

The Arab-Israeli Conflict:

An Analytical Study from 1948 to 1973

الصراع العربي الإسرائيلي: دراسة تحليلية من عام (١٩٤٨ – ١٩٧٣)

By

Dr. Nawaf Falah Al-Humaid Al-Obaisan

**Faculty Member, Department of History,
Faculty of Arts, Kuwait University**

Email: nawaf_1966@hotmail.com

DOI: [10.21608/AAKJ.2024.277969.1710](https://doi.org/10.21608/AAKJ.2024.277969.1710)□

Date received: 19 / 3 /2024

Date of acceptance: 27/4 /2024

The Arab-Israeli Conflict: An Analytical Study from 1948 to 1973

الملخص:

هدفت الدراسة إلى تسليط الضوء على الصراع العربي الإسرائيلي بطريقة تحليلية من خلال عرض لتسلسل التاريخي للصراع الذي دار بين الدول العربية ودولة الاحتلال الإسرائيلي ما بين الفترة من عام (١٩٤٨م - ١٩٧٣م)، وقد برزت مشكلة الدراسة في اثر الصراعات بين الدول العربية وإسرائيل والتي امتدت من بداية القرن التاسع عشر تمهيداً لإيجاد دولة الاحتلال الإسرائيلي منذ نهاية الحرب العالمية الأولى وبعد الانتداب البريطاني الذي ارسى قواعده في الشرق الأوسط، أملاً في اكتساب العديد من المطامع والسيطرة على أكبر مساحة ممكنة في بلاد الشام ومصر وتقسيم هذه الدول للتمكن من سهولة السيطرة عليها، وإنشاء دولة لليهود على أرض دولة فلسطين. واتبعت الدراسة المنهج التاريخي التحليلي وذلك بما يتناسب مع طبيعة الموضوع، حيث تقف هذه الدراسة على التعرف على مراحل الصراع العربي- الإسرائيلي من خلال تناول الأحداث المهمة والرئيسة التي دارت بينها خلال الفترة القائمة بين عام (١٩٤٨م وحتى ١٩٧٣م). واستنتج من هذه الدراسة أن التقاء المصالح الاستعمارية للدول الغربية مع الأهداف الصهيونية السياسية، كان العنصر الأهم في نجاح المشروع الصهيوني، وما لقيته من دعم مادي وعسكري وسياسي لإيجاد وطن قومي لليهود أو ما عرف بدولة إسرائيل، وعدم إيجاد حل لحصول الفلسطينيين على حقوقهم واستعادة أرضهم وإعادة لاجئهم إلى دولتهم، وتبين أن إسرائيل لا تقيم وزناً لأي من الدول العربية ولا يهمها سوى مصالحها وأمنها وأنها تتمادى في رفضها لأي مبادرة سلام، وترفض كل الالتزامات التي قد تؤدي إلى إعلان دولة فلسطينية، وأن القدس بالنسبة لها هي عاصمة إسرائيل الموحدة شاء من شاء وأبى من أبى.

وأوصت الدراسة الباحثين بإعادة النظر في زيادة الدراسات في موضوع الصراع العربي الإسرائيلي في كل مرآله.

الكلمات المفتاحية: الصراع العربي، الإسرائيلي، دراسة تحليلية.

The Arab-Israeli Conflict: An Analytical Study from 1948 to 1973

Abstract:

The aim of this study is to shed light on the Arab-Israeli conflict through an analytical approach, presenting a historical sequence of the conflict that occurred between the Arab states and the state of Israeli occupation during the period from 1948 to 1973. The study highlights the problem arising from the conflicts between the Arab countries and Israel, which extended from the early nineteenth century, leading to the establishment of the Israeli occupation state after World War I and following the British mandate that laid the groundwork in the Middle East. Israel sought to acquire as much territory as possible in the Levant and Egypt, dividing these countries to facilitate control and establish a Jewish state on Palestinian land.

The study follows a historical-analytical methodology suitable for the topic. It identifies the stages of the Arab-Israeli conflict by examining significant and pivotal events that took place between 1948 and 1973. The study concludes that the convergence of colonial interests of Western countries with Zionist political goals was crucial for the success of the Zionist project. Israel received substantial financial, military, and political support to establish a national homeland for Jews, known as the state of Israel. However, no solution was found for the Palestinians to regain their rights, reclaim their land, and repatriate their refugees. Israel disregards any commitments that might lead to the declaration of a Palestinian state. Jerusalem, for Israel, remains its unified capital, regardless of external opinions.

The study recommends further research on the Arab-Israeli conflict across all its stages.

Keywords: Conflict, Arab, Israeli.

Introduction:

The introduction highlights the role of international support and encouragement in establishing a foothold for Jews in Palestine. Without the backing of powerful nations throughout the 20th century, the Jewish population would not have been able to gather from various parts of the world and converge in Palestine. Britain, in particular, played a significant role in supporting and protecting them, ultimately strengthening their position.

The emergence of the Jewish state (Zionist movement) can be traced back to the persecution faced by Jews in Christian Europe. Driven by the need to find a solution to their displacement, Zionist leaders focused on Palestine as a pivotal point for collective action against the Arab nations. The Zionist movement gained prominence in the late 19th century (Fatlawi, 2003).

