

People's Democratic Republic of Algeria
Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research
Dr. Moulay Tahar University- Saida-
Faculty of Letters, Languages and Arts
Department of English



Theme case:
Recognition of Jerusalem as Israel Capital in Trumps Era

Dissertation submitted to the Department of English Language and Literature as a partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of *Master* in Literature and Civilization.

Presented by:

Miss. ASSAS. KARIMA

Supervised by:

Dr. D. BENADLA

Board of Examiners

Dr. A. MOUSSAOUI	Chair Person	University of Saida
Dr. D. BENADLA	Supervisor	University of Saida
Mr. SELMI SID AHMED ZAKHARIA	Examiner	University of Saida

Academic Year: 2018-2019

Dedication

To my mother, and my family. Thank you for supporting me throughout my studies. Your encouragement has made it possible for me to come this far and write about what I am passionate about. I dedicate this work to you.

I would also like to thank my uncles for their wise counsel and sympathetic ear. You are always there for me.

Acknowledgement

First and foremost, I am extremely thankful for the help and encouragement provided by my thesis advisor Dr. Benadla for his passionate and support.

Abstract

Jerusalem is the most important city in the world, the center of the three greatest religions. The purpose of this dissertation is to analyse President Trump's stand on the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. The paper denounces the Israeli occupation of the West Bank, plus, it discusses the decision to relocate the American Embassy to Jerusalem, arguing that this is an incorrect and bold decision. In this brief dissertation, we retrace the key historical points and problems associated with the legal status of this city, from the first decades of the twentieth century, to understand that the problem lies in the claim of ownership of this City. The dissertation ends with the hope that President Trump will succeed where his predecessors had failed and bring peace to the Middle East.

Key words: Trump, Jerusalem, peace, the Israeli-Palestinian conflict.

Table of Contents

Dedication.....	i
Acknowledgments.....	ii
Abstract.....	iii
Table of Contents.....	iv
General Introduction.....	01
Chapter One: Historic, Political and Background of the Isreali-Palastinian Conflict.....	1
1.1 Historiography.....	5
1.1.1 The Meaning of Jerusalem to Muslims.....	7
1.1.2 The Importance of Jerusalem to Jews.....	12
1.2 The War and the British conquest of Jerusalem.....	14
1.2.1 The British conquest of Jerusalem: 9 December 1917.....	15
1.2.2 April 1920: Nebi Musa Riots.....	17
2 The Foundation of the State of Israel in 1948.....	19
Chapter Two: The Influence of American Foreign Policy toward Israel	23
3.1 The Origins of the US-Israeli Special Relationship.....	23
3.1.1 The Integration of Israel into American Culture.....	24
3.1.2 Truman and the Recognition of Israel.....	25
3.2 Arms for Israel: The Special Relationship Begins.....	27
3.2.1 Isreal as a strategic asset.....	28

3.2.2 The Six Day War.....	30
3.2.3 The American Reaction to the Shamir Plan.....	31
Chapter Three: Trump’s Move towards Jerusalem and its ramifications.....	34
4.1 The history and politics behind trump’s Jerusalem decision	34
4.1.1 The Jerusalem act of 1995.....	36
4.2.1 The resolution of 181.....	37
5.2 Trumps promises.....	39
5.2.1 The ramification of the decision	41
General Conclusion.....	45
Works Cited.....	47

Abbreviation and Acronyms

UN	United Nation
UNSC	UN Security Council
UNG	UN General Assembly
UNPC	United Nation Palestine Commission
PLO	Palestine Liberation Organization
ICJ	International Court of Justice
PA	Palestinian Authority

General Introduction

The British Empire controlled Palestine for little more than thirty years (1917-1948), but during that time had an enormous impact on the course of its future development, and since the State of Israel was declared in 1948 by decision of the United Nations (UN). Immediately after its declaration a war between the State of Israel and the surrounding Arab nations broke out. So, the Palestinian-Israeli conflict is a long-lasting issue on the international agenda, being one of the most debated topics at the United Nations Security Council (UNSC) since its creation. Failed accords and several events of denial of human rights, tension became the status quo in the Palestinian region. However, recent developments elevated the Palestinian Question once again to the top of the international calendar, since the United States of America's (US) president, Donald Trump, declared Jerusalem as the capital of Israel and moved the US embassy to the Holy City.

Correspondingly, it was 70 years ago that the United States, under President Truman, recognised the State of Israel. Ever since then, Israel has made its capital in the city of Jerusalem. But today, the declaration came after weeks of suspense whether Trump would honor his campaign bid or follow former US president's foreign policy. The announcement unleashed protests and demonstrations throughout the Muslim world and condemnation from many countries. Jerusalem is the Holy land for three religions, Christianity, Islam and Judaism. This thesis is based on the recent year's debates concerning internal factors shaping the US foreign policy to be pro-Israel. The thesis objective has been to contribute a new explanatory perspective to the continuous pro-Israel US foreign policy particularly for the Trump administration.

The overall thesis objective is to answer why the US foreign policy continuously has been pro-Israel, specifically during the Trump presidency. Though, while hoping to add perspective to the reasons for the enduring pro-Israel US foreign policy during the Trump presidency, this thesis neither seeks to make generalizing assumptions about the overall, conclusive factors shaping the pro-Israel US foreign policy, nor the factors shaping US foreign policy in general. This task would be too comprehensive for a thesis of this scope, and would also require further studies of both external factors and, potentially, additional internal factors. Instead, the objective is to contribute perspective to the existing debates on the internal factors shaping US foreign policy towards Israel by examining specifically chosen observed data within a historical framework, the attempt to accomplish in the following narrative is degerming the root causes of America's decisive role as the sole arbiter of the Middle east peace process, particularly, President Trumps support. Based on this aim, specific research questions are phrased as follows:

1. What is the history and politics behind Trumps decisioning and the Israeli lobby in particular?
2. Why Trump didn't succeed in his quest to recognize Jerusalem as Israeli capital?

While these two questions have the appearance of being rather straightforward, it is narrow to the following Hypotheses:

1. Trumps way to end legitimacy of Resolution 181 was an aspersion.
2. After the six days war in June 1967, Israel become for the U.S. a strategic asset.

In order to fit the interest in this specific perspective into the framework of this thesis, further considerations have been made. The approach taken in this thesis is based on the sole

goal to answer the research questions as thoroughly and as comprehensive as possible. On this basis, this thesis will take an approach similar to many scholars within the social sciences, namely that hypotheses may not ever be fully proved, but they will be tested through observed data, and the absence of contradictory evidence, will determine whether the findings may be accepted.

The thesis is constructed on MLA 8th edition style format. I chose this topic because it is one of the happening now, I found the topic interesting and willing to know further details about it and to be heard and echoed. Additionally, conducting research within the field of political sciences makes it close to impossible to remain neutral. Thus, my bias, in relation to this conflict, is to be found in my critical stance towards the politics of the Israeli government, having the power over a majority of the resources and thus also the ability to initiate a serious peace process.

The choice of data offers a broad base of information and insights into the elites' potential for influencing the US foreign policy to be pro-Israel. Though, the data do have its limitations. It is apparent, when reviewing this data, that the people involved, aim to hide the details of the process as much as possible, though, within the limits of the law. Therefore, I do not have access to all relevant data from the US government, organizations, individuals, nor the media. Some may be classified to outsiders and some may only be found in physical versions in US archives. Furthermore, due to the scope and timeframe of this thesis, as well as my geographical location in Algeria, I am not able to interview relevant parties involved, nor conduct my own surveys. Therefore, I must rely solely on what is available to me through media reports, public databases and archives on the internet.

As such, the thesis is divided into three chapters each assessing different aspects such as background information.

The first part of Chapter one looks into the historical, geopolitical and socio-economic factors that shaped the context. This is done in the belief of the importance in understanding the different components that have a role in determining the context. Therefore, a short historical review of the most important political events was necessary to connect the contemporary research problem with its roots and to better understand the behavior and attitudes of studied individuals and communities. This section ends from the exodus and displacement of hundreds of thousands of Palestinians and their loss of land in 1948.

Chapter two explores the nature of US-Israeli relations, the concept and attributes of a special relationship and examines whether it is indeed valid to describe the US-Israeli relationship as such. It is an account of the history of the United States relation with Palestine. The researcher believes that to understand the major American involvement in the peace process requires not only a chronicle of the events, but also an explanation of the factors and circumstances that have motivated and shaped the United States.

chapter three displays the reasons that led to the main research problem that is, the 'Trump's recognitions of Jerusalem as Israeli capital'. This section starts with a brief historical review of Jerusalem Embassy act and the 181 resolution. The section further discusses options for President Trump to pursue, arguing that the most realistic and less bloody option was and remains the two-state solution.

Chapter One: Historic, Political and Background of the Israeli-Palestinian Conflict

Jerusalem has a twofold meaning. On the one hand, it refers to a specific city on a certain stretch of land near the eastern shore of the Mediterranean where modern Israel is

located. On the otherhand, it is an idea, a thought in relation to the tangible place, as its earthly manifestation. Over the past two thousand years, the country has changed hands repeatedly, generally in major wars of conquest that brought new rulers into power. These wars have also changed the official religion of the country. During the first millennium CE, it passed from Jewish to pagan rule, then becoming Christian and Muslim; in the second millennium it was successively Muslim, Christian, again Muslim, and finally Jewish.

This chapter will also encompass important events in Jewish-Muslims history that have relevance for the imagination in western thought of an earthly millenarian Kingdom of God in Jerusalem. The historical overview presented here is short, with just a few examples from a time period covering several thousand years. By means of this brief historical presentation the aim is to indicate how the various representations of Jerusalem image have developed and also to shed a light on the British conquest of Jerusalem and the ramifications that followed the occupation such as the Nebi Musa riots in 1920. Thus, the founding of the state of Israel in 1948.

Historiography

The place to which David, according to tradition, chose to bring the Ark of the Covenant in CE. 1000 BCE has, according to scholars in the field, a history of ancient worship .

Whereas, historically speaking, Jerusalem has generally been a site for Muslim pilgrimage, prayer, study or residence. Significantly, as his Eminence Shaykh `Abdul `Aziz ibn `Abdullah ibn Baz a Saudi Arabian Islamic scholar stated that Al-Aqsa Mosque was a particular seat of learning. Muslim scholars came to Jerusalem from distant lands. "Just as it is true to say that the first textbook in Islam was the Qur'an, so it is true to say that the first school was the mosque (Baz 271). Besides, Muslims, believe that Islam, more than Judaism

or Christianity, afforded the city the most tolerant period because of Islam's nature being the religion of all prophets, from Abraham to Muhammad.

Specifically, The Jewish as well as the Muslim claims on Jerusalem are not only Religious character, but also of political, geographic, economic and cultural nature. Both communities hold the city as a symbol of national identity and absolute rights. Driven by the fear to lose ground in Jerusalem, the Jewish as well as the Muslim attachment to the city is highly emotional and closely linked to the question of political status. According to an editorial article showed that after World War I, Great Britain allowed an additional influx of European Jews, giving Jews a slight majority in Jerusalem (History).

Although the Jewish migration to Palestine started during the Ottoman rule at the end of the nineteenth century and the beginning of the twentieth century, the British allowed the project of the Zionist movement to become reality by the Balfour Declaration of 1917. The Balfour Declaration as Rashid Ismail Khalidi a Palestinian American historian of the Middle East, pronounced in his book "Palestinian Identity: The Construction of Modern National Consciousness" the right for a Jewish homeland to be established in Palestine in 1917 without the permission of the Palestinian people living in the lands of Palestine at the time (Khalidi 120). For the first time Palestine emerged as a separate country at the end of the First World War with Britain's conquest of the Ottoman districts of Jerusalem, Acre, and Nablus.

