

Obama Strengthens Palestinian Case for UN Membership and Recognition of Statehood

In doing Israel's bidding, Obama digs a hole for himself and Israel and ends up helping the Palestinians make the case for UN recognition of Palestinian statehood and membership in the organization.

In a recent interview with the BBC,¹ US President Barack Obama unwittingly helped the Palestinians rather than the Israelis by criticizing the Palestinian plan to have the United Nations (UN) General Assembly (GA) recognize Palestinian statehood.²

He most probably criticized the plan because -- if it is pursued properly -- it would 1) help level the negotiating-leverage playing field, and 2) result in international law becoming again a factor in resolving the dispute

During the past almost two decades of primarily US-dishonestly-brokered/facilitated³ Sisyphean peace negotiations, Israel has had, courtesy of the US, an unconscionably immoral negotiating leverage.

The leverage has been amplified by the success of the US and Israel at 1) not allowing international law to be a factor in the negotiations for resolving the dispute and 2) preventing many others, who have an interest in seeing justice and international law upheld, from speaking or acting without fear of retribution, much less participating. Only those who are subject to Israeli and Zionist intimidation or manipulation have been allowed (and trusted by Israel) to participate in the peace negotiations.⁴

Obama's comments open door to history Israel needs desperately to be ignored

In response to the question of whether the US would veto⁵ a General Assembly resolution recognizing Palestinian statehood, Obama stated (in the reverse order in which he made his statements): 1) that the US (, which has not been sympathetic to symbolic efforts in the past,) "is [not] going to be particularly sympathetic towards" such efforts; 2) that such an effort would be symbolic; 3) that the problem cannot be solved at the UN; and 4) that the union of Hamas and Fatah makes it very difficult for Israel to say that it is going to sit across the table from somebody who denies its right to exist.

Given the nature of the indisputable historical context into which his words emerge, nothing of what he said helps Israel, or even the US to the extent that the US wants to maintain Israel's unfair negotiating advantage and allow it to continue its egregious flouter of international law. Each of the four foregoing points will be examined below in its proper historical context.

At the conclusion of the examination, the reader will agree, at the very least, that Obama's statements 1) harm Israel's case significantly by opening again the door to the examination of a history that Israel and the US need desperately to be ignored and 2) will actually help pave the way for the Palestinians and others to get recognition of Palestinian statehood at the UN, with or without US support, and ultimately membership in the UN

in accordance with Resolution 181, as hard as it might be to believe such a thing right now.

The combination of Obama's harmful statements and the likely favorable outcome for the Palestinians -- and even though an ardent, knowledgeable Zionist would have almost certainly said exactly what Obama stated -- might make one wonder whether Obama secretly intended⁶ to help the Palestinians, but one most likely will also recognize that for positions with little or no merit -- and Israel's position is a classic example -- both honest or disingenuous defenses unavoidably lead to the same unfavorable conclusion and ultimately a full and honest reckoning.

If UN resolution recognizing Palestinian statehood is merely symbolic, then Israel has no legal right to exist

With regards to the first and second points, Obama is unwittingly mocking Israel which is certainly the one who made him take a position that it knows is hilariously risible. If a UN resolution recognizing Palestinian statehood is merely symbolic, then Obama must also be saying that UN GA Resolution 181 which Zionists claim gave them the right to establish the state of Israel is also symbolic, meaning the one thing which Zionists rely on as the basis for the legal right of Israel to exist cannot serve such a purpose.

Even though Obama would be correct were he to say that Resolution 181, a symbolic resolution with no legal import, cannot be the basis for Israel's legal right to exist, for several decades now, Israel has been falsely claiming that Resolution 181 which proposed the partition of Palestine into two states, gave it a legal right to establish a state⁷ in the choicest portion of Palestine *against the wishes* of the *vast majority* of Palestinians. Is Obama now saying that Israel has no legal right to exist?

