

free palestine

Kdo
Vol. 2, No. 7, November 1970



THE MANEUVERING RULING CLASS

A ceasefire concluded in Cairo this September ended indiscriminate killing in Amman. By the middle of October, an agreement regulating the relationship between the revolution and the regime in Amman was signed under the auspices of the Supervisory Arab Committee. By the end of October, all signs indicated that *the Jordanian regime and its allies are preparing for another round of fighting.*

On the background of the Jordanian regime's nature and its behavior during the past few years, an analysis of the situation in Jordan and a study of the current events there lead to the conclusion that *it is only a matter of time* before the enemies of the Arab peoples launch their next onslaught on the revolution and its popular base.

In Jordan, it is the same military clique, responsible for executing the Zionist-imperialist plot of liquidating the Palestine revolution in September, that still controls the regime there. These men and their tribes of bedouin mercenaries do not believe in the possibility of coexistence (in Jordan) with the revolution; they do not take the agreement seriously; and they do not hide their wanting to dishonor it. They have, by their actions in the past, disqualified themselves to be signatories to a respectable document. The present government in Jordan cannot and will not honor its obligation under the agreement. Under present circumstances, only a nationalist government could carry out its obligations towards the revolution and the people, and this cannot be established so long as the Hashemites rule Jordan.

Hussein and his sycophants have already co-signed several documents with the revolution; but

IN ANTICIPATION OF THE NEXT ROUND

these agreements were all broken before the ink in which they were written had dried. Nothing in the Jordanian regime has changed significantly enough to warrant a change in its policies. It still has the same imperialist puppet at its head and it is still manned by the same self-interested elements, whose existence in that part of the world is tied up with the future of Zionism and imperialism there.

The contradiction between the aims of the revolution to liberate the people from oppression inflicted upon them by these ruling classes and the aims of these oppressors to perpetuate this rule *remain as sharp as ever, and as ominous as ever.* At the same time the allies of the regime in Jordan—Zionism and imperialism—have not desisted from their ignominious attempts to liquidate the revolution. The regime in Jordan, thus, has no other alternative but to break its pacts with the revolution—if it does not want to break away from its allies, whose support is vital to the maintenance of the regime's titular authority.

Preliminary to the September carnage came the "Rogers' Plan." It was peddled to those Arab regimes who accepted it as a last chance, a means of staying in their saddles. It was presented as an honest attempt to save the area from war and destruction. In their dash after the mirage of political victories, these Arab regimes precipitated the massacre in Jordan and contributed to further divisiveness in the Arab world. The commandos were isolated and pictured as the spoilers of Arab interests and unity. It was only the heroic determination of the freedom fighters and the unwavering support to them by the people in Jordan that foiled the Jordanian plot to get a stranglehold on the Palestine liberation movement.

THE NEUTRAL NEW PALESTINE

Today, a new ploy is being put forward by the same sponsors of the Rogers' Plan. The novel trick is "a Palestinian state" in the Occupied West Bank and Gaza. More curious than the project itself is that it's being advocated by the Zionist forces of occupation in collaboration with their "Palestinian" sidekicks. Suddenly, after the black September in Jordan, we began to hear about such organizations as *The Palestine National Front, The Organization of Palestinian Intellectuals*, etc., calling for the establishment of a "revolutionary Palestinian government" on a "neutral territory" and struggling for the liberation of the "occupied fatherland." These front organizations are propagating "Palestinian nationalism"—but all signs indicate that they derive their appeal from talk about "an Arab plot" to commit genocide against the Palestinian people who are committed to a free Palestine.

The emptiness of the slogans raised by these fronts is very clear. If they are truly a national liberation group, why shouldn't they join in the Palestinian resistance, an already established movement struggling for liberation of the same land? If

they were truly intellectuals, why don't they identify themselves and let the public judge their intellect from their creative works? What are the roots and aspirations of this new Palestinian nationalism that these self-avowed "nationalist leaders and intellectuals" are calling for? And more to the point, what makes these people Palestinians? Palestinians are those who work with the mass of their people in the camps. Those who advocate the new plan of Palestinian entity have no credentials to certify their being Palestinian, other than their accidental birth in that country; they might as well defend the country of their adoptive allegiance. Those who headed the Jordanian government in September were also this kind of Palestinians.

The *raison d'être* of the Palestine liberation movement is the promotion of Arab unity and Arab social change through the struggle for the liberation of Palestine. Among its first slogans was the one saying: "The path of liberation is the path of unity." The liberation of Palestine would be totally meaningless if it were to be aimed at the establishment of a locality called by that name. *Another Arab state, like all the rest of them, would be a mere numerical addition unworthy of the name and, definitely and more importantly, totally unworthy of the struggle that has been waged in its behalf.*

The Palestinian resistance is only the vanguard of Arab revolution, and it is only within such a context that the problem of Israel should be approached—and can be solved. Any call for "a regional solution" as an end in itself betrays the cause, in particular, of the Palestinian people—but of all the Arab peoples as well.

The proposed *neutral Palestinian entity* is nothing more than a follow-up to the ill-fated Rogers' Plan. The previous conglomeration of forces, each with a slightly different assignment, but all carrying the banner of PEACE UNDER THE ROGERS' PLAN, failed to thwart the revolution. Now raising the standard of a PALESTINIAN STATE ON THE OCCUPIED TERRITORIES, the same conglomeration of forces wish to add a Palestinian voice to their own. The task forces (of Zionists, imperialists, and counter-revolutionaries) hope to sugar-coat the pill, but it is still the same pill.

The neutral Palestine is a concoction meant to render the movement powerless and control contagion of the rest of the populace falling under its influence.

Nonetheless, one can count on the following results: the reactionary regime in Jordan will replay its role in the clean-up campaign; other Arab governments will go on their same ways; and the commandos will fight it out all by themselves. Only, this time it is the hope of the new task-forces to present the commandos as spoilers of true Palestinian interests. This is why Palestinian support of this new plan is considered by the Palestine liberation movement to be high treason.

ON THE ORIGINS OF THE ZIONIST MOVEMENT.

1.

Obviously Zionism is a very important modern political movement. It has succeeded in creating a Jewish state in Palestine, in dispossessing and uprooting an entire population, and in winning three expansionistic wars against the Arab states.

In trying to shed some light on the nature and origins of the Zionist movement I shall start by considering some prevalent explanations of this socio-political phenomenon in the course of modern European history. These prevalent and widespread explanations are more often than not derived from Zionist sources and are uncritically subscribed to by many non-Zionist and even anti-Zionist elements. These explanations are, more specifically, derived from the way in which Zionism has tended to explain itself to its own potential adherents among the masses and to the environment in which it grew and developed.

We may summarize the central thesis of all such prevalent explanations of the Zionist movement in the following manner: Zionism is the modern and contemporary manifestation of the historical phenomenon of the preservation of the Jewish people over the ages through the agency of their national, spiritual and religious bond.

Historical validity of this thesis rests on a number of assumptions:

a) That before the destruction of Jerusalem in Roman times the "Jewish Nation" was in no way different from other normally constituted nations. However as a result of the wars with the Romans the Jewish "Nation" was dispersed to the four corners of the earth.

b) In the diaspora the Jews as a whole absolutely refused, century after century, any kind of assimilation into the life of the communities amongst which they happened to live.

c) As a result the Jews formed, throughout the history of the diaspora, a homogeneous and tightly knit mass of people bound together by devotion to their religion and "Nationality". In more flowery but typically Zionist language the Jews were held together by attachment to their "national idea", and to the "sacred trust of their faith". This condition is supposed to have led to their isolation, suffering and persecution.

d) Consequently, the Jews as a "race" or "people" or "nationality" are supposed to have a certain set of essential and distinguishing characteristics which separate them from other people and gives them their alleged "uniqueness".

e) That the history of the Jews is nothing but the continuous life of a single people or "nation", in the modern sense of the term. For example the Zionist theoretician Arthur Hertzberg summarizes the central thesis of the most distinguished and influential 19th century historian as follows:

"Dinur argues that the Jews were always, from the beginning of their history, a nation in the modern sense — indeed the first such nation (an idea first propounded by Hess)."¹

Again the distinguished Jewish historian Nautet repeats the same claim in more radical form when he states:

"Israel is not a new nation. Its emergence is not a birth, but a resurrection" . . .²

Contemporary Israeli writers continue to spread this myth about the "eternal nationhood" of the Jewish people which was originally invented by the Zionist movement to serve its contemporary interests and objectives. For instance Nahum Goldman still says that the Jewish people "is almost unique in the history of Humanity."³

Again another contemporary Israeli thinker, R. J. Zwi Werblowsky, writes in the same vein spreading the myths of eternal and unique nationhood. He says:

"It is an established fact in all that follows that the Jewish people have consciously formed a nation practically every epoch of its historic existence. A specific self-awareness, that is to say a feeling of historical being and of its destiny is a constant fact of Jewish culture."⁴

The following remarks are intended to show the historical inaccuracy and falsity of the assumptions on which rest the prevalent explanations of the origins of the Zionist movement.