In conjunction with the previous mentioned, Ilan Pappé an expatriate Israeli historian and socialist activist, emphasized that many of the Palestinians leaders between 1905 and 1910 felt the danger and debated Zionism as a political movement aiming to buying land, assets and power in Palestine but without the acknowledgment of the damaging potential, they saw it as part of the European missionary and colonialist motivations (Pappé 28), which according to Pappé fairly was, but it turned out to be a dangerous initiative for the Palestinians (29).

According to United Nations Resolution 303 issued in December 1949, admitting Israelite membership in the United Nations, the General Assembly again proposed the internationalization of Jerusalem under the U.N. Trusteeship Council (Assembly 25). Moreover, as stated in the editorial of New York Times newspaper, that in 1950 the government of Israel made West Jerusalem its capital city (New York Times 1950). Jordan formally incorporated the West Bank, including East Jerusalem. In the same token, as New York Times published a view illustration showing Jordan's parliament stance, however, that it acted "without prejudicing the final settlement of Palestine's just case within the sphere of national aspirations, inter-Arab co-operation and international justice" (New York Times 1990).

Altogether, the question of Jerusalem is one of the major points of debate in the current Israeli-Palestinian conflict and surely one of the most difficult to solve. Apart from the political and territorial questions involved, the situation is further complicated by the fact that all three religions, Islam, Judaism and Christianity, lay claim to the Holy City. Although called the "City of Peace" in Hebrew (Yerushalayim), and "the Holy One" (al-Quds) in Arabic, tensions and clashes over the holy sites in Jerusalem return sometimes and tolerate the danger of sparking a fire in the whole Middle East. In this divided city, Arab and Jewish groups are largely self-segregating and mostly do not cooperate with each other.

1.1.1 The meaning of Jerusalem to Muslim

There is perhaps no other city in the world that has drawn the continued attention of the world community as much as the city of Jerusalem, especially among the believers of the three monotheistic religions: Judaism, Christianity and Islam. The city's religious centrality has generated its historical and political importance, as well as its symbolic impact, but its religious position has also been at the root of a considerable controversy.

This controversy focuses on who has the greater supplementary and power to the city, and for whom Jerusalem has the greatest religious, cultural, historical and political importance. Palestinian and Arab Islamists, recognize the religious significance of Jerusalem to Christians and Jews, they stress the Muslim character and Jews of the city and Muslim entitlement to it, and their attachment to Jerusalem constitutes part of their doctrinal views of the city.

Jerusalem to Muslims according to Richard C. Martin Professor of Islamic Studies and History of Religions Emory University, Atlanta in his book "Encyclopedia of Islam and the Muslim world" he believed that, The Islamic spiritual importance of Bayt al-Maqdis and Al-Aqsa Mosque derives from the fact that for 16 months al Masjid al-Aqsa had been. Moreover, the first Qibla direction of prayer for Muslims before Makkah. (Martin) It is also one of the three most Holy Mosques in Islam with Makkah and Madinah. Furthermore, Jerusalem is commonly associated with the Isra, known as the Night Journey of the Prophet Muhammad from Makkah to al Aqsa Mosque, as recorded in the Quran:

"Glory to Allah who did take his servant for a journey by night from the sacred Mosque to the Farthest Mosque, whose percents we did bless, in order that we might show him some of our signs, for he is the one who hearth and Seth (all things)". (Translation, Al-Quran Surah 17. Al-Israa - Yusuf Ali).

As well as his ascension Mi 'raj to Heaven to receive from Allah the principles of Islam. This event happened two years before the Hijra, as Al-Suyuti Abd al-Rahman ibn Kamal al-Din Abi Bakr ibn Muhammad ibn Sabiq al-Din, Jalal al-Din al-Misri al-Suyuti al-Shafi'i al-Ash`ari, also known as Ibn al-Asyuti (849-911), the mujtahid imam and renewer of the tenth Islamic century, foremost hadith master, jurist, Sufi, philologist, and historian, he authored works in virtually every Islamic science. As he noted in his book "Al-Khasais-ul-Kubra" that, Muhammad's move from Makkah to Madinah in 622 A.D. Accounts of these famous events record that on his way to Bayt al-Maqdis, the Prophet Muhammad visited the 1

Tomb of the Prophet Abraham in Hebron where he performed two prostrations Raka' . (al-Asyuti 280) He also added that Muhammed also visited the Church of Nativity in Bethlehem, where the Prophet Jesus was born and performed two Prostrations as well. Thus, the Islamic holiness of Jerusalem has very strong roots, since Islam respects all the prophets before Muhammad and granted him the first place (288).

Therefore, the reason why Allah made Muslims pray towards Jerusalem (al-Aqsa Mosque) for 16 months, and then ordered them to pray towards the Ka'ba, and why the event of the night Journey occurred between the two mosques: al-Haram Mosque in Makkah and al-Aqsa Mosque in Jerusalem is in fact to confirm the link between Islam and pre-Islamic religious. As a matter of fact, Ahmad Ibn Muhammad Ibn Hanbal Abū Abdullāh Ash-Shaybānī (780–855 CE/164–241 AH), often referred to as Ahmad ibn Hanbal who was an Arab Muslim jurist, theologian, ascetic, and hadith traditionist. An enormously influential and vigorous scholar during his lifetime, and He has been retrospectively described as "the most significant exponent of the traditionalist approach in Sunni Islam "he argued in his book "Kitāb al-Unsal-jalīlbi-tārīkh al-Quds wa-al-Khalīl" that, the significance of Jerusalem for Muslims comes from the Quranic verses that mention it under the name of al-Aqsa Mosque, and From the Prophetic Traditions (Hadith) of Muhammad, who told several accounts related to the importance of Jerusalem. Among them is the Tradition, "Whoever wants to see a part of Paradise, let him look to Bayt-al-Maqdis". (Ibn Hanbal 295) By the same token, he further discussed, that Another Tradition told by the fourth Calliph Ali Ibn-Abi Talib, says "The most exalted spot is Bayt al-Maqdis the most exalted rock is the Rock of Bayt al-Maqdis" (300).

In order to understand further the Islamic importance of Jerusalem, we have to turn to the Fada'il Literature, the books about religious merits of Jerusalem. The Fada'il Literature may have existed from the time of the Prophet and continued to be transmitted in the Umayyad and later Islamic periods. The earliest Fada'il books were written by Abu Baker al-

Wasiti known as " Ibn al-Farghani ", one of the scholars of the Sunnis and the community and the flags of Sunni Sufism in the fourth century he saw in his book "Faḍā'il al-Bayt al-Muqaddas" towards Jerusalem and to preach Jihad to free Jerusalem and the Holy Land from the Crusaders. The Fada'il Literature is a late source for this discussion, but is vital for understanding the Islamic meaning of Jerusalem and al Al-Aqsa Mosque (al-Wasiti 80).

Accordingly, this significance led to the Umayyads to strengthen their Political and religious relationship with Bayt al-Maqdis. In the event that, Yāqūt Shihāb al-Dīn ibn-'Abdullāh al-Rūmī al-Hamawī an Arab biographer and geographer of Greek origin, renowned for his encyclopedic writings on the Muslim world. (1179–1229) In his large geography, the "Mu'jamul-Buldān" he mentioned how this appeared clearly first with the Umayyad Caliph Mu'awiya, who had his oath of allegiance "Bay 'a" taken in Jerusalem, and who was known as the "Prince of the Holy Land" Amir al-Ard al- Muqaddasa. There can be no doubt that Abd al-Malik regarded Jerusalem as the holy and important place, especially the site of Mount Moriah, where he laid out the plan of al-Harm al-Sharif that exists today. This connection was developed strongly Abd al-Malik, who was no stranger to such ideas, since he had resided for a long time in Syria-Palestine, and had been the governor of the province of Filastin during the Caliphate of Mu'awiya (al-Rūmī 100).

Moreover, The Islamization of Jerusalem occurred when Allah ordered Muslims to face it as their first Qibla. Marwan Abu Khalaf an Associate Professor at Al-Quds University. He has an MA in Prehistoric Archaeology from the Sorbonne University and a PHD in Islamic Art and Archaeology from Oxford University, noted in his "The Religious Factors in the settlement pattern in Jerusalem in the early Islamic period " Jerusalem became an Islamic City in the first half of the seventh century A.D. when Muslims entered the Holy city in 15 A.H /168 A.D, during the reign of the second Caliph Umar Ibn al-Khattab. According to the historical sources, Umar came personally and specifically to receive the surrender City from

its Patriarch Sophronius, who refused to surrender the city to anyone else. The sources also record that the Caliph granted a special covenant Sulh, Ahd to the Christians living in the City. Its texts developed over time into the form known as the Islamic Assurance of Safety to the People of Aelia, al-Umariyya. In this Assurance the Caliph guaranteed religious freedom, safety of the churches, and secured the lives, fortunes and. properties of the people living in the city (Khalaf).

According to scholars, the City experienced steady change in its characters but continued basically Byzantine adding to it the eastern part the area of al-Haram al-Sharif"; which was not included in the Byzantine City. However, the extent remains and the new discoveries around the Haram enclosure especially "Dar al-Imara" gives indication that there was a very significance change in the layout of the Christian city concentrated mainly in the eastern part of City. It also believed that Jerusalem was influenced by Islamic -systems as soon as Muslims settled in the City. (Levine) With this in mind, Marwan Abu Khalaf, further noted. There is no doubt that life was built on religious and political factors can be indicated in the Holy City during the Islamic period. Physical evidence of the religious factors is of two types: Architectural and ritual. The architechitectoral evidence consists of religious buildings constructed in Jerusalem including: Mosques, Madrases, Khanqas, Domes, Sabils, Ribats, Mausleums etc.

The political factors can be seen from the attention which the Caliphs paid to Jerusalem, starting from the time of the second Caliph Umar who came personally to Jerusalem not as a religious leader but as Amir al-Mu'mineen the Leader of the believers, title which carries very clear political meaning. Umar's connections with Jerusalem continued after his first visit to the Holy City. According to the Greek historian living in the Byzantine period Theophans, Umar came back again to Jerusalem in the year 644/643 AD. where he ordered a mosque to be built, probably al-Aqsa Mosque (GoJerusalem).

The importance of Jerusalem to Jews

In the Jewish sources Jerusalem is presented as the most special city in the world. It is the main point of connection between God and the whole of creation, the center of the universe and the place from which the whole process of creating the world began. These special traits clearly result in Jerusalem being the most spiritual place in the world. The area of special holiness is Mount Moriah, today known as the Temple Mount. This area is located beneath the platform on which the Muslim Shrine, the Dome of the Rock, now stands. In the Jewish Bible, Jerusalem has many names: Salem (Shalem), Moriah, Jebuse (Yevuse), Jerusalem (Yerushalayim), and Zion (Tziyon).

David Noel Freedman, a biblical scholar, has found the monarchic period to be a good starting point in defining religion in ancient Israel: A convenient way to define and define the period of Israel's early faith is by the formation of the monarchy in Israel, starting with Saul (the first king of Israel) and his house and then on a more permanent basis with king David and his dynasty (Freedman 60). However, if we are to change a fairly picture of the faith of early Israel, we need according to Freedman to give attention to the earliest poetry of the Hebrew Bible. The origins of the people, community, and nation are "somewhat murky and masked in mystery", but there are indications in the book of Genesis and external sources that help the researchers to reconstruct the beginnings of the Israelitic religion (62). With Moses' revelation of the new name of God, the patriarchal religion set off on a new course.