By saying that the US is not going to be sympathetic to symbolic efforts, is Obama also saying that the US will reverse its recognition of Kosovo's statehood and oppose its effort to gain UN membership? Maybe Obama forgot that the US has been sympathetic and continues to be sympathetic to "symbolic efforts" related to the recognition of Kosovo's statehood which the US has spearheaded⁸ and to more than "symbolic efforts" with respect to Kosovo's admission to the UN.⁹

President Truman: "[Zionist] pressure groups will succeed in putting the United Nations out of business"

The US was more than just sympathetic to symbolic efforts in 1947 when it bullied UN members on behalf of Zionist extremists in Palestine who were trying to get the General Assembly to issue Resolution 181. If bullying in support of an immoral and illegal enterprise to thwart the Palestinian exercise of self-determination is not sufficiently offensive, consider the fact that most of the Zionist extremists were recent illegal immigrants,¹⁰ thousands of whom were terrorists.

The "vote [for the partition resolution] was a story of violence in itself -- albeit diplomatic violence -- in which the United States went to the most extraordinary lengths

of backstage manipulation on behalf of its Zionist protégés."¹¹ The diplomatic violence against others complemented the political violence to which American Zionists subjected President Harry Truman.

Truman confided in his memoirs: "I do not think I ever had as much pressure propaganda aimed at the White House as I had in this instance. The persistence of a few extreme Zionist leaders -- actuated by political motives and engaging in political threats -- disturbed and annoyed me. Some were even suggesting that we pressure sovereign nations into favorable votes in the General Assembly. I have never approved of the practice of the strong imposing its will on the weak whether among men or among nations."¹²

Margaret Truman: Truman could not "tell the whole truth about the [Zionist] pressure...because...he and the entire American government would look pathetically ridiculous."

The Zionist pressure was so enormous that Truman did, wittingly or unwittingly,¹³ that of which he said he never approved and was of such a nature, according to his daughter Margaret in her book *Harry S. Truman*, that her father could not "tell the whole truth about the pressure he had been subjected to by the Zionists because he was afraid if he did he and the entire American government would look pathetically ridiculous."¹⁴

Despite the opposition of virtually every senior official in the State Department, the War Department¹⁵ and the Joint Chiefs,¹⁶ Truman 'reluctantly' put "pressure [on] sovereign nations." The pressure was necessary because on two occasions the voting had to be postponed due to an insufficient number of votes for passage.¹⁷

Zionist and US pressure included personal and economic threats and bribery

The US Consul in Haiti suggested to the President of the country that "for his own good he should order the vote of his country changed."¹⁸

The Philippines which was strongly opposed to the "clearly repugnant" partition policy and which had seven bills before Congress¹⁹ was told by Clark Clifford²⁰ that voting against the partition resolution "would impair American-Philippines relations," infuriating the President and its ambassador in Washington²¹ who had also collectively received unsettling letters or telegrams from over a dozen senators²² and two Supreme Court justices.²³

Former Ambassador William Bullitt informed the Chinese ambassador in Washington "that unless China voted for partition the Chinese would not get a penny of American assistance," causing China to abstain.²⁴ "Liberia's ambassador to the United Nations complained that the US delegation [to the UN] threatened aid cuts to several countries."²⁵

Jewish groups, which leveraged knowledge of their contacts and influence with officials or former officials to make credible threats, informed the Liberian delegation that if they do not go along [with the partition resolution], the Stettinius pact with Liberia [of former

Secretary of State Stettinius] will be canceled[,]”²⁶ a pact of enormous importance to the Liberian economy. "Fearful of a Jewish boycott of his firm's products, Harvey S. Firestone, Jr., of the Firestone Tire & Rubber Company, which had a concession in Liberia, brought pressure on the president of that country," causing Liberia to vote for partition.²⁷

Jewish groups also engaged in bribery, which included making at least one promise that they "would see to it that" the US government would recognize a vote in favor of partition.²⁸ Llewellyn E. Thompson, Jr., chief of the Division of Eastern European Affairs in the State Department, reported in a memorandum on a conversation with Guillermo Belt, the Cuban ambassador: "Mr. Belt... stated that one Latin American delegate had changed his vote to support partition in return for \$75,000 in cash and that another Latin American delegate, I believe the Costa Rican, had refused a forty thousand dollar offer but that subsequently he had been ordered by his Government to support partition. It was Mr. Belt's belief that some member of the delegate's government had accepted the bribe."²⁹