The Zionist movement worked to establish a comprehensive theory of Zionist racism, drawing historical, ethnic, and religious justifications. Their goal was to secure the right for Jews to establish a national homeland in Arab Palestine, while continuously expanding and engaging in aggression against the Arab nations. (website)¹

Let's explore some key aspects of the Zionist ideology:

First, Unity of the Jewish People: The Theory of Jewish Race:

The statement "Jews constitute a single nation, and they are the purest and superior race" is one of the most important ideological foundations of Zionist racism. The Zionist movement derived the theory of the superior race from the racial theory that prevailed

and spread in Europe. The notion of the pure Jewish race is based on the following principles (Sheeha, 2003: 392-393).

- The assertion that “Jews constitute a single nation, the purest and superior race” is a fundamental ideological basis for Zionist racism.
- The Zionist movement borrowed the concept of racial superiority from prevailing European theories.
- This theory emphasizes that Jews are a primary race globally, maintaining their unity despite various influences, and preserving the purity of Jewish characteristics.

Second, Distinctive Jewish Traits: Creating a Nation of Miracles: This statement has focused on the racism that considered the State of Palestine nothing but the basis and starting point for the return to the land of Israel, which aligns with the extension of the Arab homeland (Gharoudi, 1997: 30-41).

Third, The Concept of Divine Choice of the Jewish People: This idea entails that the Jewish people have been chosen by God to be the chosen people, and Jewish philosophy has attempted to link this concept with the message of the chosen people (Gharoudi, 1997: 70-73).

Fourth, Anti-Semitism: The term "anti-Semitism" refers to preconceived hostile ideas against Jews. Wilhelm Marr was the first to use the term anti-Semitism in 1879, to refer to the hatred of Jews and hostility towards various political, global, and

international movements in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, often associated with Jews. This includes equal civil rights, constitutional democracy, free trade, socialism, capitalism, and pacifist tendencies.

Fifth, The Political Foundations of Zionist Racial Ideology:

These political foundations constitute a complex mixture of the aforementioned elements that Zionism, through the process of integration and composition between them, sought to reach what is now known as "political Zionism." It ensures that Jews constitute a single nation, and that the State of Israel represents the comprehensive and complete embodiment of the Jewish people scattered throughout the world. The goal of Zionism is to find a way to cooperate and coordinate between the Jewish nation and the State of Israel, and contemporary Zionism aims to highlight Israel as a state above all states, in an attempt by Zionists to justify their aggressive actions and subversive activities worldwide (Sheeha, 2003: 394).

Sixth, The Attempt of Zionism to Link its Racial Ideology with Socialist Ideas:

The Zionist movement exploited Marxist concepts of equality and justice and attempted to combine them with the Zionist idea calling for the establishment of an independent entity for Jews worldwide under the assumption that they constitute a single nation. Zionist ideology has attempted and continues to exploit Jews to implement its economic and social agendas through the adoption and integration of religious, geographical, and political racial theories. The greatest evidence of this is that since the

establishment of the Zionist entity in 1948, various socialist-leaning parties such as the Labor Party have alternated in governing Israel. During this period, Israel has waged a series of expansionist, racist wars against Arab countries (Shadood, 1990: 543).

The thinkers of the Zionist movement in the latter half of the nineteenth century in Europe embarked on delineating the contours of the national homeland they desired. They relied on some traditional pillars that some Jewish researchers had adopted to identify the Holy Land, as mentioned in the Torah. Thus, the global Zionist movement in the late nineteenth century became associated with an overt political goal, namely the return to Palestine for the establishment of a Jewish state. Its demands for the establishment of the State of Israel were based on religious and historical arguments and were influenced by the nationalist-racial tendencies prevalent in Europe in the nineteenth century (Saleh, 2003).

Herzl, who was elected president of the conference, defined the goal of Zionism sought to be achieved by stating: "The aim of Zionism is to create a homeland for the Jewish people in Palestine, secured by public law." In 1899, the Colonial Bank was established under the name of the Jewish Colonial Trust to finance settlement activities in Palestine and secure the financial services needed by the Zionist movement. In 1901, the Jewish National Fund was established to start purchasing land in Palestine, and the Sixth Zionist Congress in 1907 decided to commence colonization activities in Palestine.

In 1913, provisional approval was granted for the establishment of the Hebrew University in Palestine, and the final choice of the World Zionist Organization to settle in Palestine was due to the equalization of British imperial interests with the interests of the global Zionist movement in seeking areas of influence worldwide.

Thus, the primary aim of this movement was to build the Jewish state as claimed by the Zionist movement to resolve the Jewish issue. The Palestinian territories were the main target, as propagated by its slogan: "A land without a people for a people without a land" (Al-Fatlawi, 2002).

Jewish Migration in Palestine: Historical Perspective

Jewish migration to Palestine dates back to the late 19th century, albeit in an irregular manner. Key figures among the English Zionists, such as Leonard Spencer Churchill, Anthony Eden, and Arthur James Balfour, advocated for allowing Jews to seize land and wealth in Palestine to bolster the Jewish presence there. This necessitated efforts to increase human resources, leading the Mandate government to oversee the Jewish migration process and its affiliated bodies in Palestine. Consequently, Britain opened its doors wide to Jews, encouraging the Jewish Agency and its affiliated bodies in Europe to promote migration through various means. Offices for reception and migration organization were established everywhere, supplying all necessary resources. However, it is noteworthy that these Jews were selected only after a thorough assessment of their situations and capabilities, especially their financial ones. Following the end of World War

I, the Jewish population in Palestine did not exceed 50,000 (Al-Fatlawi, 2002).