We will turn our attention to the Temple Mount, notorious to the Muslim world as "al-Haram a-Sharif", a vital fact of religious principle for Jews and Muslims. For Jews it is the site of both the first and second (Kaufman). Four hundred and ten years after its completion, the Temple was utterly destroyed by the Babylonians when they besieged Jerusalem and no trace of it remains. The temple of Jerusalem had been the center for sacrificial worship and had then been destroyed. Some years afterwards, in 538 BCE, as indicated in the article

entitled "Temple of Jerusalem", the Persian king Cyrus II and his Achaemenid successors allowed the exiled Jews to return to Jerusalem. The temple was then rebuilt, the priesthood was purified and the cult restored (Perowne). Though the city had been in ruins, Jerusalem did not cease to give birth to new hopes for the future. The symbol of the city as hope grew even stronger after the destruction of the second temple in 70 CE.

Consequently, one of the most exciting phenomena in the study of sacred space to holy places is how believers of different faiths may share sanctity. Scholars and historians of religion have not occasionally noticed that the nature of a holy place holds its sanctity when it changes hands. Once a site has been recognized as holy, the sanctity attaches to it, regardless of political and religious changes. Nowhere else, perhaps, is this rule more applicable than in the Holy Land. Over the past two thousand years, Jerusalem has changed hands repeatedly, generally in major wars of conquest that brought new rulers into power. These wars have also changed the official religion of the country.

During the nineteenth century, Britain's interests in the Middle East were best served by maintaining the integrity of the Ottoman Empire. The Ottomans effectively stopped Russia's imperial advances, thus ensuring a balance of European power between Russia and Britain. The cooperative relationship between the Ottomans and Britain allowed Britain to enjoy perfect transfer through the region, furthering its ability to provide security to the jewel of its empire, India. (Fitzsimons 40)

Consequently, in these areas, the British selected rulers based on their suitability to the native population, but more importantly for their loyalty to the Crown. The British sacrificed Faisal's independent Arab Syria in favor of reunion to the French, and the future of Palestine was left uncertain due to the Balfour Declaration's intention to establish a Jewish home. The British then employed their military and financial superiority to influence these newly established governments and ensure that British political desires received their full support.

1.2 The War and the British Conquest of Jerusalem

The city of Jerusalem became an occupied territory by the British on December 11th, 1917, away before its actual occupation. Although, there is a great deal of scrutiny could be made concerning the British occupation of the city. Last, but not least, obtaining Jerusalem generated a popular theme among the British public after the occupation of Jerusalem. The British press began to describe the conquest of the holy city as the fulfilment of the crusades period.

During the nineteenth century, Britain's interests in the Middle East were best served by maintaining the integrity of the Ottoman Empire. The Ottomans effectively stopped Russia's imperial advances, thus ensuring a balance of European power between Russia and Britain. The cooperative relationship between the Ottomans and Britain allowed Britain to enjoy perfect transfer through the region, furthering its ability to provide security to the jewel of its empire, India. (Fitzsimons 40)

Consequently, in these areas, the British selected rulers based on their suitability to the native population, but more importantly for their loyalty to the Crown. The British sacrificed Faisal's independent Arab Syria in favor of reunion to the French, and the future of Palestine was left uncertain due to the Balfour Declaration's intention to establish a Jewish home. The British then employed their military and financial superiority to influence these newly established governments and ensure that British political desires received their full support.

1.2.1 The British conquest of Jerusalem: 9 December 1917

In many scholarly circles it has become accepted wisdom that the British "occupation" and "colonization" of Palestine beginning in December 1917 much like other European colonial initiatives was a morally distasteful project based on the racist belief that the colonized peoples were of inferior racial and cultural extraction in need of enlightened

Europe's caring assistance. Leila Parsons summarizes this position nicely, writing that, "partly as a result of Edward Said's work "Orientalism", most recent historians of the Middle East have produced scholarship that is strongly critical of the British colonial missions in the region. It is worth asking, then, if the British were considered liberators or occupiers upon their arrival in Jerusalem in December 1917?"

On the subject, the opportunity for a new era in Palestine history emerged, where, in the view of many Arabs in Palestine, Ottoman despotism would be replaced by enlightened British rule. The day the Ottomans retreated in the rain from Jerusalem to Jericho, was "the most glorious day" in the history of Jerusalem. Bahri's narrative, published in 1922, "Transformation of an Arab Society", retell, slows to a standstill with the arrival of the British, recalled with touching detail: "On the 23rd of September at 3pm, a Monday, the allies came with their occupying armies led by General Allenby after a brief exchange of artillery fire that lasted roughly twenty-four hours"(May 72).

In the same way, to answer our question arose previously, the British, however, were much more concerned with another issue of religious and political character. The Ottoman Sultan claimed to be the spiritual leader of the Muslims, inside and outside Ottoman lands. Early in the Middle East campaign there had been a great effort by the British to not irritate the Muslims of their Empire, mainly Indian Muslims, in any way. In his book "A Peace to End All Peace", American author, lawyer, and historian David Fromkin pointed out that, the British looked for Muslim support in the war against the Islamic Ottoman Empire; Britain also knew that the Muslims would never forgive any damage or disturbance to the Muslim graves located in Ottoman territories (Fromkin 100-101). A note issued a few weeks before the conquest of Jerusalem by the News Department of the Foreign Office, addressed to the press, explains how wisely British intelligence moved in the Muslim world:

The attention of the press is again drawn to the undesirability of publishing any article, paragraph or picture suggesting that military operations against Turkey are in any sense a Holy War, a modern Crusade, or have anything whatever to do with religious questions. The British Empire is said to contain a hundred million of Mohammedan subjects of the King and it is obviously mischievous to suggest that our quarrel with Turkey is one between Islam and Christianity (Rankin 116).

Given these points, and as clearly stated in the last line, the purpose of this note was to ensure that Muslims of the Empire would not consider the war as a Christian-Muslim conflict. Clearly, British officials were well aware that using Jerusalem as a symbolic and ideological tool was very risky, and would only be successful if done properly. Subsequently, it can be argued that Jerusalem in the short term proved to be a winning bet. The conquest of the Holy City helped gather a push for the Allies, and played a vital role in boosting the morale of the troops employed on other fronts of the war. However, looking at the long term, the occupation of the city created more complex disputes rather than solving existent ones. From King David, who reunited the kingdom of Israel and made Jerusalem his new capital, through to the Romans and the Muslim and crusading conquerors, everyone adapted the city according to their purposes and visions. In that capacity, the Nebi Musa riots for fighting over the possession of a small piece of land will be discussed in the next section.

1.2.2 April 1920: Nebi Musa Riots

Following the conquest of the city, the British established military rule which lasted until 1 July 1920. From the standpoint of the locals the government of the city had passed from Ottoman rule to that of a new foreign power. However, the British were not only European Christian rulers: they had also shown their support for Jewish immigration and settlement in Palestine by issuing the Balfour Declaration. Despite the military's hatred of politics, in the 30 months of military rule Jerusalem was the center of great political activity:

the local population was more concerned with the reshuffling of the local political scene and the rise of a complex Arab-Zionist struggle. Eventually, the Nebi Musa riots of April 1920 proved to have a, generally underestimated, impact on local politics and British policy-making. Jerusalem, as the new capital of the region, became the locus of the tripartite political struggle involving Arabs, Zionists and British. Nabi Musa (نبيموسى , meaning the "Prophet Moses"). The Qur'an states that Musa was sent by God to the Pharaoh of Egypt and his establishments and the Israelites for guidance and warning. Musa is the name of a site in the West Bank believed to be the tomb of Moses (Keeler 55–66). It is also the name of a seven-day long religious festival that was celebrated annually by Palestinian Muslims, beginning on the Friday before Good Friday in the old Greek Orthodox calendar. Considered the most important Muslim pilgrimage in Palestine, the festival centered on a collective pilgrimage from Jerusalem to what was understood to be the Tomb of Moses, near Jericho (Curtiss 163).

An account of the Nebi Musa riots, discussed in the last part of this chapter, will illustrate the shift from collective to structured violence with a focus on the importance of the new political conditions engendered by British rule.

the riot of April 1920, known as Nebi Musa, proved to be crucial for the fate of the administration; it shaped a strong reaction in the Foreign Office and among the political institution in London. The military administration was accused by Jewish and non-Jewish Zionists of being anti-Zionist and, eventually, David Lloyd George who served as Prime Minister of the United Kingdom and Arthur Balfour became convinced that time had come to establish a civil administration (Massey 201). Not only were the Nebi Musa riots lethal for the military administration, but after them it was clear that something had changed in the city. These riots were not local fights between neighbors, fighting over the possession of a small piece of land. These riots, radically changed the political aspect of Jerusalem (Mills 115).

That being the case, Scholars, Rashid Khalidi, Louis Fishman and Yehoshua Porath discuss the Nebi Musa riots as part of a course in the creation of a Palestinian identity that exceeded the Jerusalem region; nevertheless, the actual events seem not to have attracted much attention (Telegraph). The British, the only real obstacle to the development of the riots, misunderstood or ignored the signs preceding these events. However, considering the socio-political situation and the presence of a distracted third party, it seems to me the Nebi Musa riots turned out to be the first organized test of national struggle.

Furthermore, Nebi Musa was an Islamic religious festival which included marches from different towns around Jerusalem; they celebrated the prophet Moses during the same period as the Christian Orthodox Easter and the Jewish Passover. The central celebration was the long pilgrimage to the traditional burial site of Moses, along the Jericho road from Jerusalem; the celebrations lasted a week. According to local memory, this festival was established by Salah al-Din in the twelfth century, to counterbalance the presence of Christians and Jews flocking to Jerusalem for the Easter celebrations (Hajdu)

. Subsequently, it is not certain when the festival was first celebrated, the Nebi Musa festival was never a fully religious event. This festival occupied in as an open door for the Muslim political and religious leaders to show their power versus the Christian and Jewish people group. The celebrations had the power to create a bond between people from various parts of the country, which were usually divided and had poor communications, who gathered in a single place because of the festival (Center for Israel Education). Leaders of the Arab political parties and associations exploited the excitement and enthusiasm aroused by the festival in order to make sure their petitions would be heard.

As a consequence, to assess the Nebi Musa riots, is to try to support a different reading of these events, and to show their relevance in both international and local contexts. In the literature, a riot is generally understood to be an intense and sudden, though not necessarily

unplanned, attack between the members of two or more communities. A riot has been considered a patterned event, as opposed to a spontaneous outbreak of violence. In the case of the Nebi Musa riots, before the explosion of violence two political parties and one paramilitary organization emerged as opposing one another. The Arab Muslim-Christian associations emerged in support of the incorporation of Palestine into Syria and with anti-Zionist petitions addressed to British authorities with the aim of stopping Jewish immigration. As a result of this, the Jewish immigrants had now become Israelis, following the establishment of the State of Israel in 1948.

2. The Foundation of the State of Israel in 1948

“There must be a Jewish State – it is no good boggling at this – and, even if it is small, at least they will control their own immigration, so that they can let in lots of Jews, which is what they madly and murderously want”.

Hugh Dalton, Chancellor of the Exchequer, 1947

In December, 1917, Jerusalem was taken by General Allenby, against the Turks. Palestine remained under British military rule until 1948, which facilitated rapid development. Increased Jewish migration to Palestine led to ethnic conflict, which grew in intensity to the point where the British could no longer control the situation. Accordingly, the problem turned over to the United Nations, which, in 1947, recommended that Palestine should be divided between the Jews and the Arabs.

