

فلسطين الحرة

free palestine

Vol. 2, No. 8, December 1970

ISRAEL AND THE U.S.A

MR. ROGER'S NON-PLAN

EQBAL AHMAD

A measure of manipulation and duplicity is part of diplomatic tradition. But few governments in history have made lying and deception the pillars of their policies as recent governments in USA have done. "Credibility gap" is the American euphemism for popular disbelief in the veracity of their President.

The most striking fact about recent developments over the Middle East is that Washington appears to have achieved among Arabs what it does not enjoy elsewhere in the world—credibility. The supporters as well as the opponents of the cease-fire seem to have taken the Rogers Plan more or less at its face value. The supporters believe that the U.S. intends to induce Israel to withdraw from the 1967-occupied territories in return for Arab recognition of and peace with Israel. Simon Malley reports an expectation that the U.S. might even promote the creation of an Arab Batsutoland to "satisfy" Palestinian rights. [*Africasia*, No.2, September 14, 1970.] The opponents of Rogers Plan took it seriously enough to risk divisions and diversions in order to oppose it.

Interviews and research in New York and Washington indicate that the real decision makers in the Nixon government promoted the Rogers Plan for some tactical gains rather than to achieve a settlement based on the Security Council resolution. The major U.S.-Israeli goals now appear to be nearing completion; one might forecast an end to this latest phase of Dr. Jarring's "mission."

A significant fact about the U.S. initiative which led to the cease-fire has escaped attention: It was the first major diplomatic responsibility the White House permitted to William Rogers whose functions as the cabinet member responsible for foreign affairs have been almost completely appropriated by Dr. Henry Kissinger, Special Assistant to the President. As a senior American diplomat reminding the days of Dulles and "even Dean Rusk" said: "Now we are no more than well-paid clerks and messenger boys." It is noteworthy too that since the Israeli allegations of cease-fire violation, the major U.S. statements have come from White House "sources," not from the State Department.

In advancing their Plan based on the principles of Israeli withdrawal and Arab recognition of the Zionist state, Mr. Rogers and his assistant Joseph Sisco may have been sincere, for both are somewhat conventional diplomats who believe that partial placation of Arab grievances would serve to prolong U.S. interests in the Middle East. In fact, the suspicion of their sincerity was the trump used to sell the scheme to Egypt and Jordan, for both governments could be expected to settle for less than the full restoration of Palestinian rights.

If Jordan and Egypt were expected to settle for Israeli withdrawal from the territories occupied in 1967, there was no expectation in the White House that Israel would give up (1) Jerusalem over which it has declared its messianic monopoly, (2) Sharm-el-Sheikh, and Gaza, (3) the Golan Heights, and possibly (4) the pockets constituted by the collines of Latroun and Judea—all of which it claimed as secure boundaries.

Informed sources in Washington say that for several weeks preceding the cease-fire Israel had "open access" to the White House, by-passing the State Department, that there had been innumerable discussions between White House and Zionist officials, and complete harmony had been achieved. The substance of their understanding was communicated in Nixon's secret letter, dated July 24, to Mrs. Meir, and in subsequent letters exchanged by them. Nixon's assurances, the *New York Times* later reported somewhat obliquely, "went far to remove the distrust caused by Secretary of State Rogers' speech of December 9 in which he went on record favoring a return of the Arab-Israeli frontier to its status before the 1967 war." [August 7, 1970]

Much less, recognized Messrs. Nixon and Kissinger who have appointed die-hard Zionists like Prof. Nadav Safran of Harvard as advisors on the Middle East, could Israel risk its racial purity by admitting Palestinians to their homeland. Mrs. Meir already had Nixon's assuring letters when she reiterated, on August 4, her rejection of Palestinian rights:

"Even of the U.N. resolutions, concerning the refugees' free choice—[between returning to Israel and receipt of compensation and rehabilitation in Arab countries]—are irreconcilable with Israel's existence, security and character."

