
Joan Peters From Time Immemorial

Joan Peters From Time Immemorial
Downloaded from cardprinter.sendafriend.co
by Shaniya & Montgomery

JOAN PETERS AND "FROM TIME IMMEMORIAL": A REEXAMINATION OF A CONTROVERSIAL HISTORICAL NARRATIVE

In the landscape of historical writing about the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, few works have ignited as much debate as Joan Peters' 1984 book, *From Time Immemorial: The Origins of the Arab-Jewish Conflict over Palestine*. The book, promoted as a groundbreaking revisionist history, claimed to dismantle the foundational narrative of Palestinian national identity and to prove that mass Jewish immigration to Palestine was not a displacement but a return to a land that had never truly been an Arab homeland. For decades, **Joan Peters From Time Immemorial** has been cited by advocates of a particular Zionist perspective, yet it has also been subjected to devastating academic critique. Understanding the book's argument, its reception, and its enduring influence is essential for anyone grappling with the deeper historical currents of the Middle East.

The Author and Her Mission

Joan Peters was an American journalist and researcher who worked as a

consultant on Middle Eastern affairs. Lacking formal academic training in history or Near Eastern studies, she set out to write what she described as an "investigative history." Her central thesis, laid out over nearly 600 pages, was bold: the Arab population of Palestine before the establishment of the State of Israel was not indigenous, but largely composed of recent migrants from surrounding Arab countries who were drawn to the region by economic opportunities created by Zionist settlement. Peters argued that the idea of a Palestinian Arab nation with deep roots in the land was a modern fabrication.

To support this claim, *From Time Immemorial* drew heavily on Ottoman census records, travelogues, and reports from British Mandate officials. Peters contended that Palestine had been underpopulated and neglected for centuries, and that the Jews who began returning in the late 19th and early 20th centuries were not colonizers but repatriates returning to their ancient homeland. In her view, the conflict was not a clash of two national movements but a manufactured dispute stirred up by Arab leaders to serve their own political ends.

Core Argument: The

Demographic Revision

At the heart of **Joan Peters From Time Immemorial** is a demographic argument. She asserted that the Arab population of Palestine grew dramatically only after Jewish immigration began, and that much of that growth came from labor migration from Egypt, Syria, and other parts of the Ottoman Empire. She cited evidence such as the testimony of British officials who noted that many Arabs entering Palestine in the early 20th century were seeking work in the new Jewish settlements. She also pointed to the region's historical designation as "Syria" or "Southern Syria" to argue that there was no distinct Palestinian identity before the 20th century.

Peters used these claims to support a broader thesis: that the Jewish claim to the land was not only ancient and valid but also morally superior, because Jews developed the land and made it prosperous, while the Arab population had no organic connection to it. This line of reasoning resonated powerfully with certain political constituencies in Israel and the United States, who saw the book as a scholarly weapon against Palestinian nationalism and the growing international sympathy for the Palestinian cause.

Initial Reception and Promotion

Upon its release, *From Time Immemorial* was met with enthusiastic endorsements from prominent figures, including the

novelist Saul Bellow and the historian Barbara Tuchman. It was serialized in *The New Republic*, praised in *The New York Times Book Review*, and became a bestseller. For a time, it was treated as authoritative by many in the pro-Israel community. The book's central narrative—that the Palestinian Arabs were largely an invented people—was precisely what many supporters of Israel wanted to hear. It seemed to offer historical legitimacy to the idea that the conflict could be resolved simply by dismissing Palestinian national claims.

However, the acclaim was short-lived. Almost immediately, academic historians began to scrutinize Peters' sources and methodology. The most comprehensive and devastating critique came in 1986 from the historian Norman Finkelstein, then a doctoral candidate at Princeton University, who published a detailed analysis titled *"From the Jewish Question to the Jewish State."* Finkelstein's work, later expanded into the book *Image and Reality of the Israel-Palestine Conflict*, exposed what he argued were systematic distortions, misquotations, and fabrications in Peters' use of sources.

The Academic Critique: A House of Cards

Finkelstein, along with other scholars such as Yehoshua Porath and Bill Farrell, demonstrated that the demographic claims at the core of **Joan Peters From Time Immemorial** were not supported by the evidence. Peters had selectively cited Ottoman census data while ignoring contradictory figures. She had

quoted British officials out of context. In one famous instance, she claimed that a report by the British Peel Commission in 1937 stated that Arab immigration into Palestine was “very high,” when the actual report said the opposite—that Arab immigration was negligible compared to Jewish immigration.

Moreover, the claim that the Arab population was mostly composed of recent migrants was contradicted by the same demographic data Peters used. The vast majority of Palestinian Arabs in the late 19th and early 20th centuries were descendants of families who had lived in the region for many generations. While there was some labor migration, it was not on the scale that Peters suggested, and it did not undermine the existence of a stable indigenous Arab population.

Peters’ treatment of Ottoman Empire administrative boundaries was also criticized. She argued that because Palestine was not a separate administrative unit under the Ottomans, there was no basis for a Palestinian national identity. Critics pointed out that this logic could be applied to many regions of the world that later developed national identities. The very concept of national identity evolved over time, and the absence of a distinct “Palestine” province in Ottoman records did not prove that the people living there lacked a connection to the land.

Perhaps the most damaging criticism concerned Peters’ handling of a key source: the work of the 18th-century historian Henry Maundrell. Finkelstein showed that Peters had misrepresented Maundrell’s account of the population of Palestine, claiming he described a “vast emptiness” when in fact Maundrell wrote about a “great multitude” of people.