Colonial Ambitions in Palestine

Britain was the first colonial power in the Arab East, initiating political maneuvers through correspondence between Sir Henry McMahon and Sharif Hussein bin Ali in Mecca. In these exchanges, Britain sought to retain administrative control over Iraq and ambiguously formulated its memorandum to allow for intervention in the affairs of the western part of Greater Syria and Palestine thereafter. Subsequently, Britain mobilized its forces in Egypt and advanced from there into Palestine, establishing a railway line to Gaza (Yahya, 1998).

Britain remained adamant about maintaining its influence in Palestine, securing its colonial bases adjacent to the Suez Canal. It prevented the French from accessing these bases under the pretext of establishing an international administration there. Britain took this step despite recognizing its contradiction with the promises made to Sharif Hussein in the memorandum of October 24, 1915, wherein it pledged to establish a unified Arab state from the Gulf to Egypt. However, Britain perceived the potential threat posed by such a state, which would inevitably demand its legitimate rights. Therefore, Britain sought to balance it with an external force to occupy the Arabs, and this force came to be the Zionist entity (Saigh, 1989).

The British Mandate in Palestine

The mandate system was among the innovative frameworks established by the Covenant of the League of Nations, adopted

by the participating countries at the Peace Conference of 1919. This system emerged as an alternative to colonial policies previously pursued by nations and was put into effect on September 22, 1922. Consequently, the British government was chosen as the mandatory power by the League of Nations, tasked with preparing the political and economic conditions conducive to the establishment of the Jewish national homeland in Palestine. Britain prepared for the mandate, announcing the end of military administration in Palestine in 1920 and the establishment of a civil administration, appointing the first High Commissioner for this purpose (Jamal, 2009).

Britain exercised military and administrative control over Palestine, seizing all its economic sites. It pursued a policy in the commercial and industrial sectors favoring the minority Jewish community, who came to dominate the country's trade and industry. Britain imposed customs laws that hindered the importation of Syrian and Egyptian textiles, upon which Palestinian Arabs relied. Moreover, exorbitant taxes were imposed on the export of soap manufactured by Palestinian Arabs. Tariffs were also imposed on all foreign industries, prompting the establishment of numerous factories, including the cement factory (Nashra) and the oil extraction factory (Shaman), along with others (Ayhab, 2008).

End of the Mandate and the Establishment of the State of Israel

The United States' actual interest in the Palestinian issue began only after American capital became active in seeking security bases in the Middle East and the Near East to ensure control and

exploitation across the region. From the outset of this activity, Americans discovered that Britain was their strong competitor in this part of the world. The rift between the Jews and the British widened since 1939 due to Britain's new policy. Britain also enacted a law restricting land purchases funded by international Zionist organizations. Upon America's entry into the war, its attention turned to the Zionists. It was easy for America to win their support and endorse their demands, as it had shown sympathy with Zionism since its inception (Al-Rais, 1970).

Hence, the Anglo-American race began to appease Zionism. However, the circumstances of World War II forced America and Britain to temporarily halt their competition and consider their relationship with the Arab world in their best interest. Meanwhile, although the United States did not formally enter the war, President Roosevelt contacted Arab states to persuade them to support Britain and stand by its side in exchange for settling the Palestinian issue after the war. He emphasized his official and personal intervention to protect Arab rights in Palestine. However, Britain, after their success in persuading the Arabs to halt their revolution, joined the Allies and returned to their previous practices to appease Israel (Al-Kiyali, 1971).

After the end of World War II in 1945, profound changes occurred worldwide, affecting various regions, including the Middle East. Among the most notable changes and conflicts faced by the Middle East was the Arab-Israeli conflict, which is considered one of the most complex and longest-standing conflicts in modern history. The wars between Arabs and Israelis began in 1948, known to the Arab world as the "Nakba," as a

**The Arab-Israeli Conflict:
An Analytical Study from 1948 to 1973**

result of the establishment of the Israeli state or the Zionist entity on Palestinian land. The Arab-Israeli conflict renewed in 1956 through the Tripartite Aggression against Egypt. The conflict persisted until the outbreak of the Six-Day War in 1967, also known as the Arab defeat. This was followed by the attrition stage from 1967 to 1970, and then the October War (Yom Kippur War) in 1973. However, since the Rabat Summit decision in November 1974, which considered the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people, the conflict's trajectory has been confined to being a Palestinian-Israeli conflict (Saleh, 2013).

In this context, it is essential to distinguish between two main patterns of traditional conventional warfare. The first is total wars, where parties engage with all their forces, utilizing modern weapons with high destructive capabilities. These wars typically cover vast areas, potentially including the entire territories of the parties involved, within the framework of major political objectives, such as imposing unconditional surrender on the other party by destroying its capabilities and forces or threatening to do so. The second pattern is limited wars, representing an evolved form of armed conflicts where states employ some of their military capabilities in specific operational theaters. Certain types of strategic operations are excluded from these wars, and their goals usually do not aim at destroying the capabilities or forces of the other party or forcing it to surrender but rather achieving limited political or military objectives.

The Arab-Israeli conflict witnessed regular wars from 1948 to 1982, as follows:

I. The 1948 War

Known to the Arab side as the Palestine War or "Al-Nakba" (The Catastrophe), and referred to by Israel as the War of Independence. This war erupted following the declaration of the establishment of Israel on May 15, 1948. Forces from five Arab countries - Egypt, Syria, Jordan, Lebanon, and Iraq - intervened to prevent Israel from establishing itself on Palestinian land. Military operations continued until January 1949, by which time it became clear that Israeli forces had gained control of the battlefield. The war effectively confirmed the partition of Palestine, leading to the displacement of over 400,000 Palestinians who became refugees, marking the beginning of the Arab-Israeli conflict in its current form (Kamal, 2008).