The assumption that the Jews were dispersed all over the ancient world after the destruction of the temple in Jerusalem by the Romans is strictly false. For instance Leonard Stein argues in his book on Zionism that the Jews settled in various areas outside Palestine long before the fall of Judea. He estimates the number of Jews in Palestine prior to the advent of Christianity at about 700,000 compared to 4 millions distributed all over the Roman Empire.⁵ Again Abraham Leon argues, in his classic book on the Jewish Question, that the dispersal of the Jews does not at all date from the fall of Jerusalem.⁶ He points to the evidence provided by the Author Ruppin⁷ to the effect that well before the fall of Jerusalem more than three-fourths of the Jews no longer lived in Palestine.

Leon continues his argument by showing that as far as the masses of the Jews dispersed in the Greek and later, in the Roman Empires the Jewish kingdom of Palestine was of completely secondary importance. The tie with the "mother country" was manifested solely in religious pilgrimages to Jerusalem, which played a role similar to that of Mecca, for the Indian Muslims in our times. Leon mentions in support of his argument that shortly before the fall of Jerusalem, King Agrippa said to the Jews, "there is no people upon the habitable earth which have not some portion of you among them."⁸

In other words, contrary to accepted assumptions in explaining the origins of the Zionist movement, the diaspora was historically neither the product of a cataclysmic act of violence nor the result of a sudden and unexpected accident. Leon gives us the serious explanation for the Jewish dispersal all over the ancient world in the following paragraph:

"The Diaspora was consequently not at all an accidental thing, a product of acts of violence. The fundamental reason for Jewish emigration must be sought in the geographic conditions of Palestine. The Jews in Palestine were the possessors of a mountainous country which at a certain time no longer sufficed for assuring

its inhabitants as tolerable an existence as that among their neighbors. Such a people is driven to choose between brigandage and emigration. The Scots, for example, alternately engaged in each of these pursuits. The Jews after numerous struggles with their neighbors, also took the second road . . . Peoples living under such conditions do not go to foreign countries as agriculturists. They go there rather in the role of mercenaries, like the Arcadians or Antiquity, the Swiss in the Middle Ages, the Albanians in our day; or in the role of merchants, like the Jews, the Scots and the Armenians. We see here that a similar environment tends to produce similar characteristics among peoples of different races."⁹

The idea that the Jews from the beginning of their history have formed a "nation" in the modern sense of the term is simply absurd from the point of view of historical accuracy. It completely disregards the fact that nations, in this sense are the product of the living forces of history and so people may be considered to possess the properties of "nationhood" permanently, always and from the very beginning of history. The emergence of nations is part of the process of our modern historical epoch. Accordingly it is quite absurd to speak about the "Jewish nation" (except metaphorically) at a stage of history where the Jews lived a tribal, nomadic life or lived within the framework of feudal social order.

We should note also that the idea that the Jews have always formed a nation in the modern sense of the term is really not the product of serious historical research. It is rather the result of the rewriting of Jewish history by Jewish nationalists and Zionists in the 19th century in order to serve certain present and immediate political objectives and interests. Zionism as a bourgeois nationalist movement has a powerful stake in the rewriting of history so as to prove that its origins go back deep into the ever present, but dormant, Jewish "nationalism". In other words, Zionism benefits in viewing itself not as something novel produced by modern historical forces but as the revival of something primordial that had been lying in the Jewish people all through and from the very beginning of their history.

As for the widely accepted claim that the Jews maintained themselves by rejecting all forms of assimilation into the human environment they found themselves in, it also can not withstand critical historical examination. In fact the history of the Jews is both the history of the preservation of Judaism and the history of the assimilation of large sections of Jews into the social order within which they lived. For example, Arthur Ruppin mentions that "in North Africa, in pre-Islamic times, great numbers of Jews were engaged in agriculture, but of these, too the vast majority had been absorbed by the local population."¹⁰

All in all the Jews in Medieval times were fully integrated into the general social order contrary to the usual Zionist claims about the "tragic isolation" of the Jews from their surroundings. This explains why Hebrew disappeared quite early as a living language. The Jews everywhere adopted the

Dr. Sadek Jalal Al-Athm is one of the leading Arab critics whose radical views are feared not only by Arab reactionaries but by the "progressive Arab regimes" as well. A graduate of Yale and editor at *Dar Al-Tali'a* in Beirut, he is the author of several analytical books that deal with the Arab revolution. This book *A Critique of Religious Thought* (published in Beirut) has led to his expulsion, arrest and trial. This is the first in a series of three articles by him to appear in FREE PALESTINE.

SADEK JALAL AL-ATHM

languages of the peoples among whom they lived and into whose social order they were well integrated. The well-known Marxist French historian and orientalist Maxime Rodinson furnishes us with clear evidence which refutes the myth of the Jewish "tragic isolation" and shows to what extent the Jews were really integrated and assimilated into the life of the societies they existed within.

Concerning Jewish life in Christian medieval society Rodinson has the following evidence to present:

"At the end of exhaustive research on the condition of the Jews of the Latin world before the Crusades, B. Blumenkranz summarizes the results on this point thus: "Subjected to the same laws as the Christians, nothing distinguishes them anymore from them. Speaking the same language as they, labelled in the same manner, practicing the same professions, they intermix in the same houses just as they find themselves reunited together under arms for the defense of the common country." He has specified in the course of his work: "Aside from public functions, . . . there is no activity from which Jews are formally excluded." The restrictions that are mentioned are based on religion, not generally applied, and are very far from reducing the Jews to any specialization. Thus the attempt to forbid Christians to consult Jewish doctors, the prohibitions of liturgical objects. "No text of our period, neither of the law nor of practice deals with the usury of the Jews . . . (moreover) at this moment money lending simply does not exist on a large enough scale to make a problem of law and order of it."¹¹

Very similar considerations apply to the life of the Jews within medieval Muslim society as the same author points out:

"In the Muslim Empire and the States which resulted from its fragmentation (States keeping among themselves, nevertheless, close ties), international trade and regional specialization of agricultural and artisan's productions developed enormously. The Jews, as all the other elements of the population, participated in this development and became, in great numbers, merchants. As the greatest specialist in this matter, S. D. Goitein, says, "this 'bourgeois revolution' had to accelerate the transformation of the Jews, people who until then were given essentially to manual trades in a group from which the principal occupation became commerce . . . new confrontations in the Muslim Epoch (after similar developments in Babylonia in the 6th century B.C., then in the hellenistic world) with a highly mercantile civilization, they ascribe so completely to the challenge that they are themselves becoming a nation of businessmen and begin to take a considerable part in the development of the new civilization." The author adds significantly, "this transformation moreover did not raise a strong enough opposition. This is notably reflected by a *caricature* Jewish author (a Jewish heretic), who stigmatized "business" as a non-Jewish profession adopted by imitating Gentiles—be they Arabs or Muslims in general.¹²

Now we turn to another historian who provides us with a telling description of the conditions of Jewish life within the Ottoman Empire. B. Halpern writes the following on the subject:

"During the Ottoman period, Jewish subjects of the Sultan moved freely in and out of Palestine from other parts of the far-flung Empire, from North Africa to the Balkans—as did

also Moslems and Christians . . . but the Jewish immigrants and residents were drawn to Constantinople, Damascus, or Cairo, where economic and political conditions were far more favorable, rather than to Palestine."¹³

The hatred to which the Jews were subject in various degrees, at different times and in different societies (ancient and medieval anti-Semitism) cannot be seriously explained by talking about the "tragedy of Jewish isolation", their "separateness" and devotion to "the trust of their faith". Such purely idealistic explanations tend to obscure the issue instead of shedding light upon it.