News of the scandalous behavior reached Truman who complained in a memorandum to Acting Secretary of State Lovett "that [Zionist] pressure groups will succeed in putting the United Nations out of business if this sort of thing is continued and I am very anxious that it be stopped."³⁰

"The fact such pressure had been exerted became public knowledge, to the extent the State Department policy group was concerned that 'the prestige of the UN' would suffer because of "the notoriety and resentment attendant upon the activities of U.S. pressure groups, including members of Congress, who sought to impose U.S. views as to partition on foreign delegations."³¹

Unlike Israel, Palestinians do not need bullying to get UN recognition of Palestinian statehood

Unlike the Zionists who needed the US to bully countries into voting in favor of Resolution 181, countries are gladly and voluntarily recognizing Palestinian statehood and the right to become a member of the UN. Is Obama opposed to UN recognition of Palestinian statehood partly because there would be an embarrassingly stark contrast between the voluntary eagerness of the international community to recognize a Palestinian state and the "diplomatic violence" that the US had to commit in order to get a mere symbolic expression of support for her Zionist protégés to establish a state?

The UN has a responsibility to help fix the problem it was forced by the US and the Zionists to create

With regards to point three -- that the UN cannot solve the problem, it is beyond being certain that were Obama or Israel asked to provide an argument to support the foregoing claim the argument would not be a persuasive one partly because a persuasive argument would require taking a credible -- as opposed to a risible -- stand on at least two important issues.

The first issue is whether sixty-four years ago the UN helped solve a problem or created a problem by being *forced* by Zionist groups and the US to issue a "symbolic" resolution that proposed the partitioning of Palestine against the wishes of the majority of its population, which was deliberately made largely defenseless³² against a well-armed extremist minority largely composed of recent illegal immigrants many of whom were terrorists.

While the vast majority of the indigenous population which had the legal right to establish a state was disarmed by the British Army, an extremist minority of recent illegal immigrants was armed and trained and, via Resolution 181, given a Pandora's box of symbolic support. An extremist and well-armed minority of recent illegal immigrants that had no legitimate reason for being given a level playing field in legal terms was given an illusory legal arrow which it has been brandishing for decades against its victims. It has also used this illusory legal arrow disingenuously as a banner of legitimacy to gain supporters, some of whom have become its most vociferous critics after they realized that they have been fooled.

The second issue is -- given the nature of the almost two-decades-old US-dishonestly-brokered peace negotiations which have been, due to Israel's insistence, marked by the absence of international law as a framework for resolving the dispute -- whether the UN can play a beneficial role by insisting that the heretofore ignored international law rights of the Palestinians and Resolution 181 be the basis of any resolution to the dispute, and in so doing help fix the problem that it was forced to create sixty-four years ago.

UN would be merely *reaffirming* a fraction of what the Palestinians indisputably have a right

Were the UN to act properly by recognizing and admitting to UN membership a Palestinian state in accordance with Resolution 181, which Israel accepted in 1947, it would be merely reaffirming a fraction of the bare minimum to which the Palestinians indisputably have a right. The UN on behalf of most of the world would also be making it clear that the impossible to justify unfair negotiating leverage -- courtesy of the US -- that Israel has been using to avoid giving the Palestinians even an approximation of what they are due under international law is not going to pay any dividends. It is absurd of Obama to think that the Palestinians should accept less than the bare minimum to which they have a right and continue to fail to do something to neutralize the unfair negotiating leverage that Israel has had courtesy of the US.

Bishop Desmond Tutu said: "If you are neutral in situations of injustice, you have chosen the side of the oppressor. If an elephant has its foot on the tail of a mouse and you say that you're neutral, the mouse will not appreciate your neutrality." The US has not only not been neutral, but has acted as Israel's lawyer -- and a dishonest one at that,³³ and an eager accomplice in many of Israel's activities including the atrocious occupation and wars against its neighbors.

For over 64 years, it is Israel and Zionists who have been denying that Palestine has the right to exist

With regards to the fourth point, it is a bit rich coming from Israel and its supporters because -- in dealing with each Palestine-right-to-exist-denying Zionist group or Israeli government -- it is the Palestinians, rather than the Israelis, who have found themselves in this type of situation for more than sixty-four years.