This phase primarily began with the United Nations Partition Plan issued in November 1947, with 33 members in favor, 13 against, and 11 abstentions. The plan divided Palestine into three regions: the first area, 55% of Palestine's territory, was allocated for the establishment of the Jewish state, the second area, 45% of Palestine's territory, was designated for the Arab state, and the remaining area, which included Jerusalem, was to be under international supervision. On the other hand, Britain announced its withdrawal from Palestine in May 1948, and the Jewish Agency prepared for the British withdrawal. On March 10, 1948, the Haganah issued a detailed military plan to prepare the masses for the departure of the British, which occurred on May 15, 1948 (Abdul Haleem, 1999, p. 269).

**The Arab-Israeli Conflict:
An Analytical Study from 1948 to 1973**

It can be said that this war resulted in the loss of part of Palestine and led to the establishment of the Zionist entity in the heart of the Arab world. The establishment of the State of Israel was declared on May 14, 1948, marking the beginning of the second phase of the Arab-Israeli conflict. The first of the Arab-Israeli wars commenced and lasted until July 1949, resulting in what was known to Arabs as the Nakba. It followed two main paths: the first being the Haganah Plan, and the second being the Arab-Israeli War (Hijazi, 2015).

The first path, the Haganah's plan, which was called Plan D, was to seize 80% of the area of Palestine, and what they called cleansing the Palestinian areas that would fall under their control. Each Haganah division received a list of villages to be occupied and destroyed, and the cleansing operations began by surrounding the villages from three sides, leaving the fourth to escape and evacuate, and the villages whose residents refused to leave were killed, and the cleansing process extended over three stages: The first phase - from January 1947 to the end of the summer of 1948, where the coastal areas and inland plains were destroyed and the population was forcibly expelled. The second phase (1948-1949) included the Galilee and the Negev. The third phase - continued after the end of the Arab military operations until 1954, where the expulsions continued. Of the approximately 700,000 Palestinians who lived in the areas designated by the United Nations as the Jewish state, only about 100,000 Palestinians remained, who later became the internal Arabs, and the outcome of the ethnic cleansing and displacement operations was the destruction of about 500 villages and 11 Palestinian cities, the expulsion of about 700,000 Palestinians, and the

massacre of several thousand others during some massacres carried out by the Zionists against the Arabs - as part of the physical and psychological war - where they committed about 34 massacres, the most famous of them being the Deir Yassin massacre (Al-Basel, 2010). The Haganah's plan, which was called Plan D, was to seize 80% of the area of Palestine, and what they called cleansing the Palestinian areas that would fall under their control. Each Haganah division received a list of villages to be occupied and destroyed, and the cleansing operations began by surrounding the villages from three sides, leaving the fourth to escape and evacuate, and the villages whose residents refused to leave were killed, and the cleansing process extended over three stages: The first phase - from January 1947 to the end of the summer of 1948, where the coastal areas and inland plains were destroyed and the population was forcibly expelled. The second phase (1948-1949) included the Galilee and the Negev. The third phase - continued after the end of the Arab military operations until 1954, where the expulsions continued. Of the approximately 700,000 Palestinians who lived in the areas designated by the United Nations as the Jewish state, only about 100,000 Palestinians remained, who later became the internal Arabs, and the outcome of the ethnic cleansing and displacement operations was the destruction of about 500 villages and 11 Palestinian cities, the expulsion of about 700,000 Palestinians, and the massacre of several thousand others during some massacres carried out by the Zionists against the Arabs - as part of the physical and psychological war - where they committed about 34 massacres, the most famous of them being the Deir Yassin massacre (Al-Basel, 2010).

The second path, the Arab-Israeli War, had three main fronts: regular Arab armies, irregular Arab armies, and popular resistance and volunteers:

1. Regular Arab armies: Egypt, Jordan, Lebanon, Syria, Iraq, and Saudi Arabia dispatched their armies to Palestine to fight the Jews following the partition decision. These armies comprised approximately 27,000 soldiers. King Abdullah of Jordan was appointed as the leader of these armies, but on the ground, the armies remained under their respective countries' control. The lack of unified leadership was considered one of the main reasons for their defeat (Al-Shami, 2015).

2. Irregular Arab armies: These were mainly represented by two armies, the Holy Jihad Army and the Liberation and Rescue Army, led by Fawzi al-Qawuqji. Formed by the Arab League in December 1947, it consisted of 3,000 volunteers from various parts of the Islamic world. Al-Qawuqji was in constant dispute with Abdel Qader al-Husseini, the leader of the Holy Jihad Army, leading to the weakening of both armies.

3. Popular resistance and volunteers: Volunteers came from all over the Islamic world, including Bosnia and Albania. The Muslim Brotherhood responded to the call of Hassan al-Banna, and an estimated 10,000 volunteers were killed in action, while others were captured upon their return to Egypt (Beiley, 1992).

As for the Zionist forces that entered the 1948 War, they numbered around 76,000 fighters and were highly trained. They were organized into ten military brigades at the time of the state's

declaration, with predetermined objectives and attack plans, which contributed to their success against the Arab armies.

Initially, the Arab forces launched an attack on the Zionist forces and managed to make progress. However, due to various reasons, they faced defeat, allowing the Israeli forces to seize new territories. Ultimately, they acquired approximately 77% of Palestine's land. Reasons for the defeat included the weak armament and limited numbers of the Arab armies, as well as poor coordination and conflicting visions among their leadership, coupled with the absence of a unified attack plan.