In this paper we present a historical case study of one dramatic example of the time of war and postwar use of law to normalize shift and deficiency: Israel's denial of the Palestinians displaced by the 1948 war. Between 1948 and 1960, Israeli authorities gradually but rapidly

created legal structures to seize, retain, expropriate, reallocate, and reclassify the Arab lands appropriated by the state.

Firstly, in his book “High tide and after”, a British Labor Party economist and politician asserted that, at the annual Labor Party Conference in 1944, the party platform enlisted by future Chancellor Hugh Dalton was strongly pro-Zionist (Dalton 145). He further declared that, it supported a Jewish state in Palestine with expanded borders and fortified local Arabs to emigrate in exchange for reward. This position, called “Zionism Plus”, favored unlimited Jewish immigration into Palestine, specifically without consideration of economic capacity, and so rejected the MacDonald White Paper, a policy paper issued by the British government (146). On the subject, upon election to government in July 1945, Ernest Bevin, British statesman, trade union leader. He co-founded and served as general secretary believed his own negotiating skills developed through years as a union leader could resolve the Palestine problem. Convinced that he could forge an agreement, Bevin boasted, “if I don’t get a settlement, I’ll eat my hat” (147). Local Government, however, soon realized the difficulties of their position regarding Palestine.

Granted that, Zionism as the author and professor of religion William David Davies put it, is generally defined as the movement dedicating to restoring the land of Israel, the land of the Jewish people. Since the destruction of Jerusalem’s second Temple, the desire of the Jewish people to return has been well-kept-up in myths and in religious ritual (Davies 110). Additionally, the modern Zionist movement was organized in 1897 at the First Zionist World Congress, held under the leadership of Theodor Herzl, with the stated aim of “establishing a home for the Jewish people in Palestine” (Sherbok 199), British support was given ostensibly in the Balfour Declaration 1917, but the Holocaust is regarded as the force which finally persuaded public opinion that a Jewish homeland was necessary.

Before, during, and after the war 1948-49, Israel brutality against Arabs in Palestine was widespread. Noam Chomsky one of the most cited scholars in modern history, and the founder of modern linguistics, confirmed that, this was later brought to light by testimonials from commandoes of the Zionist operation who eventually become the political leader of Israel (Chomsky 94). He further added that, their military accounts assert that "the majority favored removing whoever stood in their way, including woman and children, "a policy that is attributed to flight of tens of thousands of Arabs from Palestine" (95). Example of this brutal behavior are illustrated in the various massacres of mostly defenseless Arabs of the hands of Zionist commandoes.

Specifically, Chomsky also claim that, one of the worst such instances was the Deir Yassin massacre of April 1967 where 250 Arabs were murdered, including children, and the rape and dearth of more than 100 women. The atrocities along with the liquidation of 406 Palestinians towns and villages, that turned hundreds of thousands of Palestinians into refugees have been largely absent from the earlier historiography of the 1948-49 war (95-96), in fact, the impact of this slander historical record has often shrouded the exact origins of the Arab-Israel conflict, portraying it as one between Israel and Arab nations and not between Israel and a displaced Palestinian people (97).

Ultimately, the year 1948 marked, and still continues to mark, the winding down of the prophetic clock. The historian Charles B. Strozier's study allows an entry to the use of endtime rhetoric. Though the theological basis differs endtime themes seem to be understood and shared by participants. While American Christian fundamentalists supported Israel in all fields, this will be discussed in chapter three.

Chapter Two: The Influence of American Foreign Policy toward Israel

The previous chapter presented the general roots and the wide picture of the Israeli-Palestinian conquest. This chapter, however, illustrates the historic events that shaped the political and socioeconomic atmosphere of the American influence towards Israel, a defining feature of which is that support for Israel goes beyond a pragmatic intention of U.S. interests. This is because the special relationship is grounded on deep cultural foundations that precede not only the creation of pro-Israel organizations but also the mass immigration of Jews to America. Yet beneath the surface these cultural foundations have begun to shift in conflicting directions. A paradox has emerged in the way Americans relate to Israel. On the one hand, Americans identify with Israel and sympathy for Israel remains widespread. Indeed, the American public's sympathy for Israel has surged to new heights. This chapter will analyze such factors and the extent to which they may be relevant in any framework for explaining US foreign policy decision-making.

3.1 The Origins of the US-Israeli Special Relationship

For many decades, political rhetoric and public sentiment has given Israel a special status in American foreign policy that no other state, with the possible exception of Great Britain, has achieved. This section explores the nature of US-Israeli relations, the concept and attributes of a special relationship and examines whether it is indeed valid to describe the US-Israeli relationship as such.

As a starting point for a discussion of what makes an inter-state relationship in some senses “special” we might begin with a quotation from the former US Secretary of State Dean Acheson:

I shall not bother you by doing what is done so often on occasions like this, of talking about all that we have in common: language, history, and all of that. We know all that. What I

wish to stress one thing we have in common, one desperately important thing, and that is we have a common fate (Danchev 1998).

So far, the analysis has observed the concept of the special relationship in general terms. But what of the relationship precisely between Israel and the United States? The Israeli analyst Abraham Ben-Zvi has tried to explore this relationship by comparing what he terms a 'special relationship paradigm' with a 'national interest paradigm', to try to isolate the vague element of 'specialness' (Ben-Zvi 12-27). He claims that the key criteria for defining a special relationship are strength, universality and legitimacy. This means that the relationship must be able to endure conflicts of interest and disagreements, encapsulate all aspects of interaction, be it diplomatic, economic or military and be widely accepted as justified and valid.

Generally, the odd character of the US-Israeli relationship cannot in this view be understood solely in terms of realpolitik. As this next section of the thesis will show, neither balance of power considerations nor the power of the pro-Israel lobby in the US, will suffice to explain the nature and reciprocal interplay of US-Israeli relations. On the other hand, since Ben-Zvi implies that the parameters of the relationship are determined singly and subjectively by the United States.

3.1.1 The Integration of Israel into American Culture

In the post-war years America was viewed as the richest, freest, most powerful and most just nation on earth and it is obvious why Jews would wish to be fully integrated into such a society. The vocabulary used to describe the more unpalatable aspects of American life replicated that more commonly associated with contemporary images of the Holocaust. As American culture began to absorb this new reality and the survivor figure emerged as the hero of culture, Jews were deliberated with the moral prestige of being the ending victims of man's evil.

Notably, Cultural change in American society coincided with new political realities that gradually led to a decrease of the constraints in publicizing the Holocaust. As Ferenc Laczóan assistant professor in history asserted that, by the 1960s, the Cold War mentality that had previously limited public discussion of the Nazi genocide had become so institutionalized that it could no longer be jeopardized by reminders of Second World War alliances. An environment was emerging where Americans were increasingly receptive to the restoration of memories of the Holocaust that were reinforced in the early 1960s when the East German government revealed the Nazi connections of prominent West German officials (Laczó 9). Yet the process through which the Holocaust succeeded in penetrating the layers of American isolationism is complex, and its infiltration into the cultural discourse of society through books, films and television played a crucial role.

Ultimately, For American Jews internalizing this discourse, they imagined Israel is not the actual Israel but an Israel of the mind. The main representation of the Israeli Jew is someone with whom American Jews can identify in contrast to the vision of Jewish impotence of the Holocaust that they wish to cast off. It is this idealized image of Israel that American Jews mobilized to defend. As will be shown, from this moment on the political party's position on Israel became a key electoral issue, with the Democrats coming to be seen as the party of the American Jewish people. It was to be the Democratic President, Harry S. Truman, who pledged full recognition of the State of Israel in July 1948.

3.1.2 Truman and the Recognition of Israel

When on 12 April 1945, Roosevelt died in office, he left a question mark about his true feelings, intents and schedules towards the Jews, the Arabs and Palestine. It was left to Harry S. Truman his successor, to adjust how far the US should go in helping to transform the Jewish national home into the Jewish commonwealth or the Jewish state. Truman's first social associations with American Jews occurred in his hometown of Kansas City, where his

business partner Eddie Jacobson was Jewish. Truman took the opportunity at the Potsdam conference to urge Churchill to lift the White Paper restrictions on Jewish immigration. In the summer of 1945, Truman announced his support of the immigration of 100,000 displaced persons from Europe to Palestine.

On the subject, His stance is generally attributed to a combination of factors: The Holocaust, congressional pressure and the influence of his advisor Sam Rosenman pressing him in the same direction. In his memoirs Truman's position, like that of so many presidents, was one of attempting to reconcile consistent objectives and conflicting views. On the one hand, he was in favor of letting "as many of the Jews into Palestine as it is possible to let into that country" (Truman and Acheson 136), but on the other, he was not prepared to use military force to back up his diplomatic position. As president, he had "no desire to send 500,000 American soldiers ... to make peace in Palestine" (137).

In addition to the above mentioned, in the spring of 1947 the British finished their responsibility for Palestine and Truman instructed the State Department to support the partition plan and the US played an active role in seeking the support of other governments. In his memoirs, Truman described American policy in the following terms:

My purpose was then and later to help bring about the redemption of the pledge of the Balfour Declaration and the rescue of at least some of the victims of Nazism. I was not committed to any particular formula of statehood in Palestine or to any particular time schedule for its accomplishment. The American policy was designed to bring about, by peaceful means, the establishment of the promised Jewish homeland and easy access to it for the displaced Jews of Europe (183-184).

As a final point, Truman, who emotionally supported the Jewish cause in Palestine to recognize Israel. A commitment to keeping the Balfour Declaration and his own Christian

background were of a high order of magnitude in influencing his decision. Hence, the special relationship between the United States and Israel, that Truman was influential in founding, provides the setting against which US foreign policy toward Israel is made. It is not in itself, however, an explanation of foreign policy decision-making which is a product of the contact of a variety of factors. Tel Aviv endeavored to exploit the relationship to secure an increase in arms transfers to balance Soviet weapons supplies to the Arab states. It is to an analysis of the factors that influence this process that we now turn.

3.2 Arms for Israel: The Special Relationship Begins

From the Israeli standpoint, the only way it could compete in the new regional balance of power Moscow was creating in the early 1960s, was by entering the US arms market as a perpetual source of supply. The Israelis quickly moved on to capture the Gaza Strip and Sinai Peninsula and a cabinet message was sent to King Hussein requesting that Jordan remain out of the war. Subsequently, Hussein considered his position to be too vulnerable to note the warning, a decision that cost Jordan East Jerusalem and the West Bank but, ironically, may have saved his kingdom.

At any rate, the irony of the US-Israeli relationship and the strength of Israel's negotiating position was attributable to the highly infiltrated nature of the American political system the explosive nature of the situation was heightened in November 1966 when Israel retaliated against the raids by attacking the Palestinian West Bank village of Es-Samu and killing 30 civilians. As the Director of the Center for Middle East Studies Steven L. Spiegel noted that, Johnson rebuked Eshkol Prime Minister of Israel, for the severity of the attack and reassured King Hussein of his government's commitment to the territorial integrity of his Kingdom. The administration was so angry that another democracy could behave in such a way that in the United Nations, the US ambassador Arthur Goldberg condemned both sides for the use of force (Spiegel 974-78).

Simultaneously with the Israeli-German tank controversy, the United States assumed another initiative that appeared to weaken its commitment to Israel's security. It agreed to supply arms to Jordan. According to Lyndon Johnson Memorandum that, in late 1964, King Hussein of Jordan had also requested weapons supplies from the United States the cost of which was met by Kuwait as a show of solidarity with the Palestinian cause in the 'war' against Israel. The White House believed that it had no choice but to obey to Amman's request because a refusal from Washington would have forced Hussein to look to Moscow for assistance, the effect of which would have been increased Soviet influence in Jordan (Jewish Virtual library).