Starting over 98 years ago, Palestinian- or Arab-initiated attempts at reaching an understanding with Zionists were doomed to failure because "Zionists did not really want one... because their aims were in fact unlimited; in the light of fundamental Zionist doctrine they could not be otherwise."³⁴

In the 1930s and 1940s, the Palestinians were expected to negotiate with Zionist extremists who were not only opposed to a Palestinian state emerging alongside a Zionist one, but who were also unrelentingly executing a strategy to take control of at least the entirety of historic Palestine³⁵ and believed they were entitled to portions of neighboring countries which they expected shamelessly the international community to help them get.³⁶

What was true in the 1930s and 1940s, has only gotten worse with time. The wars of expansion and the occupation and annexation of Palestinian and non-Palestinian territories aside, Israel with the connivance and cooperation of the United States has engaged in a peace process that has been a cover for settlement expansion and the further entrenchment of the illegal occupation and which it has known for more than 16 years would lead to permanent occupation of territory that would have been the basis for a Palestinian state.

Shimon Peres: "no evacuation from Judea/Samaria [i.e., the West Bank]... the Oslo agreement began and ends in Gaza"

Since 1993, when Israel agreed with the Palestinians that, subject to the agreement at the conclusion of final settlement negotiations, a Palestinian state would be established in the Occupied Territories of the West Bank and Gaza, the prevailing view both in the Israeli government and society is that the "peace process" is an effective cover for Israel's plan to retain control over the West Bank even after the conclusion of the peace negotiations.³⁷ Jacques Neriah, a former adviser to Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin, in 1995 admitted that the "intention all along was for the interim agreement to be very near the final settlement."³⁸ "Rabin's foreign minister, Shimon Peres, and his deputy, Yossi Beilin, are also on record concurring with this view. Peres told a Labor Party meeting in December 1994: "There will be no evacuation from Judea/Samaria [i.e., the West Bank]... the Oslo agreement began and ends in Gaza."³⁹

For those who so blindly support Israel that even admissions from the proverbial horse's mouth will not convince them that Israel never intended to let a Palestinian state, as the word "state" is commonly understood throughout the world, emerge they will be

disappointed to learn that the foregoing admissions have corresponding actions that make it clear what Israel's and the US's intentions have been all along.

Israel, over the past 18 years with the encouragement of the US, has created "facts on the ground" that violate the Fourth Geneva Convention and that leave the Palestinians with territory that is less than half the territory that they were led to believe they would get. By the US saying that any final settlement must take into account ever-changing, indisputably illegal "facts on the ground," the US encourages Israel to keep delaying final agreement so that it can continue to drive the Palestinians out and seize their land .

The facts on the ground were created by building new settlements on newly expropriated Palestinian land, vastly expanding old ones, demolishing thousands of Palestinian homes, displacing or terminating the residency permits of tens of thousands of Palestinians, seizing natural resources such as water aquifers and quarries, and more than doubling the number of illegal settlers in the Occupied Territories.

There is little to nothing left for a Palestinian state or to negotiate

Israel has vitiated unilaterally the negotiable border and territory issues of the final settlement negotiations so that there is little to nothing to negotiate and presented the world with a "fait accompli" that it foolishly believes will be hard to undo. What's presently left for the Palestinians is noncontiguous⁴⁰ enclaves, commonly referred to as bantustans similar to the ones of apartheid South Africa, in which Israel expects them to accept limited self-government and a fraction of the sovereignty that other states enjoy.

Before concluding, for the reader who is not very familiar with this topic, it is important to explain little why this is happening. While it is most probably and sadly true that Zionism has devolved to a significant degree into sadism, sadism cannot explain all this cruelty. "[T]he oppression of the Palestinians does not interest the Israeli strategists in the least. It follows that what goes under the name of 'the solution of the Palestinian problem', whatever the nature of that 'solution' is, cannot bring about peace, because Israeli strategies are aimed at establishing hegemony over the entire Middle East, conceived of as extending from India to Mauritania. of course, the first victim of Israeli expansionism in search of such a hegemony is the Palestinian nation."⁴¹

Conclusion

Indisputable historical facts not open to casuistic Zionist-friendly interpretation elegantly vitiate Obama's and Israel's cant. Unlike Israel, Palestinians do not need bullying to get UN recognition of Palestinian statehood and membership in the organization; the superior merits of their legal, ethical, and moral case are evident to everyone except a biased few.