The war ended with the West Bank falling under Jordanian control, while Gaza remained under Egyptian administration (Ali, 2009).

Regarding the period between 1949 and 1956, it was characterized by several features:

1. The continued subjugation of the West Bank to Jordan and Gaza to Egypt, with both parties rejecting any attempts for the emergence of Palestinian leadership, especially Haj Amin al-Husseini, who was deported to Egypt to sever ties with the Palestinian street, a move that ultimately succeeded.
2. Arab countries' internal focus due to their relatively recent independence and the prevalence of military coups, along with the rise of Arab nationalist sentiments.
3. Continued resistance, albeit significantly weakened compared to the previous stage. It included clashes between Arab and Zionist forces, especially along border areas. The West Bank

witnessed approximately 7,850 resistance incidents, while Gaza experienced around 3,000 incidents and the northern border with Lebanon saw about 600 incidents. Semi-organized resistance mainly originated from Gaza, with the Egyptian side allowing volunteers to fight against the Jews. This task was assigned to Officer Mustafa Hafez, who was martyred in October 1956.

4. On the other hand, the Jewish state sought to strengthen its foundations and continued perpetrating massacres against Palestinians. Ethnic cleansing and expulsion operations continued until 1954 (Al-Fagali, 2007).

II. The 1956 War

Internationally known as the "Suez Crisis" and referred to in the tripartite context as the "Tripartite Aggression," was sparked when President Gamal Abdel Nasser nationalized the Suez Canal after the World Bank, under American influence, refused to grant Egypt a loan for the construction of the High Dam. This led France and England, in coordination with Israel, to launch a comprehensive attack on Egypt starting on October 29, 1956. Israeli forces entered the Sinai, which France and England considered a pretext, according to a pre-drawn scenario, to intervene in the Canal Zone. Despite the withdrawal of Egyptian forces from Sinai, international Soviet and American pressure, along with Egyptian resistance, led to the cessation of operations on November 6, 1956, and Israel's withdrawal from Sinai in 1957.

The tripartite aggression against Egypt resulted in several outcomes, notably the deployment of United Nations Emergency

Forces (UNEF) along the Egyptian-Israeli borders to oversee both parties' compliance with the ceasefire and to maintain security in the region. Additionally, the aggression led to the emergence of Gamal Abdel Nasser as a nationalist leader in the Arab world and a leader of the liberation movement in the Third World (Saleh, 1985).

The year 1956 witnessed the convergence of interests of three entities - Israel, France, and Britain - in attacking both Gaza and Sinai. However, the aggression did not last long as it was rejected by the international community, especially the United States, which, by opposing the aggression, demonstrated itself as a major rising power in confronting the decline of old powers like France and Britain. The tripartite aggression ended without any Egyptian military victory over the three powers. However, what stood out in this aggression was the role of popular resistance, which persisted in defending the cities of the Canal Zone. On the other hand, the international influence of both Britain and France diminished (Yassin, 1983).

III. The 1967 War

During the period from 1956 to 1976, the motivations of the resistance shifted due to the Arab regimes' attacks on Islamic movements, especially the Muslim Brotherhood, towards what were termed as "nationalistic," "pan-Arab," and "national liberation" motivations. In the late 1950s, the Palestinian National Liberation Movement (Fatah) emerged clandestinely, operating secretly until it officially declared its existence in January 1965 in Kuwait by a diverse group of young Palestinian intellectual currents. The movement announced itself through the

**The Arab-Israeli Conflict:
An Analytical Study from 1948 to 1973**

"Alilbon Tunnel" operation and proceeded to establish its bases in some Arab countries, eventually forming its military wing, "Al-Asifah." It expanded into hundreds of cells on the peripheries of Israel in the West Bank, Gaza, refugee camps in Syria and Lebanon, and even in the Americas. By the end of 1966 and the beginning of 1967, the military operations conducted by "Al-Asifah" intensified. Fatah later departed from Jordan after the Black September events and shifted its focus to Lebanon before eventually relocating to Tunisia during the Lebanese Civil War, during which the strength of "Al-Asifah" diminished (Wasel, 2002).

The 1967 war occurred due to several reasons unrelated to this discussion, but fundamentally tied to the situation of the Arab states at that time, along with the nature of their alliances and orientations towards the external world. During this war, Israel managed to seize control of the West Bank, Gaza, Jerusalem, and Sinai, destroying 80% of the Egyptian army's equipment and causing the deaths of more than ten thousand Egyptian soldiers, six thousand Jordanian soldiers, and a thousand Syrian soldiers, in addition to casualties. On the other hand, more than 300,000 Palestinians were displaced, shifting the focus of the Palestinian cause from reclaiming the territories occupied in 1948 to those occupied in 1967. All of this occurred within six days, demonstrating the weakness, failure, and defeat of the Arab regimes, a defeat that would be transferred to the Arab peoples. Just as the defeat of 1948 was dubbed "Al-Nakba," the defeat of 1967 was referred to as "Al-Naksa."

During the period from 1967 to 1970, the Israeli occupation resistance operations never ceased, whether from the Egyptian and Syrian sides that opened the front of the War of Attrition, or from Fatah movement, where "Al-Asifah" operations intensified against Israeli targets from Lebanon, Jordan, and Syria (Saleh, 2013).