The origins of this sort of negative sentiment against the Jews in ancient and medieval times is to be found in the traditional antagonism towards the merchant in societies based on a natural economy concerned primarily with the production of use values. And it is well known that certain strata of the Jewish population were the traders and merchants of the societies within which they settled and integrated themselves. However, the hostility of societies and classes that live from the land towards trade does not mean that they can dispense altogether with that activity. The land owner, for example, might hate and despise the merchant but he cannot manage without him.

Before finishing with the topic one more observation about the "tragic isolation" of the Jews. Contemporary human societies are organized along the lines of the modern nation-state. However, we should always remember that before the rise of this form of social organization empires and states used to be internally constituted out of a welter of distinct human communities and groups each living in relative isolation from the others. In the plastic society of the decentralized feudal states, for example, each group of men lived according to its own customs, and under its own special jurisdiction. The specific organizational form of the Jews was the *Kehillah*. Each cluster of Jews was organized into a community (*Kehillah*) which lived its own social life and had its own juridical organization, i.e., it enjoyed a large measure of autonomy.

In other words, the "isolation", autonomy and in-group tightness which characterized the traditional life of Jewish communities was nothing unique or particular to the Jews themselves, devised by "wicked" forces in order to make them suffer. This was simply the characteristic condition of the life of all such communities which happened to fall within the bounds of a decentralized feudal state. (The ghetto in its reprehensible sense is a later product of middle class-dominated European society). Concerning the persecution of the Jews, Abraham Leon (a Jew by birth himself) has the following interesting observation to make:

"As a general rule the persecutions of the Jews were social in character. But the lag of ideology behind the social superstructure can account for certain *purely religious*, persecutions. In some regions, the Jews were able to preserve their special religion for a fairly long time despite their transformation into agriculturists. In such cases, the persecutions were designed to *hasten* their conversion. What distinguishes *religious* persecutions from *social* persecutions (under a religious guise) is their less violent character and the feeble resistance of the Jews. Thus, it appears that in Visigoth Spain the Jews were in part agriculturists. Consequently, the Visigoth kings never thought of expelling them, as Ferdinand and Isabella did later. On the whole, purely religious persecutions must be considered as exceptional."

Editorial

The gist of a Palestine anecdote is as follows: Once upon a time, a Bedouin entered into partnership with a peasant to raise cattle. The two became friends of sorts. One day the peasant needed some money. He borrowed it from his partner the Bedouin on the understanding that he would return the debt when the Bedouin needed it. A year later, when the holiday season rolled around, the Bedouin needed the money to buy new clothes for his family. So, he decided to make the trip to the village where his peasant friend lived and ask for the money. As soon as he arrived in the village and came to his friend's house, the peasant realized the purpose of the visit. Having had no intention of paying back the debt, but realizing that discovery would end in the breaking-up of the partnership, the peasant decided to trick the Bedouin. He went into the yard, caught a chicken, killed it, and gave his guest a leisurely dinner. The guest was touched by his host's hospitality and was embarrassed to ask for the money. Having succeeded in this first try, the peasant used the same stratagem for several years. Finally, the Bedouin realized what was going on and came for the last time, determined to collect his debts. As soon as he appeared in the village, the peasant hurried to kill the chicken, but the Bedouin called out to his host: "O Partner!" he said, "whether you kill the chicken or you do not kill the chicken, this time I'm not leaving without my money!"

This is the story of the Arab nation, and particularly of the Palestinians, where imperialism is concerned. Since the ill-advised partnership of Sherif Hussein and imperialism, Arabs got a chicken for dinner whenever they arose to assert their national rights.

The upheavals of 1921 and 1929 both prompted delegations of investigation commissions to Palestine. In both cases, the recommendations of the commissions were no sooner published than forgotten. They succeeded, nonetheless, in achieving their goal of halting the struggle for the time being. In July 1930, the British issued the Passfield White Paper limiting Jewish immigration to Palestine. In February 1931, they repudiated that white paper. At the end of the 1936-39 revolt, the British issued the McDonald White Paper (May 1939). In December 1939, Churchill declared his support for the creation of a Jewish State in Palestine. Then there were the partition resolution, the many resolutions concerning the rights of the refugees to repatriation and to compensation—none of which was carried out and all of which were meant to put a damper on some disquieting act or another.

The Palestine entity that the U.S. Government is proposing is possibly a bigger chicken. It might look and taste better, but still it is no more than just another one of so many propositions to settle the "Palestinian refugee problem" and to preserve the outpost of imperialism in the area: Israel. The Palestinian people have had enough of this stratagem. Today, rising to the talk of liberating their country, they will never accept a poor substitute for the real thing.

FOOTNOTES

1. Arthur Hertzberg, (ed.) *The Zionist Idea*, Harper Torch Books, New York, 1959, p.21.
2. Dov Barnir, "Les Juifs, Le Sionisme et le Progres", *Les Temps Modernes*, special issue, Le Conflit Israelo-Arabe, Paris, 1967, p.423.
3. "Pour Une Solution Confederale", *Les Temps Modernes*, p. 692.
4. "Israel et Eretz Israel", *Les Temps Modernes*, pp. 374-375.
5. L. Stein, *Zionism*, London, 1925, p. 13.
6. *The Jewish Question*, Editions Pioneras, Mexico, 1950, Ch. one.
7. *The Jews in the Modern World*, London, 1934, p. 22.
8. Flavius Josephus, *Works*, London, 1844, p. 693.
9. *The Jewish Question*, pp. 30-31.
10. *The Jews in the Modern World*, p. 271.
11. Introduction to A. Leon's *La Conception Materialiste de la Question Juive*, EDI, Paris, p. XXVII.
12. *Ibid.*, pp. XXX-XXXI.
13. *The Idea of the Jewish State*, p. 105.

Reserve your copy of:

A LOVER FROM PALESTINE

and other poems.

an anthology of Palestinian poetry

edited by A. AL-MESSIRI

illus. by K. BOULLATA

Send your check or money order (\$3.00) to
FREE PALESTINE



INTERVIEW WITH URI AVNERY

With this issue we bring you an interview with Uri Avnery, the so-called "most controversial figure on the Israeli political scene," whose contradictory views have perplexed some of the leftist and liberal press in the west.

Avnery began his political career as a teenage terrorist in the 'Irgun.' His sensational weekly "Ha'olam Hazeh" created an uproar in Israel. Today he is one of the youngest members of the Knesset.

This interview was taped especially for FREE PALESTINE. The author of Israel Without Zionists reveals himself and the self-evident contradictions of his "petit bourgeois" liberal political thinking in this text approved by him for publication here.

Q: Do you recognize the entity of a Palestinian people and in what terms?

A: My friends and I do recognize the existence of a Palestinian people with its national rights.

In this country which you call 'Falastin' and which we call 'Eretz Israel' there exists two national entities. However this came about, what injustice created it and what injustices have been done is an important question historically but it does not change the reality that today you have two nations living in the same territory each of them convinced that the whole country is their historical homeland.

The only way to solve this conflict is to have two national states coexisting in the country, each one embodying the nationality, the personality, the culture and the national aspirations of one of the two people with frontiers which existed before the last war and Jerusalem as a joint capital belonging to both states.

Q: You don't feel then that there is a common meeting ground between the Palestinian people and the Israelis?

A: I think that this is the way to bring about a meeting. For as long as Israelis are afraid of the Arabs and the Palestinians are afraid of the Israelis a meeting ground cannot materialize. Having an open frontier between an Israeli state and a Palestinian one is a necessity for both sides; if the mutual enmity slowly disappears, mutual confidence slowly will build up. As people meet on human terms gradually a new fabric of life will come about. In such a situation slowly the sovereignty of the two states will become less and less important and the unity of the country as such will become more and more important. I think this is the only way to achieve the reunification of the country in realistic terms without a war and without one people dominating the other.

Q: Why is it necessary that an exclusively Jewish state should exist?

A: This is a very complicated question and one has first of all to examine the terms: 'an exclusively Jewish state.'