The U.S.-Israeli collaboration reached a new high. By August 6, the *New York Times* could report that the "U.S. and Israel have arrived at a degree of mutual trust and consideration that was lacking just six months ago." This renewal of trust resulted from the fact that the terms on which Dr. Jarring was to seek accommodation were unacceptable to both. Why did the U.S. initiate a Plan which it did not expect or wish to succeed?

There are indications that Israel and the U.S. saw the following tactical advantages in obtaining a cease-fire: (1) Since last May the deployment of SAM anti-aircraft missiles in Egypt had worried them. For the first time since 1967 Egypt was acquiring effective defense capability against Israeli raids. Well before June 19, when Rogers first made his proposal, U.S. intelligence had reported that Egypt was installing SAMs along the Suez. This improvement in Egyptian defense was so intolerable to the U.S. that even the cool Dr. Kissinger threatened to forcibly remove them. This threat involving great power confrontation was received badly by the war-torn Americans.

Cease-fire would be the device to accomplish what such threats would not; it would put a halt to Egyptian preparedness, reduce Israeli losses, and prevent a premature escalation of American involvement in the Middle East. The urgency of the situation was underscored by intelligence reports two weeks before the cease-fire that at least 16 SAM batteries [with up to 6 launchers each] were deployed in the canal zone; many more were on their way to the front. The downing, during June 30 — August 6, of 14 Israeli bombers including 7 Phantoms confirmed the growing defensive strength of U.A.R. It should be recalled that in the hope of preventing the activation of the additional missiles which had already reached the canal zone, Moshe Dayan demanded and obtained the enforcement of the cease-fire twenty-four hours earlier than had been agreed. [*Time*, August 24, 1970]

(2) It would help reduce the growing moral isolation of Israel as well as the U.S. whose public image was increasingly tarnished by their aggression and intransigence.

(3) A U.S. initiated proposal which promised partial satisfaction of Arab and no satisfaction of Palestinian demands could be expected to further divide Arab governments, create dissensions among Palestinians, and confusion among Arab masses.

(4) If Dr. Jarring took his mission too seriously and began interpreting the Roger Plan strictly in accordance with the Security Council resolution, then the negotiations could be halted or at least undermined by alleging Egyptian violation. It is to be noted that while fully reporting the Israeli allegations the American press had also noted, if only in passing, that "... earlier in the week, government leaders in Jerusalem had been angered to learn that U.N. mediator Gunnar Jarring—[in his letter to U.N. Secretary General U Thant announcing the parties' acceptance of U.S. initiative]—had adhered strictly to the original text of the U.S. proposal, ignoring Israel's own highly conditional letter of acceptance." [*Newsweek*, August 24, 1970, p. 31]



(Cont'd on Page 3)

TEACH-IN AT PRINCETON

On November 10, 1970, the May Day Movement, a group of progressive Princeton students, sponsored Teach-In: Middle East Liberation at Princeton University. During a lively and enlightening three hours of addresses and questions from the audience of three hundred, the focus of discussion was the Palestine Liberation Movement: its historical background, its current aims, its progress to date, and its interrelations with various progressive movements around the world, including the Black Panther Party, the American left, and commando movements opposing the racist regimes now occupying South Africa, Namibia, Zimbabwe, Mozambique, Angola, and Guinea-Bissau.

The following statement was distributed at the teach-in by the organizers:

"We believe that the American public has been informed about events in the Middle East in a way consistently out of sympathy with the liberation struggle of the Palestinian people. As a result,

there has developed a serious lack of information about, and understanding of, the goals and activities of the Palestine Liberation Movement. We are holding this teach-in to help build understanding and support of this Movement.

"Nearly a million Palestinians were uprooted in the process of establishing Israel in 1948, and more were displaced in the 1967 war. Those who stayed in Palestine under Israeli rule have lived under the burden of martial law, heavy travel restrictions, discrimination in education and occupations, and have experienced the dehumanization of racial oppression. The present Palestine Liberation Movement is the most recent attempt by the Palestinians to regain their inalienable right to their own land, and to replace the present discriminatory, racially exclusivist ideology and state structure of Israel by a democratic secular community in which Jews, Christians, and Muslims live as equal citizens.