The UN has a responsibility to help fix the problem it was forced by the US and the Zionists to create. If the UN were to act it would be: 1) merely *reaffirming* a fraction of what the Palestinians indisputably have a right; 2) helping neutralize Israel's unconscionably immoral negotiating leverage courtesy of the US and the power of . Zionist groups to manipulate and intimidate others; and 3) upholding, as the proper

framework for resolving the dispute, international law whose absence from the US-dishonestly-brokered/facilitated Sisyphean peace negotiations has caused this problem to metastasize and go on for an inhumane length of time.

Adam Albrett

¹ Transcript: Andrew Marr interview with President Obama, BBC News, <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-13473065>

² Palestinian officials have also mentioned the possibility of seeking full UN membership for Palestine despite the risk of a US veto. It would be desirable to put the US in the position of being forced by Israel to veto full UN membership for Palestine. Unlike the US, irrespective of which of the two possible outcomes holds, the Palestinians win, and the US can only win if the Palestinians succeed in their bid for full UN membership.

³ See Naseer Aruri, *Dishonest Broker: The Role of the United States in Palestine and Israel*, South End Press, Cambridge, 2003.

⁴ That's the most honest and accurate description of the category in which the Quartet resides.

⁵ The interviewer, Andrew Marr, actually asked him *twice* whether the US would veto a resolution recognizing Palestinian statehood when such a resolution, as opposed to one for gaining membership in the UN, is presented in the General Assembly, where the US does not have the power to veto.

⁶ Given Obama's atrocious record in supporting Israeli war crimes and violations of international law and his recent speeches regarding Palestine, it is highly unlikely that Obama would now suddenly want to 'secretly' help the Palestinians.

⁷ Israel's Declaration of Independence falsely states as much.

⁸ In contrast, the US has discouraged countries from recognizing Palestinian statehood and criticized them when they have done so.

⁹ Russia and China oppose admission partly because Kosovo's statehood emerged in spite of agreement to have the final status of Kosovo be the product of a negotiated settlement with Serbia.

¹⁰ John Quigley, *Palestine and Israel: a challenge to justice*, Duke University Press, Durham and London, 1990, p. 36.

¹¹ David Hirst, *The Gun and the Olive branch: The Roots of Violence in the Middle East*, Futura Publications Ltd., London, 1978, p. 131.

¹² Harry S. Truman, *Memoirs: Years of Trial and Hope*, vol. II, Doubleday, New York, 1958, p. 225, cited in Adel Safty, *From Camp David to the Gulf*, Black Rose Books, 1992, p. 15.

¹³ Truman warned Acting Sec. of State Lovett that "he would demand a full explanation if nations which usually line up with the United States failed to do so on [the partition resolution for] Palestine." Drew Pearson, Chicago Daily Tribune, Chicago, Feb. 9, 1948, cited in John Mahoney, *Political Zionism*, The Link, vol. 36, Issue 2, Americans for Middle East Understanding, (April-May 2003), p. 5.

¹⁴ Safty, *op. cit.*, p. 15. The US-brokered peace negotiations have been marked by 18 years of the strong with a weak legal and moral case trying to impose its will on the weak with a strong legal and moral case.

¹⁵ A deeply distressed James Forrestal, Secretary of Defense, complained that the coercion and duress bordered on scandal. *The Forrestal Diaries*, ed. Millis, Walter, Viking Press, New York, 1952, p. 363, cited in Hirst, *op. cit.*, p. 131.

¹⁶ Mahoney, *op. cit.*, p. 5.