It is true that Israel today is defined as a Jewish state: we have several laws which make distinctions between Jews and non-Jews. My friends and I, have been fighting against this from the very beginning. We believe that Israel should become a normal state making no distinction whatsoever between people according to race, descent, religion, nationality, etc.

This whole idea of a Jewish state which belongs to a certain period of our past is not necessary today. On the other hand I do believe that Israel as a state where one nation finds expression of its personality, a state which speaks Hebrew, which has one national flag which embodies our culture and aspirations is necessary. The Israeli people are not going to give this up. I want to make it clear to people who are not perhaps familiar with Israeli conditions. We in Israel do not want an exclusive

Jewish State but this does not mean we want to dissolve the Israeli society, the Israeli nation and the personality embodied in the Israeli state, which is Israeli.

Q: In what respect does an 'Israel without Zionism' as you envision it differ from the Democratic non-sectarian state propagated by Fatah?

A: There is a very great difference. The program of Fatah is impossible to implement in reality. It is not a political program. After a war between our two people lasting for about ninety years we cannot transform a total war into a total peace by one stroke of the pen. To visualize becoming friends, living together, having so much confidence in day-to-day life... this is Utopia, just not in the spirit of either the Palestinians as they are today nor of Israelis as they are today. It does not work in countries where there are two people living who are by far less involved in a conflict. In Cyprus, people had not established a non-sectarian democratic state but a bi-national one, which Fatah does not propose, and yet it does not work. In Belgium, there is one people with two languages... it does not work. In Canada, there are two people with different languages who share the same social pattern and culture yet there's a movement for the separation of Quebec. French-speaking people don't want to live in the same state with the English-speaking people. It's all over the world. Different people find it more and more difficult to live together in one unitary state.

In the situation of the Middle East, I think, given the mentality of the Israeli people: a mentality formed by their own historical experiences including the extermination of the Jews in Europe and the wars with the Arabs. Taking into account the mentality of the Palestinian people born out of their own historical experience I think, you find that as a slogan for a very distant future this could be very nice; as a program for the immediate future, it has no reality whatsoever. I would like to emphasize this for Palestinians themselves: if it is not based on the recognition of our national existence it would not work. Neither Fatah nor the P.F.L.P. nor the D.P.F. recognize the fact that there is an Israeli nation. A program based on the non-recognition of such an obvious fact is as utopian as any Israeli policy based on the non-recognition of the fact that there is a Palestinian people which acts like a people with its aspirations and national rights.

Furthermore, I think Palestinians thinking of a democratic non-sectarian State have not come to grips with its details. If all the Palestinians come back to Palestine and all the Israelis remain there you are going to have about 2½ to 3 million Israelis and about 2½ to 3 million Palestinians. There may even be an Israeli majority; if it is a democratic state the state may be Israeli and not Palestinian. More important is

the fact that the economic power and social structure of the Israeli society is more advanced than the Palestinian one. Even if the Israelis were a minority in such a state, economically, socially, they would be a dominant force. If I were a Palestinian, I would not agree to such a state.

In the document called the Palestinian pact one reads that the democratic non-sectarian state, Jews will be considered Palestinians who have been living in the country before the Zionist invasion, without giving a date, it means that not all Israelis can remain in Palestine and that it will be a national Palestinian state in which some, or many, Israelis will be tolerated. This is a program that will be impossible to realize by peace. Israelis will not agree to it. Imagine for a minute that the war goes on, some future date the Arabs will win the war against Israel, I don't think Israelis would have any interest in what's going to happen after that.

Q: How do you see the relationship of a non-Zionist Israel and the Jewish people in the world?

A: I think the relationship is going to be something like that between Australia or Canada with Britain. They are states created by the British and are very much part of the British culture. They declared war on Germany twice in a century in order to help Britain. But they are separate political and national entities. I think the Israelis are a part of the Jewish people. There is a very deep feeling of mutual attachment between the two. Yet it is a separate new nation with its own national interests and particular challenges.

Q: What do you mean by a non-Zionist Israel? Is it Israeli nationalism?

A: When we talk about a non-Zionist Israel we recognize that Israel would not have been created without the Zionist movement; but we believe that the Zionist movement and ideology belong to a reality which is a part of the past even if it still has an ideological influence on the present. Therefore, everything has to be reappraised and redefined in the light of the reality of Israel as it is today.

We are fighting in Israel for a separation of religion and state. I object in Israel to have any kind of official document including identity cards marked by nation (Jewish, Arab or whatever). I think it should not concern the state at all if I am a Jew or an Arab or a Russian. In short, there are many things in Israel which have been the outcome of Zionist ideology and Zionist emotions, perfectly understandable in the light of history. Today there is a new generation in Israel, which is not really interested in what happened before and wants to live a normal life in a normal state.

Speaking to Arabs, I would like to draw a clear distinction here between de-Zionization and de-Israelization; Arabs often mistake the two for one. De-Zionization means one wants Israel to remain but works towards changing

certain things in the laws in the regime and in the attitude of Israel towards its Arab citizens and its neighbors. We do not want to abolish the state of Israel. On the contrary we want the State of Israel to exist. When we talk of de-Zionization we mean we, as Israeli citizens want to change certain things in our state to which we object: on moral, political and even ideological grounds. This is quite a widespread attitude among young people in Israel including some very prominent people. But I want to ward off illusions—these very same people who want to change and de-Zionize Israel, are very extreme Israeli patriots. They will fight very hard to keep Israel.

Q: Would you include the Matzpen people?

A: I wouldn't. Matzpen is something very particular. They are a group of people certainly much less than a hundred in number. They are insignificant. They are significant outside Israel. In Israel they do not exist and I deplore what they are doing. If Matzpen gives our Arab friends the impression that something is going to change to the point where young people in Israel will want to abolish the State of Israel, nothing could be more wrong. Those people who fought and demonstrated for peace—after the Goldmann affair—are soldiers of the Israeli army. For example, Ran Cohen, one of the leaders of the Peace Movement in Israel is a captain of the paratroops. He is spending at least two months every year on the Suez Canal. He is an extreme Israeli nationalist, even a Zionist. This has to be clearly realized by Arabs in order to understand the situation in Israel.

I think Cohen feels a very deep moral obligation towards the Palestinians and towards the refugees. This is the kind of people who are going to make peace some day. I think it is very important to realize what kind of people they are, what they believe in and not to have false ideas about it. Matzpen will never be more than fifty people. It is insignificant.

Q: What is your concept of a non-Zionist Israel in relation to the Third World and to the western powers?

A: All of us want Israel to be a part of the Third World and not to be a part of two world imperialist power blocks: Today because of the war between the Arab world and Israel the two imperialists are penetrating in the Middle East. Israel achieves arms from the U.S.; the Arab World is compelled to take arms from Soviet Russia. If the war goes on, I think, someday it will be a direct fight between the Americans and the Russians. You and us will be very secondary and auxiliary troops between the power blocs which neither you nor us have any interest in.

If we come to a situation of Peace, I think, that Israel will happily cut itself off from American interest. It becomes part of the region in which it lives. I think those people who wish to get imperialism out of the Middle East should be the first to advocate peace there. Only peace can close the Middle East to foreign penetration.

Q: How do you see the relationship between the Israel that you propagate and the countries surrounding it?

A: I have in mind something which looks today very utopian: a relationship which will develop by stages which at the end will lead to a unified Middle East. A great confederation of people like the one developing in East and Western Europe.

I believe once we overcome this premial stage and bring about the independence of the Palestinians, once we achieve some kind of peace between Israel and the Arab countries I think life itself will take over and create a new fabric which change things perhaps even quicker than we anticipate today.

I do hope Israel will become one day as much a part of the Middle East as Italy or Switzerland or Belgium is a part of Europe.

Q: What do you think about the changes in the character of Israel being now mainly a militaristic society?

A: I don't think that Israel is a militaristic society. "Militaristic" is a state of mind where people glorify the army for its own sake. This has not yet happened to Israel. It may happen if the war goes on for another twenty or thirty years. Today, fortunately, while people respect the army and while people think the army is vitally important to the security of Israel there is no glorification of the army for the simple reason that everyone is the army. The army is not something apart from society. All our people are soldiers.