"In asserting their right to self-determination, seeking to end all forms of Western colonial and economic domination, and aspiring to shape their own social destiny, their struggle resembles—and they stand in solidarity with—movements of liberation throughout the Third World. The responses greeting their demands for freedom and

self-determination have likewise resembled those accorded other Third World movements. By comparison with Viet Nam, where the U.S. can engage in a direct attack of its own on the people and their entire social and natural environment, as well as rely on Vietnamese surrogates to do its bidding, U.S. counter-revolutionary strategy in the Middle East has been relatively discreet. It must rely on Israel and reactionary forces in the Arab states to carry out the liquidation of the Palestinian liberation forces and make impossible any mass socialist revolution in the Arab countries. But the U.S. build-up in response to the summer battles in Jordan should be an indication to anyone that this kind of "discretion" may be ended at any time.

"In supporting the Palestinian struggle, we also accept and emphasize the distinction it has upheld between Judaism as a universalistic faith and Zionism as a particularist ideology based on racial identity, which emerged (only at the end of the 19th century) in a uniquely colonial and racialist European mental climate.

"We shall continue with this project of information on Palestine, the Middle East, and U.S. involvement in this area. Our next program will deal with American oil investments in the Middle East." □

Editorial

A PEOPLE'S TRIUMPH

When the history of the Palestinian people's path to liberation is recorded in full much will be written of one period in that long and arduous road. Those ten bloody days of September 1970 will serve not only as a great turning-point in the Palestinians' steady course towards victory, but they will represent, for mankind, an illuminating and inspiring example of a people's triumph over the forces of tyranny and reaction. No matter that the latter had the overwhelming advantage in weaponry and were prepared for, and engaged in, unfettered and ruthless brutality; the people led by their armed vanguard resisted, and resisted heroically, until the ground gave way from under the feet of their enemies and they were forced to put a halt to their murderous assault.

The massacres of September 17th to 27th cannot be seen as simply an attempt by Hussein 'to restore his authority' as apologists for the little tyrant allege. Him and his wretched band of fascist mercenaries had little 'authority' to begin with, being mere instruments in the hands of British and American imperialism. Those whose hands are stained with the blood of the people of Jordan and Palestine killed in those ten days are the American and British governments, the props of the butcher-king. These two governments were the first to rush to his aid after the fighting with new arms and, doubtless, new instructions for the next round they have in store for the Palestinian people.

Part of the attempts to divert attention away from the real centers of responsibility came in the form of relating the massacre to the earlier hijackings by the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine. Such superficial reasoning cannot convince anyone with the vaguest understanding of the forces at play in and around Jordan and of events, wide in their dimensions and implications, which have been occurring in the Middle East over the past few years. Yet, it is a convenient excuse to cover up Hussein's crime and the crime of those who led him towards his bloody task. The responsibility for the massacre lies squarely on the doorstep of the Big Powers in their attempts to 'solve' the Palestinian Question at the expense of the Palestinian people. The latest of these attempts, the American 'peace initiative' of William Rogers explicitly demanded of the Jordanian government measures to prevent the Palestinian Fedayeen from

continuing their war of liberation against the Zionist state of Israel. Hussein had to 'deliver the goods' to prove his good faith. He did not, however, bank on the magnificent steadfastness of the Fedayeen backed by their popular ocean of support in Jordan and in the other Arab countries. Nor did his imperialist masters.

As a result of the failure of their latest all-out offensive against the Palestinians, the imperialist powers are now investigating the possibility of a more devious approach. Hence, the recent hints by American government spokesman concerning the creation of a West Bank 'Palestinian state' and of 'bringing the Palestinians into the peace talks'. The state they have in mind is, of course, nothing more than a political farce—a Bantustan of Israel—while the Palestinians they hope to co-opt for their purposes will only share the fate of Quislings everywhere.