Given these points, on 17 September, relieved by the US military buildup in the Mediterranean, Hussein ordered his army to move against the fedayeen. In response to the King's actions, Syrian tanks moved into Jordan. Hussein was concerned that Syrian and Iraqi forces would breach the territorial integrity of his state if he moved against the fedayeen. Unbeknown to him, the King's purpose to secure a guarantee of assistance against external aggression was to give a push to the union of a strategic alliance between the United States and Israel, to the eternal disadvantage of the Arabs.

3.2.1 Israel as a Strategic Asset

Israel was the ideal proxy, particularly amongst conservative elites and military officials who admired the nation's military ability and characteristics of self-reliance, democracy and anti-communism. A US response was clearly required to this new development, but following the invasion into Cambodia, the domestic climate was not favorable to American involvement in another regional war, in this case Israel, to enable them to defend regional security on America's behalf, was coming closer to reality.

On 18 September, the Israeli option was finally put to Labor Prime Ministers Yitzhak Rabin and Meir, according to a wiki source editorial that, they were in Washington on an official visit. In confronting the crisis, the perceived interests of the US and Israel converged and, based on its performance in June 1967 and its advocacy of American values, Washington believed it could rely on Jerusalem in a perimeter. The perception of mutual interest was highlighted by the fact that, for the first time, America actually needed Israel to defend its regional position (Ford 6).

Furthermore, in his book "American Policy Toward the Arab-Israeli Conflict", an American scholar William B. Quandt pointed out that, US-Israeli co-operation during the crisis created new examples in the relationship and set against the psychological backdrop of the Nixon Doctrine, Israel attained for a time the wanted status of strategic asset. The speed and success of the speedily negotiated agreements between Kissinger and Rabin testified to the deep understanding and personal association between the two men and the strategic relationship between the two governments (Quandt 122). Jerusalem had shown itself capable of protecting American interests by deterring a full Syrian assault on Amman. Its argument that only a strong Israel could deactivate Soviet influence in the region thus became part of official White House doctrine.

Finally, the Six-Day War broke out, Israel tried to persuade Jordan not to intervene in the war. At first, it carried a message to Jordan via General Odd Bull, head of the UN observers in Jerusalem, and through the U.S. embassy in Amman, Jordan, assuring Jordan that Israel would not attack unless first attacked by Jordan. King Hussein, who believed Egypt's false reports of the Egyptian army's victories in battles with Israel. For this reason, Washington directly aligned with Israel against its Arab enemies and the Soviet Union. Conflict between the Arabs and Israel was seen as part of the broader confrontation between

the two superpowers and the US supported Israel as a means of protection its position in the region. Although the US did not play a direct role in the.

3.2.2 The Six Day War

an-Naksah, "The Setback", On 5 June 1967, Israeli forces launched a surprise attack on Egypt and destroyed the Egyptian air force in its bases on the ground. The Israelis swiftly moved on to capture the Gaza Strip and Sinai Peninsula and a cabinet message was sent to King Hussein demanding that Jordan remain out of the war. Hussein considered his position to be too vulnerable to notice the warning, a decision that cost Jordan East Jerusalem and the West Bank but, ironically, may have saved his kingdom. Israeli troops advanced across the Golan Heights, forcing out terrorist militia and capturing the Syrian town of Quneitra.

In fact, in hostilities with neighboring states, Israel captured the West Bank, including East Jerusalem. The hostilities grew out of tension between Israel and Syria. Charles W. Yost posted in his article entitled "The Arab-Israeli War", that on May 13 Prime Minister Levi Eshkol threatened to invade Syria (Yost). As a matter of fact, according to the U.N. Security Council Official Records, Syria complained to the president of Security Council (1967). On the subject, as Professor John B. Quigley asserted that, Egypt asked the U.N. to remove its peacekeeping force from the Israel-Egypt border, so that Egypt could move against Israel "the moment it might carry out any aggressive action against any Arab country".

In conjunction with the above mentioned, U.N. Secretary General U Thant dragged the U.N. force out of Egypt and asked Israel to accept it on its side of the border as a guard against a possible attack by Egypt, but Israel declined (Quigley 161). Furthermore, Quigley further discussed that, on June 4, 1967, Israel's cabinet authorized an invasion of Egypt (162), and the next day Israel attacked Egypt. Jordan reacted by shooting into Israel around Jerusalem. At

the U.N. Security Council, Egypt charged Israel with aggression, but Israel claimed that Egypt struck first.

Considering, Jordan's military action against Israel was legalized under Article 51 of the U.N. Charter, as an act of the joint defense of Egypt. Mr. John Dugard Professor of International Law emphasized that, Israel's use of force against Jordan was part of its aggression against Egypt, and was therefore illegal. Thus, Israel took East Jerusalem through aggression. Under the U.N. Charter, Article 2, paragraph 4, territory may not be taken by aggression, and once taken must be returned (Dugard 115).

Summarizing this information, Israel captured East Jerusalem by military action, and, under international law, annexation of territory in the course of hostilities does not give title to that territory. This rule applies whether the military action leading to the annexation was hostile or defensive. The United Nations considers East Jerusalem to be territory under Israel's aggressive occupation. Yitzhak Shamir the seventh Prime Minister of Israel, his devotion to greater Israel and opposition to a land for peace solution to the Israeli-Palestinian dispute had a certain resonance with popular images of survivors returning to Eastern Europe and the concept of Israel as a safe haven.

The American Reaction to the Shamir Plan

In May 1989, following discussions with the US administration, Israel openly presented its four-point peace plan. The proposal was typically unclear. It mentioned elections amongst the Arabs of Judea, Samaria and Gaza, but failed to specify which Arabs Israel was prepared to negotiate with and who was going to be arbiter of the debate. Washington had stated its position that the elections be based on a mutually agreed formula, which implied modifications to the Shamir plan and the inclusion of the US as a negotiator with the Palestinians. An Israeli expert in international law Baker also requested that

Israel find a way to allow Palestinians from outside the territories to participate in the elections.

Defense Minister Rabin was willing to allow the electoral participation of East Jerusalem Arabs with the provision that they voted outside the public boundaries. It was assumed that this would set a precedent whereby they could express their political rights in the territories and not in Jerusalem itself which would remain an undivided part of Israel. Shamir, in representing the Likud-National Liberal Movement (a Centre-right to right-wing political party in Israel) position, took his opposition to Baker's proposal to the Israeli people. In a speech to the Likud faction of the Knesset, he opposed the participation of Arabs resident in East Jerusalem in elections and declared that Israel would never surrender territory to the Arabs (Joel and Hajjar 2014).

Additionally, it was this that provoked Baker to deliver what was to become a highly controversial speech to the Aipac convention in an attempt to restore American integrity as an 'honest broker'. Baker's speech began with shared democratic values and strategic partnership between the two countries but then hit a conflicting note when he spoke of the future of the occupied territories and the missing element in the Shamir peace plan. He spoke of "territorial withdrawal" (Mitchell 200), as the potential peak of negotiations and then, making an obvious reference to the ideology of Shamir, asserted that:

For Israel, now is the time to lay aside, once and for all, the unrealistic vision of greater Israel. Israeli interests in the West Bank and Gaza - security and otherwise - can be accommodated in a settlement based on Resolution 242. Forswear annexation. Stop settlement activity. ... Reach out to Palestinians who deserve political rights. We have to work in phases and at this phase the less we deal with the principles of a permanent solution the better (Baker 1989).

Finally, in conjunction to what have been established in the previous chapter; the Likud Central Committee demanded that Shamir attach four explicit conditions to his plan: No East Jerusalemites be permitted to participate in elections, the Intifada be terminated before the convening of elections, Israeli settlement activity be continued and no tract of land be renounced. The Likud modifications to the Shamir plan increased tensions within the Labor-Likud union and even Rabin began to question the utility of continuing under the new conditions. However, in order to protect Israel's remaining credibility in Washington, Shamir resolved the crisis by dropping the changes to his original plan.

Chapter Three: Trump's Move towards Jerusalem and its ramifications

After the 1948 war, Israel controlled the western part of Jerusalem, while the eastern part was under the Jordanian control, including the Old City, Al-Aqsa Mosque and Dome of the Rock. After its victory in the Six-Day War in 1967, Israel occupied East Jerusalem and declared both parts, east and west, as its 'united and eternal capital'. When Israel adopted the Jerusalem Law in 1980, which declared Jerusalem 'complete and united' as the capital of Israel. On November 29, 1947 the UN General Assembly adopted Resolution 181 dividing Palestine into two states of the Jews and Palestinians.

In any case it has to be taken into account that there was a decision by the US Congress back in 1995 to establish, the Jerusalem Embassy Act requiring that the US Embassy to be transferred from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem. However, that act has not been implemented, a provision that allow them to postpone the decision, notion that Jerusalem issue must be resolved in the context of a final negotiation between Israeli and the Palestinians. But why has trump broken this consensus?

Before moving forward, part of the question has been answered in the previous chapter on US-Israeli relationship. Specifically, after the Six Day War 1967, Israel become for the US a "strategic asset" in the region, part two of the question will be answered in the next section of this chapter.

4.1 The history and politics behind trump's Jerusalem decision

In 20 years, each American president exercised the law's waiver, refusing to move the U.S. Embassy to Jerusalem or to recognize Jerusalem as Israel's capital city. The president's motive was that, delaying would advance the cause of peace. On December 6th President Donald Trump announced that he was reversing decades of U.S policy vis-à-vis the Israeli capital, declaring that the U.S recognized Jerusalem as Israel's capital city. The president also

announced that had ordered the State department to begin work to relocate the U.S Embassy to Tel Aviv to the Israeli capital.

In his article, the reporter Yishai Schwartz stated that, in December 2017, President Trump recognized Jerusalem as Israel's capital and pledged to move the U.S. embassy from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem. These actions represented an exit from the long U.S. executive branch practice of not recognizing Israeli authority over Jerusalem or any part of it (Schwartz 2017). In addition, the President pointed to the Jerusalem Embassy Act of 1995 (P.L.104-45) as a significant factor in the policy change. The western part of Jerusalem that Israel has controlled since 1948 has assisted as the official seat of its government since shortly after its founding as a state. Israel officially considers to be its capital (Israel).

Furthermore, in his December remarks, President Trump specified that he was not taking a position on "specific boundaries of the Israeli sovereignty in Jerusalem," and would remain to consider the city's final status to be subject to Israeli-Palestinian negotiations (Tbilisi 2017). However, to the statement from the white-house he did not obviously mention Palestinian aspirations regarding Jerusalem; Palestinians envisage East Jerusalem as the capital of their future state. In a February 2018 interview, the President said that he would support specific boundaries as agreed upon by both sides (Trump 2018). He also has called on all parties to maintain the "status quo" arrangement at Jerusalem's holy sites.

Finally, Since Trump has yielded to Israel, there is strong possibility the Palestinian will be inclined towards the Europeans to assume leadership in future peace talks. The Jerusalem question is most likely to shape a new inclusive front including Arabs, Persians, Muslims, Christians, Sunnis, Shiites, Islamists, modernists, moderates, and nationalists. Hence, the next flare of violence will derive from the religiosity of politics and the sacrifice of defending the religious sites on both sides.