People who are afraid of Israel being militaristic should be the first to work for peace because this is the only way to prevent it. If there is peace and the army becomes unimportant, then, energetic young people will not think of becoming officers in the army—they'll think about becoming scientists or engineers or other things. But I want to tell you one thing which Arabs should recognize even while we are at war: on the whole the army high command in Israel is more moderate than many politicians in Israel. It is different from any country in the world which I know of. I would say that in the attitude towards such questions as the recognition of the Palestinian people, the fifty highest ranking officers of the Israeli army are more progressive than the fifty highest ranking politicians in Israel. I find them very understanding perhaps because they are more in direct contact with the Palestinian situation. The army is fighting against the Fedayeen every day. There is a greater realization of the Palestinian question and of a need to find a solution.

Therefore it is not so simple a question if the army becomes more important the state becomes more extreme, not quite so in Israel. Even a man like Dayan I think understands the Palestinian problem more than the old-time Zionists like Golda Meir. If you ever come to concrete political decisions I do hope that even Dayan won't be the worst. Dayan can be convinced that a solution without the Palestinians will not be a good solution, that we must find a way to the Palestinians.

Q: Do you think Israel has fulfilled the Zionist dream?

A: There had been a very interesting article about this by Naom Goldmann in "Foreign Affairs" which was very much criticized in Israel and it gives a negative answer.

I think what has happened many times in human history will happen to you people: that there is a movement, you think about a distant aim in utopian terms, you succeed: the movement creates a new reality and then they generally find the new reality is not that one which they had conceived.

If Zionism intended that all the Jews of the world will come to Israel it has failed. Today we have an Israeli nation of two and half million people; we have an immigration to Israel of about 40,000 a year which is less than the natural increase of the Palestinians. This means we are going to stay more or less as we are even if Soviet Russia opens its gates to its Jews. It won't basically change the situation as it is at present. Orthodox Zionists if they are ready to face reality must conclude that Zionism has succeeded in certain parts and failed in others. Both parts belong to history.

Q: What is your opinion of 'the law of return'?

A: I think the whole discussion about the law of return is to a great extent artificial. If a state wants to have immigration it does not need any law for it. I think Israel without a law of return would be exactly like the situation is in Canada. Israel like Canada needs manpower on every level. Even without Zionism without the law of return, with no ideology whatsoever Israel will try very hard to get new people into Israel.

Since the Law of Return makes a distinction

in law between somebody called a Jew and somebody not called a Jew we always objected very strongly to it. This fight though is independent of our attitude toward the Arabs. We are Israelis who want our own state to be the kind of state which we want to live in.

You must understand that the Law of Return was the expression of a mood of a certain time when it was created. Israel has just been established and there were hundreds of thousands of Jews left in all kinds of camps in Europe after the Nazi crimes. The British in Palestine had closed immigration. Now, after twenty years it's obsolete. But frankly I say again, it does not really make a difference because Israel needs immigrants as much as the U.S., Australia or Canada. Palestinians today are living all over the world because nearly every modern state needs people and they are really glad to have Palestinians. You see them everywhere now as much as you see the Jews. You have two parallel diasporas. All industrial nations need manpower. Tomorrow if you abolish the Law of Return and say that all people are equal before the Israeli law that will not really change things because we still need these people. Israel will still try very hard to attract them.

My friends and I have been fighting since 1948 for the acceptance of the U.N. principle for the refugees to have the free choice between repatriation and compensation. I find it easier today talking about this before an Israeli audience than in 1950 because there is a definite Jewish majority in the population; there is no threat to the composition of the Israeli society.

The other idea that immigration is a danger to the Arab is, I think, a falacy. You don't see a million Jews sitting on their suitcases waiting to be allowed to come to Israel. On the other hand, the expansion of Israel can come about with or without immigration: it depends upon the state of war between the Arab world and Israel. If Arabs are afraid of Israeli expansion they should be the first to ask the Israeli State to have fixed and final frontiers and we in Israel will welcome it very much indeed.

I think it's about time, many slogans both on the Israeli and the Arab side have to be re-examined from time to time: to see if they still are true or if they ever were true.

I would like to conclude with this remark: whatever your outlook on the situation is, whatever solution you see to the struggle: it is bad that there is such a lack of communication between the two sides. I think that one of the best things one can do is, for Palestinian Israelis and Arabs in general, to find some way of communication, of understanding each other even in a situation of war.

Q: How come you have changed your views concerning the annexation of Jerusalem?

A: I have not changed my views about the annexation of Jerusalem. What I said to you today is exactly the same thing which I said in my speech in the Knesset on the day we voted on this. I was and I am against the unilateral annexation of Jerusalem into Israel but I am for its unification. I don't think Jerusalem should ever be reverted to the situation which existed between 48 and 67 when there was a wall and barbed wire between two parts of the same city and people shooting at each other in the middle of Jerusalem. I love Jerusalem, I am very deeply attached to Jerusalem, I have Arab friends who are deeply attached to Jerusalem and what I want to bring about is a situation in which Jerusalem will remain united in a way which will be acceptable both to Israelis and to Palestinians and be compatible with the honor of both. This plan which we have in mind of Jerusalem unified, Jerusalem being the capital of Israel and of Palestine, on this we believe not only since the 1967 war but since 1948. We want Jerusalem to be unified. We hope that the Palestinian State will come about and we hope that Jerusalem will be the capital of both Israel and the Palestinian Republic. □

LETTER TO THE EDITORS

Dear Friends,

In view of heightening U.S. interference in the Middle East and with respect to the deplorable U.S. invasion of Cambodia to perpetuate the overthrow of the legal government of Samdech Norodom Sihanouk, in July of this year I forwarded copies of the enclosed letter to President Nixon, Secretary of State Rogers, Senators Pearson (Kansas), Fulbright (Arkansas), Muskie (Maine), Kennedy (Mass.), and McGovern (S. Dakota) and to Congressman Larry Winn (3rd District Kansas). In my opinion the Middle East crisis is the most important aspect of U.S. foreign policy and to right the wrongs perpetuated on the Palestinian and Arab peoples should be the chief aim of all truly unprejudiced democratic people. Therefore, I was quite dismayed and angered by the replies which I received from some of the 'liberal' senators. Only Senators Fulbright and Muskie (I have yet to receive McGovern's reply) bothered to give their opinions and this came in the form of copies of their recent statements which, except for a small one-page press release from Sen. Muskie, dealt solely with their opinions on the Indo-China aggression.

Senator Muskie evaded the issues of the situation by hawkishly calling for increased U.S. military aid to the Zionists and brazenly warning that U.S. 'long term interests' in the Middle East are far greater than in Indo-China. Not once were the rights of the Palestinian or Arab peoples mentioned. Meanwhile Congressman Winn and the other senators, with the exceptions of McGovern, Fulbright, and Muskie, failed to give any opinions of the matter but only forwarded two or three paragraph one-page letters, in their usual way of impersonal response, merely extending assurances to consider the subjects in my letter and extending their gratitude for being allowed to hear my views. Senator Kennedy even neglected to use the traditional evasion—that is—by complaining of the 'difficulty in replying in full' to correspondence. Arch-conservatives Rep. Winn and Sen. Pearson simply reaffirmed their support of the Nixon regime's policy of having Asians kill Asians (vietnamization).

The President of the U.S.A. and his chief foreign policy officer, the Secretary of State, didn't even bother to reply. For the past two years, out of a deep interest in international affairs and a genuine concern for and a firm desire to become actively involved in the changing of the situation of oppressed peoples, I have corresponded with the heads of and the representatives for nearly forty-five foreign allied, neutral, non-aligned, and socialist nations including the People's Republic of China, the Republic of Cuba, the Democratic Republic of Viet Nam, the United Arab Republic, the U.S.S.R., the Republic of Zambia, the Federal Republic of Nigeria, the Nationalist Chinese, the south Koreans, the Kingdoms of Sweden, Saudi Arabia, and Jordan, and representatives of all the major western capitalist powers and their satellites to learn where they stand in relation to oppression and especially their policy toward the Palestinian Liberation Movement and I received extensive detailed replies especially from the fraternal Socialist nations who forwarded not only their friendly greetings but great volumes of literature on their views. As a United States citizen, I

an answer to PAUL JACOBS

Jacobs' responses to the interview with FREE PALESTINE might be characterized as "Zionism by any means necessary" because Jacobs clings, through all of his concern for generations of the best of Middle Eastern youth, to the concept of a Jewish state. The sentiments which Jacobs expresses, moreover, are not so innovative for we have heard from numerous official and non-official Israeli quarters, left and non-left, similar sentiments. It is a magnanimity which would recognize the national consciousness of the Palestinian people and entitle them to self-determination anywhere except on the land from which they were driven. It is, in short, a desire to get the Palestinians off the Israelis' backs and obviate any necessity for feelings of guilt among Israel's supporters and benefactors who might harbor such sensitivities.