Responsibility for the recent Jordanian massacres does not stop, however, with American and other Big Power governments. Arab governments and political forces that have accepted the Rogers proposals must share in that responsibility regardless of original intentions. Knowingly or unknowingly they provided Hussein with enough political leverage to carry through his pre-ordained scheme, with the resulting carnage. Some Arab governments are further to blame because they were unable, or unwilling to match their verbal rejection of the Rogers proposals and support for the Palestinian Revolution with concrete acts

when the moment of truth arrived. Invoking the pretext of 'avoiding an American intervention' is a shameful cowering to imperialist threats and exposes the limitations of some 'anti-imperialist' regimes.

There is no doubt that the fighting in Jordan has resulted in the strengthening of the Fedayeen's position in Jordan and in the rest of the Arab world. The material losses which they have suffered must be weighed against the considerable political gains they have reaped as a result of their heroic stand. It is clear that the Jordanian Army used everything in its power in its attempt to liquidate the Palestinian Revolution. Its failure to do so must now prove to the rest of the world that no 'political solution' unacceptable to the Palestinian liberation movement can succeed. On the other hand, the Palestinian Revolution must exploit to the full its new position of strength and learn from the lessons of the severe test that it has successfully overcome. The most important of these lessons is the need for unity in the Fedayeen's ranks. There can no longer be any excuse for splitting the ranks of the Palestine liberation movement on the basis of polemical and ideological differences; such differences cannot, of course, be erased nor should they be. What must, however, disappear is independent action by any one group which bears on the interest and security of the whole Movement. There will be many more tests ahead and a united liberation movement is essential for final victory. □



Revolutionary American Jews:

Support the Palestinian Resistance

[The following statement was delivered by the Jewish members of the American delegation to the International Conference on Palestine, organized by the General Union of Palestinian Students (GUPS) in Amman, Jordan, September, '70]

As revolutionaries of Jewish heritage in the United States of America, we take this opportunity to wholeheartedly support the Palestinian liberation movement.

As Jews and as proletariat, our grand-parents participated in the Russian Revolution, the anti-Nazi resistance in Europe, the early struggles of the working class to organize itself in America.

Some of us have learned from our history as revolutionaries, as proletariats, and as semites, that our real enemy is the capitalist, racist, imperialist class throughout the world. Zionism and all its allies continue to oppress mankind, particularly our semitic sisters and brothers, through a sophisticated form of racist-settler colonialism originated and supported by Western imperialism.

We cast our lot with the Palestinian liberation movement which struggles in behalf of our semitic sisters and brothers. We hope for the day that the exploited dark-skinned Jews of occupied Palestine, one-half of its present Jewish population, will reject the false security offered them by the racist-Zionists and join in class struggle against Zionism, racism, and imperialism with the rest of the Arab masses. We hope for the day that Israeli workers, students, and youth will reject their exploitation by U.S. and West German anti-semites who use them as middle-men in their attempts to control the peoples of the Middle East and Africa. We hope these people will someday fight alongside the Arab masses to establish a free democratic non-sectarian, anti-imperialist Palestine.



We plan to spread the true facts of the Palestinian liberation movement as the only hope for lasting peace in the Middle East. As American Jews, we will attempt to combat the Zionist propaganda machine which chokes freedom of thought in the Jewish community and prevents Jewish youth from rejecting Zionism and joining the ranks of anti-imperialist struggle.

It is the Zionists who have equated Zionism with Judaism and, by doing so, have intimidated and repressed followers of the progressive Jewish tradition. The Zionist collusion with the racist regime of South Africa, their support of colonial oppressors in Angola and Guinea-Bissau, and the counter-revolutionary forces of the Congo, Chad and Ethiopia has driven a wedge between the Jewish people and our black sisters and brothers throughout the world.

It is the Zionists in the United States who hypocritically raise the specter of anti-semitism whenever black and brown people resist exploitation by landlords, merchants, and social welfare neo-colonialists who happen to be of Jewish background. It is the Zionists who treacherously accuse our black and brown sisters and brothers of anti-semitism when they take a vanguard position in support of Palestinian liberation. We know that our struggle is to get the Zionists out of the black and brown colonies of Harlem, Chicago and Detroit, and out of Palestine.