In Arab thought, this period is known as "Al-Naksa," while Israel and international writings refer to it as the "Six-Day War." This war represented a multidimensional catastrophe, the effects of which have not been entirely erased from Arab memory to this day. Three Arab countries' armies suffered a crushing defeat at the hands of Israeli forces between June 5th and June 10th, 1967. Israel occupied significant territories during this period, including the Egyptian Sinai Peninsula, the Syrian Golan Heights, the West Bank, Gaza Strip, and East Jerusalem, which was under Jordanian control. The consequences of this war remain a major obstacle to the peaceful resolution of the conflict (Ismail, 1987).

IV. The War of 1973

The period from 1970 to 1973 witnessed a decline in resistance for several reasons, the most important of which was the withdrawal of the "Fatah" organization from Jordan after the Black September events and its relocation to Lebanon, in addition to the end of the War of Attrition with the death of Gamal Abdel Nasser.

Then came the war of 1973 to end the phase of conventional army wars, it was the last war entered by the conventional Arab

**The Arab-Israeli Conflict:
An Analytical Study from 1948 to 1973**

armies against the Zionist entity - including a series of aggressive events by Israel against some Arab countries - ending the dream of "Arab nationalism" with the collapse of the Nasserite slogans in the face of defeat that turned into a "setback". As mentioned earlier, this setback was borne by the Arab peoples, not the Arab regimes, which shifted responsibility for their deep and disastrous political mistakes leading to the 1967 defeat onto the peoples. On the other hand, the investigations conducted to determine the reasons for the defeat were not serious or meaningful. It was useful for the defeated Arab regimes to turn this defeat against the peoples to emphasize despotism, especially with the transformation of the state of despotism and severe repression existing before the defeat and the war into an ideological discourse blaming the peoples for their backwardness and delayed culture (Wasel, 2002).

This war is known in the Arab world as the "October War" (or the Tenth of Ramadan), while Israel calls it the "Yom Kippur War" (or the Day of Atonement). The Egyptian and Syrian forces carried out a joint military attack as part of a surprise historical attack against Israeli forces in Sinai and the Golan Heights. This led to the complete collapse of the Israeli first defense lines. While the Egyptian forces were able to stabilize their positions 15-20 kilometers east of the Suez Canal, the Syrian forces retreated to the October 5 lines again. The situation on the Egyptian front also dramatically intermingled in what became known as the "Breach", before the ceasefire on October 24. Negotiations began after the war to resolve the clashes, which effectively began in early 1974 (Amin, 2011).

The Arab region continued to experience this situation until just before 2011, a state of blaming the peoples for the decline they were experiencing, in addition to the absence of a civilizational project for their revival, such as the Arab nationalist project, which was an acceptable project by the regimes, or rather: it was slogans exploited by the regimes for their own benefit and to placate the peoples about their atrocities. Therefore, we find that the Arab countries - especially those located on the borders of conflict with the Zionist entity - decided that the 1973 war was their last war with that entity, as a single option rather than a strategic one. This option would confine the Arab-Israeli conflict to bilateral conflicts, with the Palestinians being the most affected by this situation, as their conflict became bilateral, and it was called the Palestinian-Israeli conflict or the Palestinian issue (Al-Ghazali, 1987).

As for the Palestinian side - as mentioned earlier - the Palestinian resistance was forced to leave Jordan and rely on Lebanon after Black September. During the period between 1969 and 1974, the Fatah movement was able to obtain significant Arab support and reached the peak of the Palestine Liberation Organization, with Yasser Arafat becoming its leader. In the Arab Summit in Rabat (October 1974), the organization became the legitimate and sole representative of the Palestinian people, and the following month, it achieved a political victory when Arafat delivered his speech at the United Nations, and the Palestine Liberation Organization was accepted as an observer member. Since 1969, the United Nations no longer dealt with the Palestinian issue as just a refugee issue, but rather recognized the existence of the Palestinian people and issued resolutions in the seventies

supporting the right of the Palestinian people to self-determination (Al-Jamsi, 1998).

This, in addition to the spread of uprisings in the Palestinian street in response to the occupation, the most famous of which was the "Land Uprising", which began in 1976 as a result of increased Israeli suppression campaigns and confiscations of large areas of land. The strikes were announced and the compensation offered by the occupation administration was rejected, and this day was called Land Day, and the Palestinian street still commemorates it with protests to this day.

This phase ended with the signing of the Sadat Peace Agreement in 1987, and the entry of the Palestinian resistance into the quagmire of the Lebanese civil war in 1975, in addition to the closure of Syrian, Egyptian, and Jordanian borders against the Palestinian resistance. On the other hand, Israeli assassinations against leaders of the Palestine Liberation Organization increased (Saleh, 2012).

V. The War of 1982

Known as the Lebanon War or the Invasion of Lebanon, and although some sources do not consider it a "major armed conflict" like previous conflicts, it was one of the sharp and complex developments in the course of the Arab-Israeli conflict. The Israeli forces invaded Lebanon to destroy the bases of the Palestine Liberation Organization and advanced to besiege the Islamic sector of Beirut for ten weeks, before withdrawing after reaching an agreement regarding the withdrawal of the "Palestinian forces" from Lebanon. Its most important results

included Israel's expansion of the "border strip" it had occupied in southern Lebanon in 1978 and the massacre committed by the Lebanese Phalangist forces under its protection - that is, the Israeli forces - in Sabra and Shatila. The Israeli army, led by Ariel Sharon, suffered a severe blow (Saleh, 2013).