This magnanimity of Jacobs and others rests on a false assumption, of which some people might be sincerely convinced while the conviction of others stems from more sanguine considerations. It assumes that the Palestinian movement for liberation is merely a national liberation struggle to regain land of which the Palestinians had been dispossessed. This line of argument does not consider the broader social and ideological dimensions of the Palestine-Zionist conflict which very considerably surpass the land issue. If the land issue were, in fact, all that was at stake, theoretically a Palestinian state in, for instance, a province of Canada, would satisfy Palestinian demands, or, as has been suggested by Israelis and Americans, the West Bank and the Gaza strip with a corridor running between them. The difficulty with this point of view is that it violates reality on several counts.

First, the maintenance of a Jewish state and the creation of a separate Palestinian state is basically a racial "solution" to the Palestine-Zionist conflict which Jacobs, as a liberal, would not call for in any other place in the world as an answer to minority persecution. What is perhaps more important is that the Palestinians themselves regard this as a racist "solution." It does not strike them as in the normal course of human events that as recently as September 22, 1970 the Israeli Supreme Court refused to allow an atheist to register as an Israeli by nationality rather than as a Jew. But Jacobs understandably doesn't want to deal with the tricky question of Zionism today as an essential dimension to the conflict. What he knows is that many Israelis are "totally unconcerned with Zionism as a pro-seletyzing movement." What he apparently doesn't know, or doesn't want to tell us, is that the people who govern Israel are not "totally unconcerned", indeed, not even a little bit unconcerned. Jacobs knows that the Jewish Agency, an agency of the Israeli Government, expends hundreds of millions of dollars every year and engages "emmissaries" who operate throughout the world, including Russia, to facilitate inculcating Zionist thought and the movement of Jews in the Diaspora to Israel. This zealotry of Zionism by some amazing mental calculations, he charges to the Palestinians because of the "escalating conflict."

What Jacobs gratuitously denominates as the "Palestinian Arab problem" is, in point of fact, the "Jewish problem," unresolved, disguised now as

the Palestinian Arab problem. And that is whether the solution of minority persecution needs must be a Zionist solution. Accepting the view that the Zionist answer is correct must, of necessity, maintain that minority persecution is a law of nature and that a struggle for equal rights, civil liberties, peace, social justice, etc., is only, at best, a cover for what is inevitable in man's nature.

Secondly, Jacobs states that it is impossible to separate the national from the religious sentiment as the motivating factor in the maintenance of a Jewish state. I find it amazing that, in effect, Jacobs goes on to sanction a concept as medieval as this. That the religious engine should be used in the twentieth century to justify the existence of Zionist Israel is all the more amazing when the secular state has gained such legitimacy and support as a rational and desirable political and human construction.

Thirdly, Jacobs apparently sees the Palestine-Zionist conflict as existing in some kind of political vacuum, vis-a-vis Israel's complete identification with western imperialism and as a willing agent of, first British and French, and now American imperial interests against self-determination, both economic and political, of the Arab people. The evidence of this fact is so overwhelming, particularly after the recent "events" in Jordan, that it need not be enumerated here although, I suspect, I will be charged with not adducing the proper evidence or that, a la Robert Scheer and *Ramparts Magazine*, Israel is driven into its foreign policy because of Arab animosity to it.

Suffice it to say that both in Israel and the U.S. Israel is seen as an agency of control for the U.S. in the Middle East, and this fact would exist whether or not there was Zionist influence on domestic American politics and whether or not American support of Israel is radicalizing the Arab masses for the simple reason that the U.S. relies on technology, of which Israel is a Middle Eastern expression, to control the masses of people in the Third World.

Lastly, when Jacobs states that many American Jews suffer in their own community when they speak up for Palestinian Arabs' rights, we might add that many Palestinian Arabs have suffered for asserting their rights, not only at the hands of the British and Zionists in Palestine, or Israel now, but by their "fellow Arabs," the American and Israeli supported agent, King Hussein.

ABU MULHID

would expect that the President and Secretary of State of this land whose people have elected him into office would give at least the same extensive reply or more.

But instead, as is so often the case with officials in Washington, they have chosen to ignore the cries against the injustices which the U.S. government perpetrates upon its own citizens and upon the peoples of other lands in the name of profit, power, and 'defense against Communism'. More and more Americans are taking note of this attitude and the administration and the 'representatives of the people' in Washington will have to pay the consequences of closing their ears

to the voices of concerned and involved peoples.

In the near future I intend to bring these matters to the attention of these officials and others. I request your earnest opinion of my enclosed letter, especially pages four and five, and I hope that you can elaborate or clarify some of my statements.

IN UNSHAKEABLE SOLIDARITY WITH THE HEROIC PALESTINIAN AND ARAB PEOPLES IN YOUR NATIONAL LIBERATION STRUGGLE AGAINST ZIONISM AND ITS IMPERIALIST ALLIES,

Yours most gratefully and fraternally,
September 15, 1970 J. P. Carr, Jr.

UNTIL THE DUST SETTLES

ANIS NASSER

What led Egypt to accept the Rogers peace plan? What did Egypt hope to accomplish by accepting the plan when it did?

Until satisfactory answers to these two questions are given, there is no reason not to conclude that the recent events in Jordan had their origin in the precipitous Egyptian acceptance of the Rogers' plan. A plan that by its very nature and motives involved the liquidation and selling out of the Palestinian armed struggle, with the further postponement of the revolution of the Arab masses of which the Palestinian is the leading vanguard. All the ink and words of the Arab leadership pledging support to "the Palestine revolution... until it achieves its objectives of full liberation and the defeat of the aggressive Israeli enemy", cannot negate the foregoing proposition since the attainment of "liberation" requires the defeat not only of Israel, but the much more savage and dreadful foe, U.S. imperialism. For its part, the Arab leadership is not unaware of the relationship of Israel and imperialism. General Nimeiry, during a press conference given after his return from Amman stated, "I would say that the first enemy of the Arab nation is Zionism, represented by the state of Israel. The state of Israel has many expansionist aims against the Arab state. The state of Israel is an agent of the United States, which acts in cooperation with Israel in the plot against the Arab people." On its face this statement is unimpeachable. However, upon analysis it is defective in its priorities. Because if Israel is an agent of the United States, then by definition the United States, Israel's principal, is the first enemy of the Arab nation. While there are contradictions between the interests of principal and agent, both must be united in the objective of the continued division and weakness of the Arab nation.

The twin pillars of U.S.-Israeli policy vis-a-vis the Arabs have been: (1) the maintenance of a balance of power between Israel and the Arabs. (The term "balance of power" used in this instance is a transparent falsehood. It has always meant Israeli military superiority.) And (2) the commitment to the "territorial integrity" of the states of the Middle East. (This has meant the territorial integrity of Israel, Jordan and any other agent state whose "independence" contributes to the weakness of the Arab world. It has no practical or moral application to Israeli expansionism which so far has been the only state to actually retain territory as a result of two wars.)

The implementation of this policy has led to intervention, war and the disaffection of the most powerful bourgeoisie in the Arab world, that of Egypt. It is a policy that rests on the crudest use of violence without a trace of sophistication. As applied against the Egyptians, it compelled a bourgeoisie interested in internal development to fight wars it neither wanted nor could win. Nasser and Egypt have for years been the bete noir of Israeli propaganda and in two wars the army of Egypt has been the principal target of Israeli might. Significantly, this use of force has been successful in smashing any pretensions Egypt, as the center of Arab nationalism, embodied by Nasser, had toward genuine independence.