4.1.1 The Jerusalem act of 1995

Congressional leaders have been clear to ensure that U.S. policy recognizes Jerusalem as the capital of Israel. One example: On Oct 24, 1995, Rep. Peter Deutch, a Florida Democrat, rose “in support of H.R. 1595, which is a piece of legislation that will facilitate a long-unpaid movement of the United States Embassy in Israel from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem. This is the only Embassy in the world, American Embassy, that is not in the capital that is designated by the country that the Embassy is in” (Cong 1995).

We need not to remind that the Act was intended to recognize that Jerusalem is the capital of Israel (Pub. L. 104-45). In addition, the law was adopted by the Senate 93-5, and the House tally was 374-37. The legislation became public law on November 8, 1995, it is fair to say that President Trump has done nothing more than operationalize this overwhelming Congressional sentiment (Rec 165). The Act permits the President to waive the budget cut for successive six-month periods if the President determines it is necessary to protect the "national security interests of the United States.

Moreover, Congress expressed this two-party sentimentality again in 2017. Senate Resolution 176, a resolution commemorating the 50th anniversary of the reunification of Jerusalem was approved in the Senate on June 5, 2017 (Cong 95). It praised Israel's commitment to religious freedom and its administration of the holy sites in Jerusalem. The resolution reaffirmed: (1) that it is long-standing U.S. two-party policy that the lasting status of Jerusalem remains a matter to be decided between the parties through final status negotiations towards a two-state solution; and (2) the Jerusalem Embassy Act of 1995 as U.S. law, and calls upon the president and all U.S. officials to stand by its requirements (176). The vote was 90-0.

President Trump already has instructed the State Department to begin preparations to move the American Embassy from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem. In his article Nahal Toosi, noted that, some opponents of the announcement warned of catastrophic reactions in what is sometimes called the Muslim world (Toosi 2017). There were predictions that there would be another intifada in Gaza and the West Bank. There were those who attempted to incite such an uprising. But while protests were reported in a number of countries Jordan, Pakistan, and Malaysia, among them their size and duration did not live up to the predictions.

In sum, the waiver requirements of the Jerusalem Embassy Act should be taken broadly. The Act should be read to give the President broad decision to determine whether moving the Embassy to Jerusalem implicates "national security interests of the United States". The President, not the Congress, has the power of recognition, and the location of the United States Embassy to Israel has inevitable implications for United States recognition policy.

4.2.1 The resolution of 181

"The city of Jerusalem shall be established as a *corpus separatum* under a special international regime and shall be administered by the United Nations, which will protect and preserve the unique spiritual religious interest located in the city of the three monotheistic religions across the world" (Res 181).

On 29 November 1947, the emerging UN General Assembly (UNGA) adopted Resolution 181. This would go down as the infamous partition plan that proposed carving Palestine into separate Arab and Jewish states with Jerusalem as a *corpus separatum* under international control.

Initially, it also recognized the United Nations Palestine Commission (UNPC) to implement the plan. Under the resolution, the British would completely evacuate Palestine by

August 1948; civilian control of Palestine would steadily be moved from the British to the UNPC and, subsequently, to the two new states and armed militia to be completed by 1 October 1948, this latter would dismiss in general elections and full independence for the states (U. N. 181), the commission attempted to implement the partition plan from New York.

Yet, the British saw Jerusalem administratively united with Palestine, because it retained spiritual religious significance, but far from being a separate entity, it was the capital of Mandatory Palestine. Its centrality was reflected in the actions of the Palestinian nationalist and Zionist movements at this time. Scholars such as Ian Black and Benny Morris emphasized that, the first Palestine Arab Congress was held in Jerusalem in 1919; it subsequently met again in the city in 1921 and 1928. Meanwhile the Jewish Agency chose to house its headquarters in Jerusalem, on land bought in the same year that the British Mandate was formalized (Black and Morris 4). The importance of the city rests exactly on the kind that, far from being separate, it lay at the heart of Palestine.

To sum, Resolution 181 weakened Palestine national claims to Jerusalem and, accordingly, contributed to the destruction of the people's political rights. That is to say, it must thus be considered when evaluating Resolution 181, which is most precisely understood as a move not only to divide Palestine in two but also to detach and transmute its most sacred and central city. As the head of the State of Palestine Mahmoud Abbas observed, the UN has been part of Palestine's fate since its creation in 1945. If the earlier role of the League of Nations via the British Mandate is also considered, it could be argued that international institutions have played a role in determining events in Palestine for almost a century, often as a cover for colonial and neo-colonial plans (Khalidi 2016).

5.2 Trumps promises

Trump's move has been anticipated since his presidential victory at the end of 2016. His electoral platform included a key promise to move the U.S. Embassy from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem. To help capture the shades of U.S. President Trump's decision to recognize Jerusalem as the capital of Israel and to move the American embassy from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem, one needs to consider politics is not only domestic, but also personal.

In his short address at the White House, in accordance to the Guardian Newspaper Trump enthusiastically emphasized that "while previous Presidents have made this a major campaign promise, they failed to deliver. Today, I am delivering" (Beaumont 2017), in reference to the Jerusalem Embassy Act, which had been passed by the 104th Congress on October 23, 1995.

Notably, one day after Donald Trump's address the Republican Jewish Committee the Republican Jewish Committee in the New York Times, a full-page ad slogan, depicting Mr. Trump praying at the Western Wall, stating "President Trump, You Promised. You Delivered. Thank you for courageously recognizing Jerusalem as Israel's Eternal Capital" (Freedland 2017). Ironically out of the 282 promises he made during his presidential campaign, Trump chose probably the most debatable and instable issue in Middle Eastern chaos.

Additionally, Sheldon Gary Adelson is an American business magnate, and Republican donor, he briefed the president After attended a private meeting with him in his Tower in New York, about the Zionist Organization of America, Morton A. Klein, about Trump's determination to move the American Embassy from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem since it was to him "a major priority", and "something that's in his heart and soul" (Landler 2017). Moreover, Sheldon himself donated \$20 million to a pro-Trump political action committee with the objective of swaying the United States recognition of Jerusalem as the

capital of Israel. Moving the embassy from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem is likely to increase Trump's admiration among these circles(Usher 2018).

On the subject, a combination of complex factors played an important role in shaping Trump's decision. Domestically,the internal situation in the United States was not the only factor that shaped Trump's decision on, for instance, Trump and his administration were counting on absorbing the rage of his major Arab allies, especially Egypt and Saudi Arabia, which need U.S. support within their particular internal tensions. While Saudi Crown Prince Mohammed bin Salman needs U.S. support to contain his internal opponents and inaugurate his leadership in the kingdom (Awadallah 2019).

Another contributing factor was Trump's meetings with the representatives of the various evangelical Christian groups who urged him to take action about the status of the U.S. embassy in Israel. For instance, President of the Family Research Council, Tony Perkins, recalls that during the meetings he attended "it was clearly communicated that evangelicals and Bible-believing Christians see a special relationship with Israel (Foreign policy 5).

Also, in 2003 the Trump Foundation donated \$10,000 to schools in the religious West Banksettlement. President Trump's son-in-law and senior adviser Jared Kushner's familyfoundation has also made charitable donations to West Bank settlements. These donations were made mostly to schools and religiousyeshivaswhich is a Jewish educational institution that focuses on the study of traditional religious texts (Maltz 2016).

Nevertheless, on January 2, 2018, theadministration threatened to cut part of the \$700 million in annual aid it provides to the PalestinianAuthority(Gearan 2018). Even though, President Trump grieve that despite the hundreds of millions of dollars a year that the U.S. puts into Palestinian coffers, the U.S. gets "no appreciation or respect"(Miller and Colvin 2018). He further stated: "They don't even want to negotiate a long overdue peace treaty with

Israel”. Palestinian officials responded by calling Mr. Trump “not a serious man” (Rasgon 04). Still, Abbas advisor Ahmed Majdalani reportedly said: “We will sever all ties with the Americans,” and “this means the end of the peace process and the U.S. role there” (Rumley 2017).

Besides, the Palestinians in general does not trust the American administration to be a candid broker for negotiations, specifically after the declaration to recognize Jerusalem as Israel’s capital. According to Palestinian Center for Policy and Survey Research, 88% view the US sided in favor of Israel, and 65% are against the renewal of contacts with the administration that were postponed following the Jerusalem declaration. A slim majority of 51% say that if the US submits a peace plan, the so-called “deal of the century” (PCPSR 2018).

Finally, Trump justified his decision to declare Jerusalem as the capital of Israel by implementing the law passed by Congress in 1995. The law states that Jerusalem should remain united and should be recognized as the capital of Israel. Considering, his plans to change the status in Jerusalem will, most likely, be counterproductive. Any future role of the United States as an impartial mediator in a peace process is likely to be weakened, and the up-to-date administration’s strategy in the Middle East will be delayed, especially if the Palestinian people decide to build up their efforts to invalidate the decision by activating popular resistance, hence, the next section will assess the consequences of Trump’s decision.

5.2.1 The ramification of the decision

The fate of the city of Jerusalem has been a vital and delicate issue in the Palestinian-Israeli peace talks; its discussion has been deferred to the final-status negotiations due to its religious and political significance of the various parties to the conflict. The change in the status quo, after Trump’s decision, will have a deep symbolic interpretation and will be

considered as an enhancement to Israeli authority at the expense of Palestinian rights in the city.

First of all, as stated in the Washington-Post during his campaign, Trump vowed to be a “true friend to Israel,” and the United States would “be working with Israel very closely, very, very closely”(Johnson 2016). In the hope that, these obligations to Jewish-American organizations and support for Israeli strategic interests have helped him construct a conviction of an occasionally-principled President, whereas he acts as a realist seducer with neo-Machiavellism in other less intricate issues. Christopher Ruddy, conservative news media executive, praises what he perceives as Trump’s bold drive of logic; “People are waking up to the fact that the President doesn’t see grays and doesn’t like pastels. He is very proud that he’s fulfilled so many campaign promises, and the embassy decision is another notch on his belt” (Landler).

By the same token, the Palestinian Authority President Mahmoud Abbas said the decision was “tantamount to the U.S. abdicating its role as a peace mediator”(Staff 2017). Even more, in their “Israeli Lobby and U.S. foreign Policy” book published ten years ago, Mearsheimer and Walt considered the lobby as a “loose coalition of individuals and organizations who actively work to steer U.S. foreign policy in a pro-Israel direction”(Mearsheimer and Walt 113). They further asserted that, the Adelsons and other Jewish-American financiers have succeeded effectively in convincing Trump to move in that direction. They are amid a larger group of pro-Israel lobbyists including Jewish Americans, Christian Zionists, and groups from the political right with an overlay with neo-fundamentalists(128-132).

Trump has apparently shifted from his hard-hitting bargaining art of the deal to a rather lavish art of giveaways. Thomas Friedman, veteran observer of the United States foreign policy for nearly 30 years, explains that:

Trump is susceptible to such giveaways, not only because he is ignorant, but because he does not see himself as the President of the United States. He sees himself as the President of his base. And because that's the only support he has left, he feels the need to keep feeding his base by fulfilling crude, ill-conceived promises he threw out to them during the campaign. I've never seen a President give up so much to so many for so little, starting with China and Israel (Friedman).

Indeed, the Saudi reaction was conspicuously indifferent. King Salman, arguably the most influential Arab leader in the region, condemned Trump's decision. However, it had been reported that the kingdom had been urging Palestinian President Abbas to accept a weak peace plan, which might not have included East Jerusalem as a future capital of Palestine. During the protests which followed Trump's announcement, Palestinians in Beit Hanoun, Gaza, burned American, Israeli, and Saudi flags (Kate). As of writing, the American administration has made the ambitious claim that it will move the American Embassy to Jerusalem by May 14th, 2018, to commemorate Israel's 70th anniversary of statehood (Labott and Koran 2019).