The general outlines of these wars indicate that only one of them, by academic standards, was comprehensive, at least in terms of its operational theater and political objectives, which is the 1948 war, while the four subsequent wars were limited, especially the 1956 and 1973 wars. But the matter is more complex than that. Although the 1967 and 1982 wars did not witness real conventional fighting, given the rapid retreat of Arab forces and the absence of regular forces facing the Israeli army in Lebanon, the results of the former made it resemble a comprehensive war. True, it took place in border areas, and only military bases inside Arab countries were subjected to Israeli attacks, but it led to a deep shock within military institutions and governance structures and the Arab public opinion. The 1982 war also saw Israel besieging an Arab capital for the first time, attempting to reshape its governance structure according to its directions (Al-Rifai, 1993).

Terminology of the study:

Conflict:

Language: "from the verb 'struggle', meaning rivalry and competition between two or more parties" (Ibn Mansour, 2009, 237).

**The Arab-Israeli Conflict:
An Analytical Study from 1948 to 1973**

Terminology: As defined by Mohamed Fahmy (1990) as: A situation that reflects a great deal of conflict between the wills of two or more parties expressing, according to the expression of behavioral patterns, a conscious and deep-rooted opposition to the contradiction between them over values, goals or interests that are difficult to reconcile. In other words, the conflict carries with it a great deal of contradiction in the intellectual value system in a way that is difficult to reconcile.

Procedurally: The conflict in this study is meant to be the situation involving intellectual, ideological, political and religious dimensions, between the Arab and Palestinian side and the Israeli Zionist side in a way that is difficult to reconcile between them. This conflict was embodied between the Arab countries and the Zionist movement and its project summarized in the establishment of a national homeland for the Jews in Palestine, which was rejected and fought by the Arab countries around Palestine and for which they fought wars and confrontations with Israel and are still until now.

Previous studies:

The study of Bukhchiba, Ali and Abbadi, Muhammad (2015) entitled Arab-Israeli wars (June 1967 war as a model) The study aimed to shed light on one of the most important and prominent stations of the Arab-Israeli conflict, which is the 1967 war, and the study used the historical approach that is in line with the subject of the study, by linking the conditions that preceded the war and its results, and trying to highlight the causes of the Arab defeat and its repercussions.

Al-Hajouj study, Qusai (2021) entitled "The Arab-Zionist Conflict: Between Settlement Policies and Liquidation Projects / The Model of the Deal of the Century" The study aimed to identify the backgrounds of the Arab-Zionist conflict, identify the most prominent settlement policies and projects to liquidate the Palestinian cause, in addition to identifying the draft deal of the century, and identifying its most important contents, repercussions and political, economic and social dimensions. The study used the historical method in addition to the systems analysis method.

The study of Bani Milhem, (2012) entitled "The dimensions of Zionist thought and its repercussions on the Arab-Israeli conflict in the time of peace, the study aimed to provide a view on the nature of the Arab-Zionist conflict from the angle of the Zionist intellectual and cultural components, and the study also aims to provide an intellectual vision on the extent of the impact of intellectual dimensions on the map of the Arab-Israeli conflict in the time of the so-called peace phase in the Middle East, and try to show the extent of the link through the stages of conflict and peace and to show the impact of this situation on the region and its stability.

Study of Muhammad Khair (2005), "The Role of Islamic Groups in the Arab-Israeli Conflict: A Case Study (Hamas) 1980-2005" The study aimed to explain the historical stages of development of the Arab-Israeli conflict and then clarified the emergence of the Islamic current in Palestine from 1948 and then focused on the period from 1980 to 2005, and the study concluded the emergence of the Islamic resistance current to Israel and the

**The Arab-Israeli Conflict:
An Analytical Study from 1948 to 1973**

importance of the impact it left in framing the Arab-Israeli conflict and emphasizing the issue of Islam in the conflict between right and wrong, as well as the inability of the Arab nation And Islamic refrain from playing its role with the strength of the Islamic current represented by the Islamic Resistance Movement (Hamas) in taking the initiative in the Palestinian cause and achieving many positive developments recently.

Al-Hussami study (2004), "The European Union's Policy towards the Process of Peaceful Settlement of the Arab-Israeli Conflict in the Middle East (1990-1999)" This study seeks to focus on analyzing the development in the European policy towards the peace settlement process and identifying the reasons for this development in the European role, and the extent of the relationship between it and the development of the process of political and security integration among the European Union countries, and this study comes in light of the changes that have affected the structure of the international system and it tries to determine the nature of the structure of the new international system and thus Study the position of the European Union in this system and its relationship with the main poles, especially the United States of America, This entails analysing the EU's ability to pursue more effective policies towards the proper Middle East process. The study concluded that the role of the European Union during the mentioned period is still weak and ineffective, especially in bilateral negotiations, but the European Union seeks to develop the common defense, security and external institutions and to restructure the institutions of external decision-making that may increase its contribution to the peace settlement process in the future.

The importance of the study:

- The importance of this study (theoretical): The importance of this study is highlighted by enriching the scientific library with regard to the Arab and Israeli conflict in general, and the importance of this study lies in the fact that it sheds light on the stations of the Arab-Israeli conflict since the beginning of wars and conflicts between Arabs and Israel, from 1948 to 1973.
- Practical importance (applied): Through this study, the most prominent points at which the conflicts between the Arab countries and the Israeli occupation have stopped, which can benefit many researchers in the history of the Palestinian cause and the wars that took place between the Arab countries and the Israeli occupation state, will be identified.

Objectives of the study:

- The study aimed to identify the origins and basis of the existence of the Zionist entity and the Israeli occupation state inside the State of Palestine.
- Identify the most prominent stations at which the Arab conflicts and the Israeli occupation state stopped from 1948 to 1973.

Research Methodology:

The historical approach was adopted in this study in line with the nature of the subject by addressing the most important facts and events and trying to analyze and compare them.