Air and artillery bombardments by the Israelis along the Suez Canal with periodic strikes against Egyptian industrial centers (Helwan, Suez) were particularly devastating. The Americans supplied the Israelis with their best in aerodynamic death, the phantom, and to Nasser's surprise (see Reston interview), the most advanced radar technology which nullified much of Egypt's air defenses. It was only the intervention of Russian defense technology that prevented Israel from bombing Egypt at will. The installation of the Russian anti-aircraft missiles treated the world to a display of Israeli indecency culminating in the present demand to remove the missiles (a mini Cuban crisis?).

The Egyptian plans to oust the Israeli occupiers by a war of "attrition" were shattered on the Israeli-American alliance. It was Egypt that was suffering the attrition, while Israel, with an unlimited supply line from its principal, was turning Egypt's vaunted strategy of attrition back upon the Egyptians. The Arabs pouted, fussed, and fumed at each American shipment of planes to Israel. But the imperialists had grown accustomed to such outbursts, all of which were safely ignored. To the Egyptians, it must have been clear that the Americans were resolved to support the Israelis in their demand for negotiations toward a final peace settlement prior to withdrawal from selected occupied territories. In pursuing the attack against Egypt, the Americans chose the country that given the relationship of forces in the Arab world, would be most influen-

tial in dragging other Arab countries along. In this respect the early reaction of the government of Syria to the acceptance of the Rogers' plan was suspiciously equivocal. It was said that the Syrians would accede to the plan if they could get back the Golan Heights. Only later, after it became apparent that Israel, for reasons of its own internal dynamic, was stalling and making impossible demands, did Syria denounce the negotiations. The subsequent assent of Jordan was predictable, its government would do anything, subject to the street veto of its citizenry, that the US State Department desired. Hence, the necessity that Egypt be first to accept the imperialist conditions for peace.

It was against this background of unrelenting Israeli pressure, military impotence evidenced by the disproportionate application of forces to defensive positions, an equivocal commitment to the liberation of Palestine, and the unknown factor of Russian influence, that brought about the decision to capitulate, a decision that was at once desperate and vain. Desperate because it demonstrated the hopelessness of the Egyptian ruling class. Vain because it was made without the consent of the Palestinian masses, the people most involved in any general peace agreement the Arab governments might make with Israel. The Palestinian response was prompt. The Palestine Liberation Organization rejected the Rogers' plan and any territory that the Egyptians might wrangle from the imperialists as a sop for Palestinian nationhood. Almost immediately they found their radio station in Cairo closed. An act in the Nasserite tradition of manipulation—a tradition arising from contempt for the masses and a faulty understanding of history. The landing and burning of the imperialist 747 at Cairo airport by the Palestinian air force dramatized to the Egyptians what imperialism had already discovered—namely, the uncontrollability of the Palestinian revolution. Again, the Egyptians responded conventionally by closing down airports, but the Palestinians had their own airport, "Revolutionary Airport". The plane hi-jackings were embarrassing and frightening to Arab bourgeoisies who were unaccustomed to their masses making decisions on the international level, in this instance on the issues of war and peace.

It was only a matter of time from the agreement of Egypt, Jordan and Israel to negotiate a peace that the "extremist element," i.e., the fedayeen, among the Arabs would have to be dealt with. It is not necessary to actually produce a CIA directive against the guerrillas such as "terminate with extreme prejudice" to know that the Jordanian army and its king acted with the blessing of the imperialists. The second pillar of American Middle Eastern diplomacy, the territorial integrity of Jordan, was at stake. To imperialism, the menace was the worst imaginable—revolution—a revolution that is moving the Arab masses, long restive against imperialism's sway, to an understanding of the main contradictions besetting Arab society. Hence, the Rogers' plan and genocide in Amman.

"Jordan's suffering, however, is small compared to the death and misery that would be inflicted on the whole of the Middle East, and perhaps beyond, if the Palestinian guerrillas were allowed to prevail with their mad scheme for a fight to the bitter end to exterminate Israel. The extremists' arrogant challenge to international peace efforts and to the conciliatory overtures of King Hussein and President Nasser *must be put down decisively* (emphasis added) if there is to be any chance for peace in the area in the foreseeable future." Editorial, *New York Times*, 24 September 1970.

The actions of the Jordanian Army have indelibly branded it an imperialist tool. It must be remembered that his army has never fought against Israel, only retreated, and that it has killed more Palestinians than Israel ever did. Nimeiry's indictment of agency suffers from the omission of the kingdom of Jordan, also the agent of imperialism in its plot against the Arab people. Before the dust has settled from the murderous assaults of Jordan's army, David Packard was promising to make up any losses in material and to supply starfighters and arms, arms that would never be used against Israel, but against Palestinians. In general, the imperialists were well pleased with the performance of their army and king. Some commentators were positively smug in describing the alleged "victories" of the Jordanian mercenaries over the guerrillas and Syrians. Psychological compensation doubtlessly was a factor after the frustration of seeing their jets destroyed with impunity.

Yet, the imperialists had again miscalculated. The attempted liquidation of the guerrilla forces in Jordan did not proceed with the expected dispatch. The operation was too costly in blood and aroused the Arab leadership to call Hussein to account for his heavy handed atrociousness. The unexpected strength of the resistance and pressure from the Arab leadership forced Hussein to cease fire. The guerrillas had won another round but at high cost. A cost they would not have had to pay had the twin capitals of the Ba'ath, Damascus and Baghdad, been able to give their own ultimatum to the Jordanian Army, Syria vacillated and Iraq froze before the threat of Israeli and/or American intervention. Nixon could well be pleased with his mixture of "power and restraint". However, the contrast between the heroic stand of the people of Amman and the behavior of those who can support the fedayeen in word only will not be lost on the Arab masses.

Hussein, in the aftermath of battle, is a creature covered with blood. A favorite puppet of the imperialists, they no doubt will clean him up and restore him to his role of "brave" king. Those efforts toward conciliation by the Arab leadership tend to his legitimacy rather than isolation. Pacts that agree to position guerrillas on the border to be used as a weapon of pressure against Israel are vitiated ab origine. Suicidal provisions leading to the disarming of the Palestinian masses are being realistically ignored. There can hardly be any doubt that at some later time, the Jordanian Army will move to crush the Palestinian revolution again. Meanwhile patent efforts to divide it into "moderate" and "extremist" factions in order to manipulate are doomed. The projected Palestinian state, either on the West Bank or in the north of Jordan is a solution suggested by fools. It is not nationhood that the Palestinian armed struggle portends, but revolution. For imperialism, the opportunities of '48 and even '67 are gone. Moderate or extremist, the goals of Palestine liberation are unacceptable to imperialism. The past two weeks are confirmation of the fact that against such an enemy all must be extremists.

The death of Abdel-Nasser is the death of a myth. A genuinely popular leader, he embodied the hopes of the Arab masses. A cult of personality attached to him not so much because of his achievements as the investment of the will of the masses in a leader who represented their striving to emerge from a world dominated by imperialism condemning them to permanent underdevelopment. The imperialists may well rue his passing when hero-worship gives way to self-reliance. □

4 October 1970

SUBSCRIBE TO

THE PALESTINE RESISTANCE BULLETIN
\$1.50 for 12 issues (cash only)

Send to

P. R. BULLETIN
P. O. Box 59
Somerville, Mass. 02144

"ONLY CONNECT . . ."

When Hollywood's Oriental arch-criminal Fu Manchu and his slinky band lynched people as they looked out of windows, put human fingers in chop suey, and plotted the enslavement of the White Race, especially its women, I disapproved of him openly,

Yet nobody called me Anti-Buddhist or Anti-Confucian.

And when the Mafia not to mention the Sicilian Police terrorized their people and gave liberals the water torture,

I protested Mafia and the Sicilian Police,

Yet nobody called me Anti-Catholic. And my maintaining that the Klu Klux Klan stinks doesn't label me Anti-Protestant.

But call Israel's imperialism imperialism, racism racism, fascism fascism And you're an Anti-Semite.

ERIC RATTERY

only went to the other side

JUST A BIT TOO LATE

"U.S. CONSIDERING PALESTINE STATE, Hints It Is Studying Idea of a Separate Entity as Part of Mideast Peace Plan." So ran the headline of an article by Hedrick Smith in *The New York Times* on October 15th.