We thank our Palestinian sisters and brothers for welcoming us here and allowing us to see for ourselves the fascist nature of Zionism and the revolutionary and humane nature of the Palestinian liberation movement.

Victory to our semitic sisters and brothers in the people's war to reclaim Palestine.

Victory to the struggle of all oppressed and exploited peoples in the world. □

Names Withheld Upon Request (Sept. 2, 1970)

(Continued from Page 1)

(5) If manipulated skillfully these allegations could also provide the opportunity for enlarging U.S. military aid to Israel without alarming public and diplomatic opinion. In fact augmentation of armaments supplies to Israel was part of the U.S.-Israeli secret agreements prior to the cease-fire. On August 6, the *New York Times* reported that "Israel had received more than verbal promises from President Nixon" to ensure that the military "balance" will not be disturbed by the cease-fire. According to this report, the U.S. had "already undertaken to supply Israel with Phantom supersonic fighter bombers if the Israeli air superiority over the Suez was threatened."

Since the "balance" of Israeli superiority was already threatened by Egyptian deployment of defensive missiles, the arming of Israel was to be accelerated under the cover of allegations against U.A.R., but in fact irrespective of actual Egyptian conduct during the cease-fire. Recent reports have confirmed that a squadron of 18 Phantoms and large supplies of electronic equipment had already been committed to Israel just before the cease-fire; secret delivery of these weapons began in July (when 6 Phantoms were shipped to Israel) and continued after the truce came into effect.

Meanwhile Israel continued to shore up its position in the cease-fire zone with the newly supplied weapons. At the U.N., Ambassador Zayyat of U.A.R. discreetly filed the first charges against truce violations by Israel; the U.A.R. also protested to Washington that the supply of additional Phantoms was contrary to the private assurances Mr. Rogers and Sisco had given in this regard. Ambassador Zayyat said that he did not announce these developments to the press because "If you are going to sail one way, you should not row the other way." But then that is exactly what the U.S. and Israel had set out to do from the very beginning.

The precise nature of U.S. supply commitments to Israel are not known. In reality it is an open-ended commitment. On September 2, under pressure from the White House, the U.S. Senate gave the President *carte blanche* to supply Israel with unlimited armaments to counter "past, present and future Soviet deliveries to Arab states." Subsequently, Pentagon sources have revealed that in her meeting with Mr. Nixon on September 18, Mrs. Golda Meir will receive an "arms package" worth more than one billion dollars. (She has requested \$2 billion in arms).

This package would include 24 more Phantoms, unspecified number of *Shrike* anti-radar air-to-ground missiles, tanks, bombs, and electronic detection and jamming instruments. Israel's request for one hundred additional Skyhawk jets is also expected to be fulfilled. It should be noted that American advisors are guiding the Israelis in the use of the latest weapons like the *Shrikes* which were first used in the bombing of Northern Vietnam. One might also underscore that, unlike Soviet supplies to Egypt, American equipments to Israel are mostly in the offensive not the defensive category of weapons.

Massive military aid is not the only way in which the U.S. is "compensating" Israel for "Egyptian violations" of the cease-fire. Plans are underway for substantial economic aid to Israel. Last week (September 12) Secretary Rogers told a Senate sub-committee that "Israel faced a serious economic problem" and the U.S. "will make a decision in the near future" on economic aid to Israel. In fact that decision had been made before Rogers made the statement. Israeli and American officials had already been working out the size and terms of U.S. economic assistance. For example, early in September the Israeli Finance Minister Pinhas Sapir had conferences with his American counterparts including the Secretary of Treasury (David M. Kennedy), the Director of the Bureau of Budget (George P. Schultz), and the President of the Export-Import Bank (Henry Kearns).

