements-in-palestine-in-1947

[19].   Morris, B. (2001). *A History of the Zionist-Arab Conflict.* New York: Vintage Books.

[20].   Muslih, M. (1988). *The Origins of Palestinian Nationalism.* New York: Columbia University Press.

[21].   Öztürk, F. (2014). The Ottoman Millet System.*Güneydoğu Avrupa Araştırmalar Dergisi*, 71-86.

[22].   Quataert, D. (2005). *The Ottoman Empire 1700-1922.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

[23].   Schulze, K. E. (2008). *The Arab-Israeli Conflict.* Harlow: Pearson Longman.

[24].   Scott-Baumann, M. (2007). *Conflict in the Middle East.* London: Hodder Education.

[25].   Smith, A. (2016, October 19). *Nationalism Studies: Monitoring the Changing World*. Retrieved 12 25, 2016, from https://nationalismstudies.wordpress.com/2016/10/19/anthony-smith/

[26].   Telushkin, J. (1991). *Jewish Virtual Library*. Retrieved 12 24, 2016, from http://www.jewishvirtuallibrary.org/jsource/Zionism/bilu.html

[27].   *The Covenant of the League of Nations*. (n.d.). Retrieved 12 25, 2016, from http://avalon.law.yale.edu/20th_century/leagcov.asp

[28].   Trueman, C. N. (2016, August 16). *The History Learning Site*. Retrieved 12 26, 2016, from http://www.historylearningsite.co.uk/modern-world-history-1918-to-1980/the-middle-east-1917-to-1973/the-balfour-declaration-of-1917/the-balfour-declaration-of-1917/

[29].   *United States Holocaust Memorial Museum*.(n.d.). Retrieved 01 2017, 03, from https://www.ushmm.org/wlc/en/media_fi.php?ModuleId=0&MediaId=6859

[30].   Vazquez, J. (2009). *The War Puzzle Revisited.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

[31].   W.Burton& M. Cleveland. (2009). *A History of the Modern Middle East.* Philadelphia: Westview Press.

[32].   Walz, H. (1977). Zionism and Racism: Contrasting Perspectives and Perceptions. In I. O. Discriminations, *Zionism & Racism* (pp. 17-27). London: Billins &Sons Ltd.

[33].   *What Really Happened*.(n.d.). Retrieved 12 26, 2016, from http://www.whatreallyhappened.com/WRHARTICLES/palestinians.php#axzz4TwDnAs5P

[34].   Yavus, H. (2013). Warfare and Nationalism: The Balkan Wars as a Catalyst for Homogenization. In I. B. Hakan Yavus, *War and Nationalism: The Balkan Wars, 1912-1913, and Their Sociopolitical Implications* (pp. 31-85). Salt Lake City: The University of Utah Press.

[35].   Zahlan, R. S. (2009). *Palestine and the Gulf States: The Presence at the Tables.*New York: Routledge.