Such errors, repeated throughout the book, led to a near-universal rejection of the work by professional historians.

Legacy and Enduring Influence

Despite the scholarly consensus that *From Time Immemorial* is deeply flawed, the book has never completely faded from public discourse. It continues to be cited in online forums, political speeches, and even some educational materials. The persistence of its narrative speaks to a broader phenomenon: the appeal of revisionist histories that simplify complex conflicts. For many, the idea that the Palestinian national movement is a recent invention is attractive because it suggests that the conflict can be resolved by rejecting those claims outright.

The book’s legacy is also tied to the rise of the “new historians” in Israel and the wider debate about historical narratives. While Peters was not an academic, her work was part of a wave of revisionist writing that challenged the traditional Zionist historiography. However, unlike the Israeli new historians (such as Benny Morris, Ilan Pappé, and Avi Shlaim) who used archival research to critique established narratives from a scholarly perspective, Peters’ work was seen as polemical and ideologically driven. The difference is important: the new historians often opened new avenues of inquiry, while Peters’ book ultimately closed discussion by presenting a one-sided, evidence-poor account.

Moreover, the controversy surrounding

Joan Peters From Time Immemorial has itself become a subject of study in the sociology of knowledge. Scholars have examined how a book that was so thoroughly discredited could still achieve such influence. Factors include the political climate of the 1980s, the Cold War context in which Israel was a key U.S. ally, and the powerful marketing machine behind the book. The case of Peters' book is a cautionary tale about the importance of rigorous peer review and the dangers of allowing political agendas to drive historical scholarship.

The Broader Historical Context

To understand why *From Time Immemorial* matters, one must place it within the ongoing struggle over the historical narrative of Palestine. For decades, both sides of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict have used history as a weapon. The Palestinian national movement emphasizes deep roots, continuous presence, and the injustice of the Nakba (the 1948 displacement). The Zionist movement emphasizes ancient ties, the return of a persecuted people, and the transformation of a barren land into a modern state. Peters' book attempted to provide a "smoking gun" that would demolish the Palestinian narrative entirely.

Yet, as many historians have pointed out, the real history is much more nuanced. The land now known as Palestine has been home to diverse populations for millennia—Canaanites, Israelites, Philistines, Romans, Arabs, Jews, and others. Jewish presence in the

region never fully ended, even after the Roman destruction of the Second Temple. Arab populations have been there since the Muslim conquests in the 7th century. Both peoples have legitimate historical and emotional ties to the land. The conflict is not about who was there "first" but about competing national movements in a modern political context.

Peters' attempt to deny any indigenous Arab connection was not only historically inaccurate but also counterproductive for genuine peace efforts. By delegitimizing Palestinian identity, the book reduced the possibility of mutual recognition. Peace requires acknowledging the other's narrative, even if one disagrees with parts of it. The rejectionism inherent in Peters' thesis helped reinforce intransigence on both sides.

Key Takeaways for Readers

For anyone researching the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, it is vital to approach **Joan Peters From Time Immemorial** with a critical eye. The book can be read as a primary source—a document of the ideological battles of its time—rather than as reliable history. Its flaws have been meticulously cataloged by scholars, and its conclusions should not be cited without caveats. Some of the specific points in the book:

- The claim that the Arab population of Palestine was predominantly composed of post-1880 immigrants is not supported by credible demographic data.
- The use of Ottoman census

records was selective and misinterpreted.

- The book misrepresents British Mandate reports and travel accounts.
- It conflates the legitimate historical Jewish connection to the land with a myth of an empty land awaiting Jewish return.

Conversely, the book does prompt some legitimate questions about population movements in the late Ottoman period. There was indeed labor migration into Palestine from surrounding areas, but this existed alongside a large, settled indigenous population. Understanding those dynamics requires nuanced scholarship, not polemics.

The Enduring Debate Over Historical Narratives

The controversy over *From Time Immemorial* also highlights a broader issue in historical writing: the tension between “history as science” and “history as identity affirmation.” Many non-specialist readers turn to books like Peters’ to find confirmation of their worldviews rather than to challenge them. This is a natural human tendency, but it can lead to the uncritical acceptance of flawed works. For journalists, educators, and policy makers, the lesson is clear: always check

the sources, follow the footnotes, and consult peer-reviewed scholarship.

The book remains a key reference in the “myth-busting” genre of Zionist advocacy, even if it has been discredited in academic circles. It continues to appear in library catalogs, online discussions, and occasionally in political speeches. Its lasting impact is a reminder that bad history, once written, is hard to banish entirely. This makes critical thinking and historical literacy more important than ever.

Conclusion

Joan Peters’ *From Time Immemorial* is a book that promised to rewrite the history of the Arab-Jewish conflict in Palestine. It became a bestseller and a political touchstone, but it failed the test of scholarly scrutiny. The weight of academic criticism—showing systematic misuse of sources, misquotations, and selective reading—has relegated the book to the category of polemical advocacy rather than serious history. Nevertheless, its arguments continue to resonate in certain circles, a testament to the power of a compelling narrative even when it is divorced from evidence. For anyone seeking a genuine understanding of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, the book is best studied as a case study in the manipulation of history for political ends. The real history is more complex, more tragic, and more human than any single revisionist account can capture. Engaging with that complexity is the task of responsible scholarship and honest dialogue.