But it is not a new idea. Israeli and certain Arab circles have been advocating this idea for quite some time. Today, the sponsors of the idea of a "separate Palestinian entity" are those parties involved in the Middle East who accepted the Rogers' plan and who, since its official debut, have been diligently trying to implement it.

The Rogers' plan and the actions taken to implement it were what precipitated the massacre of thousands of Palestinians by Jordanian desert troops in Amman last month. The plan, it became clear to all, was not viable. Custodians of the plan, however, still cling stubbornly to its promise of "peace" and now, in a different guise, are pursuing their aim of liquidating the Palestine liberation movement. If the September events in Jordan convinced Zionists and the Big Powers that their agents in Jordan are incapable of bringing about the demise of the revolution, they did not dissuade the outsiders from resorting to an even more deceptive trick—i.e., dangling small bait on a hook.

The comments issued by the U.S. Department of State, "officials acknowledged, were aimed at winning Palestinian support for Middle East peace talks."

WHAT IS BEING CONSIDERED.

In the *New York Times* article, Mr. Hedrick Smith reported that "the Nixon Administration, reacting to the rising power and importance of the Palestinian commando movement, is showing greater interest than ever in the possible emergence of a Palestinian State as part of an overall peace settlement in the Middle East." Mr. Smith quoted a State Department officer as saying, "Certainly the Palestinians will have to be a partner in the peace and their legitimate interests and aspirations will have to be considered in any such peace settlement." Given the commandos' "power and importance" and the need the U.S. sees for Palestinian participation in a peace settlement, it would seem reasonable for the State Department to draw the conclusion that *the commandos* must be included in deliberations towards a peace agreement. But such is not the case. "We have no preconceived ideas," the State Department official continued, "about what form Palestinian participation might take. We do note that more and more Palestinians seem to be talking about some entity."

The State Department deserves congratulations perhaps for making the public observation that "more and more Palestinians seem to be talking about some entity." But, perhaps too, it does not. Some inquiry into its motives is called for first. It would be very interesting, for instance, to find out when and where the State Department got wind of Palestinian interests. Who are the Palestinian people telling the State Department about an entity of their own, "a Palestinian state consisting of the west-bank area of Jordan and the Gaza Strip, or an even larger area"? One might not suspect the State Department of connivance, were it not for the familiar ring of that formula. Furthermore, the proponents of this formula speak of "legitimate Palestinian interests and aspirations," but they skirt the issue of *who exactly* is to decide what

Palestinian aspirations are and which of these aspirations are legitimate. An analysis of what officials in Washington are really saying reveals a chasm so wide in their logic, it is a wonder the State Department and the National Security Council, too, haven't yet fallen into it lock, stock, and barrel. The National Security Council is considering the possibility of "shifting the focus of American diplomacy away from Arab governments toward the Palestinians." It may be that the spectre of Vietnam is rearing its tiresome, if not fearsome, head before Washington; Washington is plainly trying to avoid another Paris-type set-up in the Middle East. In short, the U.S. would like to finesse any head-on collision with a popular revolution. So, it falls back on "the problem of determining who speaks for the one million Palestinians." Mr. Smith goes on to report that "Washington is skeptical that the militants speak for more than 10 to 20 percent, at most. Moderate Palestinians have taken part as ministers in Jordanian governments, but their following is not tightly organized."

If the Palestinian commandos—who are obviously the ones called "militants" here—represent only 10 to 20% of the Palestinians, where did the Palestinians acquire the military prowess that King Hussein and his forces were unable to defeat? and from where, for that matter, do they derive the weight behind commando leaders that no other Arab leaders can counterpoise. If Palestinian militants are such a negligible minority—and especially as Palestinian "moderates" are content to serve in King Hussein's government—why should the U.S. (or any other country) bother going to the trouble of helping set up a Palestinian state? Who is *really* to benefit?

WHAT IT MEANS.

Those who first and most convincingly spoke of a Palestinian entity were the commandos. Their aims were made public from the outset. They are calling for the establishment of a free Palestine to replace Israel and its race-based and exclusive policies. *Palestine*, as the commandos see it, *is not an unspecific entity*. They have put forward their principles and goals and are now in the process of realizing them.

Why don't the "State Department Palestinians" come out of the woodwork, make their identities known, and spell out their alternative program for Palestine? Or more pointedly, how many "State Department Palestinians" are there and where is their base of popular support? The fact is bare: Israeli and U.S. officials of one sort or another are their principal and most vocal spokesmen. And thereby hangs a tale. It may well be that there exists a handful of "State Department Palestinians." But they would be totally insignificant without their Zionist and Big Power props. If they did not exist, they would have to be invented as a strategic device for dealing with a thorny problem.

The "State Department Palestinians" are endowed with a dubious virtue: *they* can be focused upon. With "the failure of King Hussein's forces to quell the commando movement" now evident, the possibility of "shifting the focus of American diplomacy away from Arab governments towards the Palestinians" can comfortably be countenanced? Thus, a Palestinian entity as proposed by the State Department falls into line as just another "plan" to substitute for previous but similar ones.

Suddenly, the U.S. considers giving Palestinians a state on a silver platter; Zionist Israel is concerned with the well-being of the Palestinian people; Hussein *et al* want to do better by the Arab masses. One might well ask *what right do these people have to determine a Palestine?* Only weeks ago they ganged up on the vulnerable Palestinians and tried to wipe them out. Today, they are speaking of a Palestine entity. Is it because they recognize "the Palestinian movement as a more potent political and military force than they thought before the Jordan Civil War and the death of Mr. Nasser"? Undoubtedly; but their new tact is not taken out of admiration for Palestinian spunk—of that much, one can be sure.

FOCUS vs. TARGET.

A distinction must be made between the Palestinians serving as a "focus" and those who are the "target" of the Zionist-imperialist-reactionary coalition in the Middle East. Bluntly put, the *target* of all these actions and maneuvers in Washington and elsewhere is the Palestine revolution. The movement is fearsome to contemplate because it is the spearhead of an ever broader resurgence of Arab peoples. The tri-partite coalition is simply anxious to see the vanguard of that revolution vanquished. Israel alone can't handle the job. Neither can Hussein. The U.S. is wary of exercising military muscle in another explosive arena. Hence, the benevolent concession (with its not so well-hidden snags).

THE PROPOSED STATE.

Besides amounting to only a fraction of pre-1948 Palestine, the state now being considered in Washington would: (1) recognize the legitimacy of Zionist Israel; (2) exist under Zionist and Big Power surveillance; and (3) serve as a buffer state between Israel and the radical revolutionary elements which would not accept to live in the new state. There is no question: it would be a state in which Palestinians would be used as a tool in maintaining, or even extending, the social and economic oppression of present interests in the area over the Arab peoples.

The irony of whole ploy is that ~~while this idea came~~ about as a result of the struggle waged by the commandos and their supporters—it is calculated to exclude them and isolate them, with the intention of dissipating their force and influence in the future. Liquidation has already been attempted more than once.

WHY IT IS UNACCEPTABLE.

The State Department Palestine is meant to be a substitute in the hearts of Palestinians for the secular, democratic state the Palestine liberation movement has been advocating. It is definitely not an answer to the needs of the Palestinian people. It would not be allowed to be the progressive, anti-exploitative state the commandos want—it would be designed to be the opposite.

For Palestinians to reach for these bits of Palestine now would amount to selling out; such a move would only entangle the Palestinian people in the web of inequitable interests it is trying heroically to clean out of their homeland.

As bait, the State Department's Palestine is a move that has come too late. Palestinians see it for what it is.

—Ibn al-Balad

Free Palestine

is a monthly paper published by the Friends of Free Palestine. Editor: Abdeen Jabara. "Free Palestine" welcomes its readers submitting comments, letters and articles.

FREE PALESTINE
P. O. Box 21096
Kalorama Station
Washington, D.C. 20009

Address Correction Requested

(Send to above address)

Please enter a year's subscription for the enclosed \$5.00;

Name _____

Street _____

City & State _____

Zip Code _____



FIRST CLASS MAIL

Underground Press Syndicate
Bin 26, Village Station
New York, N. Y. 10014