Conclusion:

- The political changes that took place in the nineteenth century have a key role in the emergence and development of Zionist thought.
- The convergence of the colonial interests of Western countries with the Zionist political goals was the most important element in the success of the Zionist project, and the material, military and political support it received to find a national home for the Jews, or what was known as the State of Israel.
- Israel has invested its maximum energy of opportunities in order to strengthen and enable its security situation within the region, and imposed more facts on the ground, as it is unable to live without peace with the Arab countries, which in turn obtained it, but the Palestinian resistance remained present all the time to gnaw and destabilize this peace and deny all these agreements in general, to return its land that was stolen from it by the Israeli occupation and the conflict remains between the Palestinian state first and some Arab countries and the Israeli occupation.

Recommendations

- It is necessary to work on preparing more research related to the Arab-Israeli conflict, whether in Palestine or the Arab countries affected by these conflicts.
- Please consider re-including issues of the Arab-Israeli conflict in the school curriculum.

References:

- Abdul Halim, A (1999), *The Arab Conflict with Zionism and Israel over a Hundred Years*, Abdul Hameed Shoman Foundation, Amman.
- Abou Khashiba, A. and Abbadi, M. (2015) "*The Arab-Israeli Wars (June 1967 War as a Model)*", Master's Degree, University of Administration, Algeria.
- Al-Bassel, R. (2010) *The Palestinian Cause: Entrances to Understanding*, (Cairo: Dar Al-Bashir for Culture and Science, pp. 63-72.
- Al-Feghali, T. (2007), *The battles of the Arabs from before Islam until the Gulf War*, Volume 21, 1st Edition, Beirut, Dar Nobles.
- Al-Ghazali, A (1987), *The Future of the Arab-Israeli Conflict*, Beirut: Center for Arab Unity Studies, First Edition, p. 117
- Al-Hajouj, Q. (2012), *The Arab-Zionist Conflict: Between Settlement and Liquidation Projects / Model of the Deal of the Century*, Master's Thesis, Middle East University, Amman.
- Al-Husami, M. (2004). *EU policy towards the process of peaceful settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict in the Middle East (1990-1999)*. Unpublished PhD thesis, League of Arab States, Cairo.
- Ali, J. (2009) *Memory of a Nation: A Reading in the Files of the Arab-Israeli Conflict*, (Cairo: Dar Al-Nahda Al-Arabiya, pp. 437-439.
- Al-Jamsi, M. (1998), *October War 1973*, 1st Edition, Egyptian General Book Organization, Egypt.
- Al-Rifai, B (1993), *Arab-Israeli Wars 1948-1982*, 1st Edition, Sina Publishing, Cairo.

**The Arab-Israeli Conflict:
An Analytical Study from 1948 to 1973**

Al-Shami, Rashad (2015), *The Zionist Project in a Century: Achievements, Failures, New Trends*, at the Arab-Israeli Symposium.

Amin, A (2011), On the 64th Anniversary of the Partition Decision: The Struggle of Will and Decision in the Declaration of the Palestinian State, *Al-Quds Magazine*, (Cairo: Arab Media Center, Issue 155, p. 33-).

Bailey, S. (1992), *Arab-Israeli Wars*, Dar Al-Harf Al-Arabi, Beirut.

Bani Milhem, G (2012) Dimensions of Zionist Thought and its Repercussions on the Arab-Israeli Conflict in Time of Peace, *Journal of Social Affairs*, Issue (114), Summer.

Fahmi, M. (1990) *International conflict and its repercussions on regional conflicts*, Baghdad.

Fatlawi, S. (2002). *The Roots of the Zionist Movement*, Dar Wael, Amman, pp. 15

Hijazi, A (2015) *The Social Roots of the Nakba, Palestine 1858-1948*, (Cairo: Madarat Center for Research and Publishing, pp. 223-228.

Ibn Manzur, M. (2009) *Lisan Al Arab*, Lebanon, Dar al-Kutub al-Ilmiyya.

Ismail, M., Al-Jaish, M. (2006), *The Internal Situation in Israel and its Impact on the 1987 War*, Master's Thesis, Islamic University, Gaza, p 103.

Kamal, J. (2008), *60 years of the Arab-Israeli conflict*, reviewed by: Ahmed Mohamed Sabry, Heba Al-Nile Arab Publishing, Giza, p. 23.

Mr. Yassin, A (1983) *The Case of the Civilizational Challenge between Egypt and Israel*, International Politics, No. 72, p. 8.

- Norris, J. (2013). *Ottoman Colonial Development Palestine and the Eastern Mediterranean*. In *Land of Progress: Palestine in the Age of Colonial Development, 1905-1948* (pp. 26–62).
- Polley, G. (2022). *British empire: The forgotten Victorian crusade to colonise Palestine*.
- Saleh, M. (2003). *The Forty Facts in the Palestinian Cause*, Palinfo Center. P5.3-154.
- Saleh, M. (2012) *The Palestinian Cause: Its Historical Background and Contemporary Developments*, Beirut: Al-Zaytouna Center for Studies and Consultations, p. 35.
- Saleh, N (1985), *The Political History of the Arabs (1856-1956)*, 1st Edition, Dar Iqra, Beirut, p. 409.
- Wasel, A. (2002), *The Arab-Israeli Conflict*, 1st Edition, Beirut, Dar Al-Manhal.
- Yahya, J. (1998) *The Modern and Contemporary Arab World "The Period between the Two World Wars"* Part 2, Modern University Office, Alexandria, pp. 287-289.