However, despite disapprovals from every Arab and Muslim world leader of the Trump administration's decision, Palestinians viewed the overall Arab response as inadequate. When asked how satisfied they were with the Arab world's response, 73.4% of Palestinians claimed to be either "very dissatisfied" or "somewhat dissatisfied" opposed to 24.4% who were either "very satisfied" or "somewhat satisfied" (Poll No. 91). During the April protests along the Gaza border meant to confirm the Palestinians' right to return to their homes inside Israel, Palestinians burned photos of Mohammad bin Salman, in addition to Israeli and American flags (Tarnapolsky).

Moreover, the Guardian post that Jerusalem presents a great opening for Iran and its allies (Hizballah and the Syrian regime) to assemble against the United States and recover

their image in the eyes of the Sunni Muslim world. However, the increase of Iran does not seem to go beyond the level of burning statements because of Iran's desire to uphold the nuclear deal with the United States (Holmes 2019). Similarly, Critics in the Middle East argue that Trump has destroyed America's neutrality and status as an honest broker in the peace process. From their perspective, recognizing Jerusalem as Israel's capital has probably gutted any prospects that this administration would be able to jump-start the long-stalled Israeli-Palestinian talks (Khan 2017).

In September 2018, the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) filed suit to have the International Court of Justice (ICJ) order the United States to remove its embassy from Jerusalem (America). Subsequently, the suit is based on the PLO argument that the 1961 Vienna Convention of Diplomatic Relations necessitates a country to locate its embassy on the territory of a host state. In response, the Trump Administration withdrew in October from the Convention's optional protocol, which gives the ICJ jurisdiction to hear disputes arising from the Convention (Kattan 2018).

Conclusion

This last chapter comes out to the real motivations for Trump to go ahead with the declaration of his decision on Jerusalem, despite the disapproval of his senior advisers to the National Security Council. Trump tried to make his decision in agreement with the 1995 Jerusalem Embassy Act. He did not hesitate to insinuate his three predecessors did not have the courage to carry the decision. The issue for Trump is that he made a promise as a candidate, which he believes he has to fulfill, unlike his predecessors. Simply by virtue of how it was decided to simply move the embassy, Trump's decision to recognize Jerusalem as Israel's capital and direct the State Department to start preparations for the embassy transfer is important. He broke with over 20 years of policy pursued by his three predecessors, who avoided the move until a peace settlement was reached.

General Conclusion

Jerusalem is a city which is in modern-day Israel and is considered as one of the Holiest Places in the world. Jerusalem is a place of immense respect and reverie for the world's largest three religions: Judaism (religion of Jews), Islam and Christianity, and both Israel and Palestine have always considered Jerusalem as their capital city. Because of all these said religions, especially Muslims and Jews, ferocious battles have taken place between both said peoples to control the city and Holy Places within the city, for thousands of years.

Primarily, during the First World War, the British government, marking at creating promises in strategic regions of the Middle East, reached agreements with Arabs and Zionists regarding Palestine, even more, in which the Jews would be supported by the British with the aim of establishing their own, after tons of negotiations, such agreement was officialized by the Balfour Declaration, in 1917, which is also pointed as being one of the main advocates of the conflict among Arabs and Jews.

Particularly, Jerusalem was divided into two parts, in the first 20 years of Israel's existence and independence. The Western portion belonged to Israel, while Jordan took control of East Jerusalem. After the 1967 Six-Day War, Israel occupied all of Jerusalem. Till now. It is also vital to note up-to-date American actions related to the conflict. The United Nations has been dealing with the Palestinian situation since the very creation of the organization. One can see resolutions regarding the topic since 1947, as the already mentioned Resolution 181 (1947) of the UN General Assembly, which defined the partition of the territory into two States, one Jewish and another Arab.

Furthermore, the status of Jerusalem is a sensitive issue for the Israeli-Palestinian conflict as both parts aim at defining it as their capital city. On December 6th 2017, the US president Donald Trump finally announced the US recognition of Jerusalem as the capital of

Israel. The declaration came after weeks of suspense whether Trump would honor his campaign bid or follow former US presidents' foreign policy. The announcement unleashed protests and demonstrations throughout the Muslim world and condemnation from many countries. Jerusalem is the Holy land for three religions Christianity, Islam and Judaism, therefore, it is not a consensus that the city should belong to a Jewish State.

Having said this, it's worth adding that Trump's announcement came 100 years after Lord Balfour's promise to establish a Jewish homeland in Palestine. Both Balfour and Trump gave away what they didn't own. President Trump presented his decision as an effort to make a first-time act to step in the right direction of the peace process. Yet he did not present a strategic inclusive plan to end the Israeli occupation and resolve the conflict. He failed when he spoke about Jerusalem as the capital of Israel and made no clear mention of the Palestinians' national right to Jerusalem, whereas everybody knows that without East Jerusalem as the capital of the State of Palestine, no Palestinian will pledge to peace with Israel.

To conclude, His Jerusalem decision has undermined his credibility in the eyes of more a billion of Muslims, Christians, and Arabs as well as Europeans, and will extend the anti-Americanism sentimentality in the Middle East, Africa, Asia, and even in Europe. Any future role of the United States as a neutral mediator in the peace process will weaken further. Above all these dynamics future scenarios, the deal-maker president moved in his address from recognizing Jerusalem as the capital of Israel to anticipate the likelihood of reaching an upcoming 'deal of the century'.

Works Cited

- 176, S. Res. 2017. <<https://www.congress.gov/115/bills/sres/176/BILLS-115sres176ats.pdf>>.
- 181, General Assembly Resolution. *Future Government of Palastein*. 29 November 1947.
- 181, United Nations General Assembly Resolution. *political and Diplomatic Documents*. Gedalia Yoges and Yehoshua Freundlich, 1947. City of Jerusalem .
- 1967, Resolution 237. "unscr." 14 june 1967. 16 August 2019. <<http://unscr.com/en/resolutions/237>>.
- 1995, Jerusalem Embassy Act of. n.d. 104 U.S.C. <<https://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/PLAW-104publ45/html/PLAW-104publ45.htm>>.
- 6), Statement by President Trump on Jerusalem (December. "U.S. Embassy Tbilisi." 06 December 2017. 22 August 2019. <<https://ge.usembassy.gov/statement-president-trump-jerusalem-december-6/>>.
- Albion Ross. "Jordan and Palestine Remain Separate Entities." *New York Times* (1990): NP. <<https://www.nytimes.com/1990/09/16/opinion/l-jordan-and-palestine-remain-separate-entities-505890.html>>.
- America, State of Palestine v. United States of. 28 september 2018. < <https://www.icj-cij.org/files/case-related/176/176-20180928-APP-01-00-EN.pdf>>.
- Assembly, General. "unispal." 9 December 1949. 04 08 2019. <<https://unispal.un.org/DPA/DPR/unispal.nsf/0/2669D6828A262EDB852560E50069738A>>.
- Awadallah, Alia. "Can't Buy Mohammed bin Salman Love." (2019). <<https://foreignpolicy.com/2019/07/11/cant-buy-mohammad-bin-salman-love-biden-buttigieg-campaign-donations-saudi-uae-lobbyists/>>.
- Baz, Abdul Aziz bin Abdullah bin. *English Translation of Majmoo' al-Fatawa of Sh. Ibn Baz*. Ed. Muhammad AbdulRaof. Trans. www.alifta.net - The Website of The General Presidency for the departments of Scientific Research and Ifta - Riyadh. 2nd Edition. Vol. 30. slamhouse Website, n.d. <<https://islamhouse.com/en/books/402981/>>.
- Beaumont, Peter. "Israel braced for clashes following Trump's recognition of Jerusalem as capital." *theguardian* (2017). <<https://www.theguardian.com/world/2017/dec/07/jerusalem-un-security-council-us-recognition-jerusalem-donald-trump-israel-capital>>.
- Ben-Zvi, Abraham. *The United States and Israel: The Limits of the Special Relationship*. Chichester, West Sussex: Columbia University Press, n.d.
- Chomsky, Noam. *Fateful Traingle The United States, Israel, and the Palestinians* . Ed. Pluto Press. London SE12 8AJ: British Library Cataloguing, 1999. <www.elecbook.com >.
- Cohn-Sherbok, Dan. *A Popular Dictionary of Judaism*. Ed. 1995 Psychology Press. n.d.
- Colvin, Zeke Mille Jill. "Trump Threatens to Cut Off US Aid to Palestinian Authority." *Associated Press* (2018). <<https://www.apnews.com/014efbb86511429d9c09c818a76f58e0>>.

- Curtiss, Samuel. *Primitive Semitic Religion Today*. Ed. 2005 Kessinger Publishing. n.d.
- Dalton, Hugh. *High tide and after, 1945-1960*. Vols. Volume 3 de Memoirs, Hugh Dalton Baron Dalton. Michigan University, 2008.
- Danchev, Alex. *Specialness: Essays in Anglo-American Relations*. New York: St. Martin's Press: St. Antony's Series, 1998.
- Davies, William David. "The Territorial Dimension of Judaism." Davies, W. D. Vol. Volume 23 of Quantum books. University of California Press, 1982, n.d. 169.
- Dugard, John. "Recognition and The United Nation." Vol. Vol 3. 1987. 4 vols. <<https://heinonline.org/HOL/LandingPage?handle=hein.journals/tilj24&div=28&id=&page=>>>.
- Eastern, Near. "Lyndon Johnson Administration: Memorandum on Latest Developments on Jordan Arms Problem." 13 February 1965.
- Fitzsimons, Matthew Anthony. *Empire by treaty: Britain and the Middle East in the twentieth century*. illustrated. the University of Michigan: University of Notre Dame Press, 1964, 7 Jul 2006.
- Ford, Henry Kissinger, Yitzhak Rabin & Simcha Dinitz. "President Ford–Henry Kissinger–Yitzhak Rabin memcon." *wikisource* 12 September 1974: 6. National Security Adviser. Memoranda of Conversations. <[https://en.wikisource.org/wiki/President_Ford%E2%80%93Henry_Kissinger%E2%80%93Yitzhak_Rabin_memcon_\(September_12,_1974\)>](https://en.wikisource.org/wiki/President_Ford%E2%80%93Henry_Kissinger%E2%80%93Yitzhak_Rabin_memcon_(September_12,_1974)>)>.
- Freedland, Jonathan. "Donald Trump's Jerusalem statement is an act of diplomatic arson." *the guardian* (2017). <<https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2017/dec/06/donald-trump-jerusalem-statement-capital-israel-middle-east>>.
- Freedman, David Noel. *The Unity of the Hebrew*. 1st Edition. Michigan: University of Michigan 1991, 1991.
- Friedman, Thomas L. "Trump, Israel and the Art of the Giveaway." *The Newyork Times* (n.d.). <<https://www.nytimes.com/2017/12/06/opinion/trump-foreign-policy-giveaway.html?action=click&pgtype=Homepage&clickSource=story-heading&module=opinion-c-col-left-region®ion=opinion-c-col-left-region&WT.nav=opinion-c-col-left-region>>.
- Fromkin, David. *A Peace to End All Peac*. New York, New York 10011: Henry Holt and Company, LL C, n.d.
- Gearan, Anne. "Trump threatens to take away more U.S. aid from Palestinians if they don't negotiate with Israel,?" *The Washington Post* (2018). <https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/trump-threatens-to-take-awaymore-us-aid-from-palestinians-if-they-dont-negotiate-with-israel/2018/01/25/a927e02a-01e3-11e8-8acfad2991367d9d_story.html?utm_term=.c92ff94dabfb>.