(6) The prestige that accrued to the Nixon Administration from its successful diplomatic initiative as well as the climate created by allegations of cease-fire violations permitted it needed victories over congressional critics of the war in Indo-China. For example, a \$19.2 billion Military Procurement Authorization Act had long been deadlocked in the Senate by anti-war elements. Then on September 1, Defense Secretary Melvin Laird publicly claimed that the held-up defense funds were urgently needed to finance shipments to Israel, and further congressional delay in approving the Bill "could mean that vital funds would not be available for the maintenance of military balance in the Middle East."

Senate "doves" on Indo-China, are hawks over the Middle East. A day after Laird's statement the Senate overwhelmingly approved the pending Bill. Senator Ful-

bright's amendment to eliminate from the Bill a special clause authorizing the administration to supply Israel with unlimited arms was defeated by a vote of 87 to 7. Similarly, William Rogers made the statement concerning economic aid to Israel before a Senate Appropriations sub-committee. He was seeking reversal by the Senate of a \$536 million cut by the House of Representatives in Nixon's \$1.8 billion foreign aid request for 1971.

Only one American politician appears to have perceived the Nixon-Kissinger-Golda Meir game behind the Rogers Plan. Senator Fulbright's *Old Myths and New Realities* statement on the Middle East, released to the press just before Dr. Jarring began the talks at the U.N. and before Israeli charges of cease-fire violations had had its full play, was aimed at exposing the Administration's deceitful posture. His proposal that the U.S. formally guarantee the security of the state of Israel in return for (1) Israeli withdrawal from *all* territories occupied in 1967, and (2) equitable provisions for the return and rehabilitation of Palestinians, was designed to test the U.S.'s as well as Israel's sincerity in accepting the Security Council resolution.

His intent became clearer during an interview on television. The U.S., he said, was committed to defending Israel's existence in any case, treaty or no treaty. In this instance a treaty would be only a formality, but a formality which would deprive Israel of the veto it exercises over peace in the Middle East, over cease-fires, negotiations, withdrawal from occupied lands, and some justice for the Palestinian refugees—all in the name of *Security*. Understandably, his proposal elicited violent opposition from the White House, among Nixon's Congressional allies, and without an exception among all Zionist leaders. In Israel itself such diverse personalities as Abba Eban, Dayan and Gahal leader Begin displayed rare unity in denouncing J.W. Fulbright.

In planning the tactics of their struggle Arab and Palestinian leaders must remember that by virtue of its internal dynamics no less than the expansionist nature of Zionist ideology, Israel is likely to feel most threatened by the prospect of even a partially equitable peace in the Middle East. It seems that this peculiarity of Israel is still insufficiently understood by Arabs, for they appear to have again failed to exploit with revolutionary creativity the opportunities presented by a deceitful enemy. □

ON THE ORIGINS OF THE ZIONIST MOVEMENT.

(CONTINUED FROM LAST ISSUE)

2.

SADEK JALAL AL-ATHM

In the face of the inadequacy and historical inaccurateness of the common explanations of the origins of the Zionist movement, we have to look elsewhere for a more "scientific" and comprehensive explanation.

Above all, such an explanation must take into account the socio-economic context out of which the Zionist movement grew and within which it developed. It can not satisfy itself with idealistic phraseology about the devotion of the Jews to "the sacred truth of their faith" or any similar subjectivist interpretations.

It is an established fact that one of the main historical achievements of the modern bourgeois classes (particularly in Western Europe) was the construction of the modern unified nation-state on the ruins of the decayed and outmoded feudal dispersion. In this sense, the unified nation-state proved itself to be the most convenient political structure for the growth of modern capitalism, its free development and unhindered expansion. As a result the historical phenomenon of bourgeois nationalism came into being.

These facts became established most firmly and at first in Western Europe, where the middle class was strongest. In other areas of the European continent, where the middle class was still relatively weak or in the process of formation and consolidation, the establishment of unified national states was delayed for some time (the second half of the 19th century, e.g., Italy, Germany, the Balkans).

