The current hypothesis of the “silent conquest” of Syria-Palestine is well researched by among revisionist (originist) scholars of the rise of Nascent-Islam. These scholars often agree that the Arab conquest of Syria-Palestine differs greatly from the standard narrative of large scale battles between the Byzantine forces and Arab forces. In fact, there is a rising belief that the Arab movement really began in Syria-Palestine with a relatively calm transference of power. However, a re-evaluation of recent and established evidence of this period doesn’t adequately explain why the transition in power happened as explained or why the Arabs were prone to use existing bureaucratic, financial and military structures if the Arabs meant to wrest power from the Byzantines. The evidence points to an Arab secession beginning in the early 7th century and persisting even after the Arab loss at the first siege of Constantinople in 678 CE. Gideon Ani’s 2014 archaeological survey of the region revealed not only were there few large-scale battles but there is also little evidence of stress among the inhabitants of the region, which would be evident in “hordes” (underground caches) of money and supplies. Furthermore, an updated reading of Andrew Stratos’ work on the naval engagements of the time, demonstrates that much of the Arab maritime activity was in search of resources such as lumber. The first archaeological evidence of the original Umayyad Caliph Muawiyya found at Hamat Gader (Palestine) not only is in Greek but is also found in an existing Roman bathhouse and it recognizes the authority of the local Byzantine elite. Thus, secession is not only probable but evident.