¹⁷ "Congressman Lawrence Smith, addressing the Congress on December 18, 1947, recounted what happened: 'Let's take a look at the record, Mr. Speaker, and see what happened in the United Nations' Assembly meeting prior to the vote on partition. A two-thirds majority was required to pass the resolution. On two occasions the Assembly was to vote, and twice it was postponed... In the meantime, it is reliably reported that intense pressure was applied to the delegates of three small nations by the United States' member, and also by officials at the highest levels in Washington. The decisive votes for partition were cast by Haiti, Liberia, the Philippines. These votes were sufficient to make the two-thirds majority. Previously, these countries opposed the move.'" John Mahoney, *Political Zionism*, The Link, vol. 36, Issue 2, Americans for Middle East Understanding, April-May 2003, p. 5.

¹⁸ Memorandum by President Truman to the Acting Secretary of State, Washington, December 11, 1947, *Foreign relations of the United States, 1947*, The Near East and Africa, volume V, p. 1309, and Robert J.

Donovan, *Conflict and Crisis: The Presidency of Harry S. Truman, 1945-1948*, University of Missouri Press, p. 329.

¹⁹ Mahoney, *op. cit.*, p. 5.

²⁰ Clark Clifford served as White House counsel for President Truman.

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Clark_Clifford

²¹ Robert J. Donovan, *Conflict and Crisis: The Presidency of Harry S. Truman, 1945-1948*, University of Missouri Press, p. 329.

²² Mahoney, *op. cit.*, p. 5.

²³ Donovan, *op. cit.*, p. 329.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 330.

²⁵ Michael Palumbo, *The Palestinian Catastrophe*, (1987), p. 31., cited in Quigley, *op. cit.*, p. 37.

²⁶ *Ibid.*

²⁷ *Ibid.*

²⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 330-331.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 331.

³⁰ Memorandum by President Truman to the Acting Secretary of State, *op. cit.*, p. 1309.

³¹ "Report by the Policy Planning Staff on Position of the United State With Respect to Palestine: Top Secret," January 19, 1948, *Foreign Relations of the United States 1948*, vol. 5, p. 546, at p. 553, 1976, cited in Quigley, *op. cit.*, p. 37.

³² By the late 1930s, the British Army had to a very large degree disarmed the Palestinians and helped develop the Zionist army, the Haganah, into a force that could easily defeat all the armies of the neighboring countries.

³³ Aaron David Miller described his time at the US State Department with the following words: "yes basically we [myself, Dennis B. Ross, current advisor on Middle East affairs, and others] were just spear-carriers for Israel. We made a mistake." Francis A. Boyle, *Breaking all the Rules: Palestine, Iraq, Iran and the Case for Impeachment*, Clarity Press, 2008, p. 22. According to Prof. Boyle, "[n]ot only did the State Department go along with...[Israel's agenda during the peace process negotiations], but they lied to the Palestinians as to the meaning of the English legal documents that they had drafted, that they were trying to get the Palestinians to accept. I[, Francis Boyle,] have that story in my...book[, "Palestine, Palestinians, and International Law."] You can read it there with the footnotes....The Palestinians would bring me these documents together with their mem-coms--the memorandums of conversation--with Djerejian or Ross or Miller etc. and say: "Well, they told us the documents meant this." And I said: "Well, that just isn't true. It's plain English, this is what it means." So I would straighten out the real meaning of the document, and then they would go back.", *Ibid.*

³⁴ Hirst, *op. cit.*, p. 33.

³⁵ Hirst, *op. cit.*, pp. 112, 108-143, 207-254.

³⁶ For a time, they expected some in the international community to give them parts of neighboring countries in the same way that they got a little over half of Palestine via Resolution 181

³⁷ Aruri, *op. cit.*, p. xv.

³⁸ *Boston Globe*, January 30, 1995, cited in *ibid.*

³⁹ *Ha'aretz*, January 6, 1995, cited in Aruri, *op. cit.*

⁴⁰ A recent commentator writing in the UK's Independent actually interpreted the term contiguous in a recent speech by Obama as referring to the possibility that Obama somehow advocates connecting Gaza and the West Bank. The commentator is either clueless or someone who's trying disingenuously to make Obama's speech, which seeks to impose another calamity upon the Palestinians, appear to be favorable to them.

⁴¹ Israeli Shahak, *Open Secrets: Israeli Nuclear and Foreign Policies*, Pluto Press, London, 1997, pp. 31-45.