- Hajdu, Maya Margit. "The Holy City: Celebrating Religious Festivals in Jerusalem." *The Culturetrip* (2019). <<https://theculturetrip.com/middle-east/israel/articles/the-holy-city-celebrating-religious-festivals-in-jerusalem/>>.
- Hajjar, Joel Beinin and Lisa. *Palestine, Israel and the Arab-Israeli Conflict*. Washington, DC: the Middle East Research & Information Project., n.d. <<https://merip.org/palestine-israel-primer/>>.
- Harry Truman, Dean Acheson. *Affection and Trust_ The Personal Correspondence of Harry S. Truman*. New York and Canada by Random House of Canada Limited, Toronto: Alfred A. Knopf, 1953–1971.
- History. "State of Israel proclaimed." 09 february 2010. 05 August 2019. <<https://www.history.com/this-day-in-history/state-of-israel-proclaimed>>.
- Holmes, Oliver. "UN calls for 'maximum restraint' after alleged Israeli strike in Lebanon." *The Guardian* (2019). <<https://www.theguardian.com/world/2019/aug/26/israel-accused-of-targeting-iran-allies-in-lebanon-bombing>>.
- Ian Black, Benny Morris. "Israel's Secret Wars: A History of Israel's Intelligence Services." London: Hamish Hamilton 1991, n.d. <www.mfa.gov.il/mfa/mfa-archive/1999/pages/focus%20on%20israel-%20jerusalem%20-%20architecture%20in%20the%20b.aspx>.
- Israel, The Capital of. n.d. the State of Israel 2013. <<https://mfa.gov.il/mfa/aboutisrael/state/pages/jerusalem%20-%20capital%20of%20israel.aspx>>.
- Jim Baker 1989 AIPAC speech*. Perf. American Israel Public Affairs - Part 2. 2019 National Cable Satellite Corporation. C-Span Network, n.d. <<https://www.c-span.org/video/?c4532888/jim-baker-1989-aipac-speech>>.
- John J. Mearsheimer, Stephen M. Walt. *"The Israel Lobby and U.S. Foreign Policy*. 1st Edition. Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2008.
- Johnson, y Jenna. "I will give you everything.' Here are 282 of Donald Trump's campaign promises." 28 November 2016. <https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/i-will-give-you-everything-here-are-282-of-donald-trumps-campaign-promises/2016/11/24/01160678-b0f9-11e6-8616-52b15787add0_story.html>.
- Kate. *Mondoweis*. 09 July 2019. <<https://mondoweiss.net/2019/07/bullet-fragments-palestinian/>>.
- Kattan, Victor. "Palestine Declares (Legal) War on the United States of America." (2018). <<https://www.haaretz.com/middle-east-news/.premium-palestine-declares-legal-war-on-the-united-states-of-america-1.6527711>>.
- Kaufman, Asher S. "Where the Ancient Temple of Jerusalem Stood." n.d. <<https://www.baslibrary.org/biblical-archaeology-review/9/2/2>>.
- Keeler, Annabel. *Abraham's Children: Jews, Christians and Muslims in Conversation*. Ed. 2005 A&C Black. Norman Solomon, Richard Harries, Timothy Winter, n.d.

- Khalidi, Rashid. *Palestinian Identity: The Construction of Modern National Consciousness*. Ed. American Council of Learned Societies. illustrated, reprint. Columbia University Press, 2009, n.d.
- . "SOAS." *The Hundred Year War in Palestine*. Ed. Russell Square: College Buildings. Prod. Centre for Palestine Studies. Columbia University, 11 March 2016. August 2019. <<https://www.soas.ac.uk/lmei-cps/events/11mar2016-the-hundred-year-war-in-palestine.html>>.
- Khan, Muqtadar. "After Trump's Jerusalem Declaration, What Next?" (2017). <<https://www.cgpolicy.org/articles/after-trumps-jerusalem-declaration-what-next/>>.
- Laczó, Ferenc. "The Europeanization of Holocaust remembrance." *Eurozine* n.d. <<https://www.eurozine.com/the-europeanization-of-holocaust-remembrance/>>.
- Landler, Mark. "For Trump, an Embassy in Jerusalem Is a Political Decision, Not a Diplomatic One." *the New York Times* (2017). <<https://www.nytimes.com/2017/12/06/us/politics/trump-embassy-jerusalem-israel.html?hp&action=click&pgtype=Homepage&clickSource=story-heading&module=first-column-region®ion=top-news&WT.nav=top-news>>.
- Maltz, Judy. *a Jewish educational institution that focuses on the study of traditional religious texts*. Comp. FUDforum 2.7.7. 2001-2007 FUD Forum Bulletin Board Software. 06, 8:45 AM December 2016. <<http://www.the-boondocks.org/forum/index.php?t=msg&goto=238895&>>.
- Massey, W.T. *How Jerusalem was Won: Being the Record of Allenby's Campaign in Palestine*. London: Constable and Company, 1919. <<http://www.gutenberg.org/ebooks/10098>>.
- Mills, E. *Census of Palestine 1931. Population of villages, towns and administrative areas*. Ed. Census Of Palestine 1931. UK crown copyright, 1998. <<https://archive.org/details/CensusOfPalestine1931.PopulationOfVillagesTownsAndAdministrativeAreas>>.
- Mitchell, Thomas G. "Israel's Security Men: The Arab-Fighting Political Careers of Moshe Dayan, Yitzhak Rabin, Ariel Sharon and Ehud Barak." McFarland, 2014, n.d. 256.
- No, -67 Public Opinion Poll. 01 April 2018. Palestinian Center for Policy and Survey Research (PSR). <<http://www.pcpsr.org/en/node/725>>.
- Pappe, Ilan. *The Ethnic Cleansing of Palestine*. Ed. Thomson. Oneworld Publications Limited 2006, 2006.
- Perowne, Stewart Henry. "Temple of Jerusalem." n.d.
- Policy, Foreign. "Support For President Trump's Decision To Recognize Jerusalem As Israel's Capital." WhiteHouse, 2017. <<https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefings-statements/support-president-trumps-decision-recognize-jerusalem-israels-capital/>>.
- Quandt, William B. *Decade of Decisions: American Policy Toward the Arab-Israeli Conflict, 1967-1976*. University of California Press, 1977, n.d. <<https://books.google.dz/books?id=5CgBKRxP3twC&pg=PR3&dq=Quandt+Decade+>>

o+f+Decisions&hl=ar&source=gbs_selected_pages&cad=2#v=onepage&q=Quandt%20Decade%20o%20f%20Decisions&f=false>.

Quigley, John B. "Palestine and Israel: A Challenge to Justice." Quigley, John B. Duke University Press, 1990, n.d. 337. <<https://books.google.dz/books?id=xANtAAAAMAAJ&pg=PA300&lpg=PA300&dq=Asher+Wallfish,+%22Meir+Reveals+Text+of+War+Decision%22,+Jerusalem+Post&source=bl&ots=TjBOiDgUbL&sig=ACfU3U06HkKD0A4TlqZyzN00XBGz5jPScA&hl=ar&sa=X&ved=2ahUKEwiw8PCV9IXkAhUG1BoKHaIHAY8Q6AE>>.

Rankin, Nicholas. *A Genius for Deception: How Cunning Helped the British Win Two World Wars*. Oxford University Press, 2009, n.d. <<https://books.google.dz/books?id=wOfQCwAAQBAJ&pg=PA116&lpg=PA116&dq=The+attention+of+the+press+is+again+drawn+to+the+undesirability+of+publishing+any+article,+paragraph+or+picture+suggesting+that+military+operations+against+Turkey+are+in+any+sense+a+Holy+>>>.

Rasgon, Adam. "Abbas Adviser: Trump's Twitter Storm on Aid Has Absolutely No Justification." *The Jerusalem Post (Israel)* (2017). <<http://www.jpost.com/Arab-Israeli-Conflict/Abbas-adviser-Trumps-Twitter-stormon-aid-has-absolutely-no-justification-532695>>.

Rec, 141 Cong. 1995. <<https://www.congress.gov/crec/1995/10/24/CREC-1995-10-24.pdf>>.

—. 1995. <5> (<<https://www.congress.gov/crec/1995/10/24/CREC-1995-10-24.pdf>>).

Rec, 163 Cong. 2017. <<https://www.congress.gov/crec/2017/06/05/CREC-2017-06-05.pdf>>.

"Riots Break Out in Jerusalem's Old City During the Muslim Nebi Musa Festival." 2019.

Rumley, Grant. "Mahmoud Abbas Doesn't Have a Trump Strategy." *Foreign Policy* (2017). <<http://foreignpolicy.com/2018/01/03/mahmoud-abbas-doesnt-have-a-trump-strategy/>>.

Schwartz, Yishai. "How to Move the U.S. Embassy to Jerusalem." 30 November 2017. 22 August 2019. <<https://foreignpolicy.com/2017/11/30/how-to-move-the-u-s-embassy-to-jerusalem/>>.

Seikal, May. *Transformation of an Arab Society*. I.B.Tauris, 2002, n.d. 06 August 2019. <https://books.google.dz/books?id=XO4ECBQfh2oC&pg=PA1&dq=Bahri,+Tarikh+Haifa&hl=ar&source=gbs_toc_r&cad=3#v=onepage&q=Bahri%2C%20Tarikh%20Haifa&f=false>.

Spiegel, Steven L. *The Other Arab-Israeli Conflict: Making America's Middle East Policy, from Truman to Reagan*. University of Chicago Press, 1986, n.d.

Staff, Reuters. "Abbas says Jerusalem is eternal Palestinian capital, dismisses U.S. peace role." 06 December 2017. <<https://www.reuters.com/article/uk-usa-trump-israel-abbas/abbas-says-jerusalem-is-eternal-palestinian-capital-dismisses-u-s-peace-role-idUKKBN1E02U2>>.

- Tarnapolsky, Noga, Rushdi Abu Alouf. "Death Toll Rises to 8 as Palestinians Rally along Gaza-Israel Boerder." *Lost Angeles Times* (2018). <www.latimes.com/world/la-fg-israel-gaza-palestiniansprotests->.
- Telegraph, Daily. *Press cuttings from Allenby's Papers 4/3*. London: Liddle Hart Centre from Military Archives, 1917.
- Times, The New York. "Jenisalem Named Capital of." *The New York Times* (1950). 04 August 2019. <<https://www.nytimes.com/topic/destination/israel>>.
- Toosi, Nahal. "State Department Warns of Violence Ahead of Trump Jerusalem Decision." *Politico* 04 December 2017.
- Trump, Donald. *White House, Remarks by President Trump and Prime Minister Netanyahu of Israel Before Bilateral Meeting Prime Minister Netanyahu*. Davos: The White house, 25 January 2018. <<https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefings-statements/remarks-president-trump-prime-minister-netanyahu-israel-bilateral-meeting-davos-switzerland/>>.
- "Trump's Jerusalem Decision & Freedom of Expression. Jerusalem Media and Communications Centr." 2018.
- US plans to move embassy to Jerusalem in May*. By Elise Labott Laura Koran. Prod. CNN. 2018. <<https://edition.cnn.com/2018/02/23/politics/us-embassy-jerusalem-move-may/index.html>>.
- Usher, Barbara Plett. "Jerusalem embassy: Why Trump's move was not about peace." (2018). <<https://www.bbc.com/news/world-us-canada-44120428>>.
- Yost, Charles W. "The Arab-Israeli War." January. 16 august 2019. <<https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/israel/1968-01-01/arab-israeli-war>>.