In the latter areas the rising middle class expressed its fundamental interests and political ambitions via the formation of powerful nationalist movements and parties capable of commanding broad popular support. These bourgeois movements carried their struggle on two fronts:

a) Against the prevalent conditions of feudal economic and political dispersion on their territories in the hope of forming a unified national state of their own.

b) Against the supremacy of the highly developed bourgeoisie of the already powerful neighboring nation who had already unified the territory into one free market.

The second kind of struggle had for its purpose the liberation of the local but weaker bourgeoisie from foreign domination, i.e., the liberation of its own "national free market" from foreign control. This struggle took the form of a call for the defense of the "fatherland" against foreign domination, interference, etc. . .

In the light of these considerations we can see that Zionism as the nationalist movement of the Jewish middle class (the more specifically of the middle and lower bourgeoisie) in Europe. Since Zionism belongs to the category of the later nationalist movements of Western Europe we find it highly influenced and saturated with the contents and methods of the latter (particularly German nationalism).

In other words the Zionist movement is the product of the massive revolutionary transformation that overtook Europe with the rise of capitalism and the bourgeois classes and the ultimate victory of their economic, social and political system.

At the same time, it is also true to say that the Zionist movement is a powerful reaction on the part of the Jewish bourgeoisie (1) against the local Christian European middle classes on account of the fierce and bloody economic competition between them.

This fierce competition expressed itself in many forms. The most decisive was the anti-Semitic movement among the non-Jewish Europeans. Anti-Semitism helped to push the Jewish bourgeoisie to look for a private national free market of its own, outside Europe altogether. Under such circumstances no one will compete with the Jewish bourgeoisie over the domination of this market, and specially no one will compete with it on "uneven" terms as was the case in European countries.

It was under such circumstances that serious talk started about the "Jewish nation", and the "Jewish state" among the ranks of the Jewish middle class and its spokesmen. The European bourgeois classes succeeded in unifying and expanding their "national territories" under various ideological pretexts. Similarly, the Jewish bourgeoisie selected for itself a territory which it called historically its own (Palestine), and then went on to conquer it and constantly expand its area under the ideological pretexts of defending the sacred "fatherland", "unifying the land of our ancestors", etc. . . In classic bourgeois style, the Zionists naturally spoke about the "Jewish homeland", or the "promised land of our fathers and forefathers" and not about the unified national market which the Jewish bourgeoisie needed so badly.

As mentioned earlier, since it was impossible to carve out such a market, with all the social and political structures that it implies, in Europe itself, the Jewish bourgeoisie started looking very early for possible territories overseas: Uganda, Argentina, Palestine, etc. . . etc. . .

This tendency to look for the national homeland abroad was quite natural considering that the Zionist movement matured at the time when European capitalism had already reached its highest stage viz. imperialism. At that time colonial and imperialist ventures in Asia, Africa and Latin America were in full swing. We may summarize the point by saying that Zionism is basically the "national problem" created by the Jewish bourgeoisie for the sake of the Jewish bourgeoisie—in the age of the highest state of capitalism and in imitation of the other European middle classes and their nationalist movements.

Consequently the Zionist movement was fully characterized by all the traits of the socio-economic environment in which it grew and developed. It carried with it the traits characteristic of the European capitalist nations in the age of imperialism, viz. chauvinism. Racism, inverted anti-Semitism, economic and territorial expansionism, as well as the Gospel of colonialism and the "sanctity" of exploiting the non-European natives abroad. This brought Zionism (like it did to European imperialism in general) into bitter conflict with the nascent nationalist movements developing in the "East" and struggling against European colonialism and foreign domination and exploitation. More specifically this brought Zionism into a bitter and continuous struggle against the Arab nationalist movement. Arab nationalism, unlike Jewish nationalism, was neither aggressive, nor expansionistic nor colonialistically minded. In fact it could not be any of these things for it was simply one of many anti-colonial liberation movements that arose in the three continents which fell under the yoke of European imperialism and exploitation. The Arab nationalist movement was weak, on the defensive and sought no more than independence from foreign rule at home. This is why the history of the struggle of the Arab nationalist movement against the colonial and neo-colonial powers (France, Britain and the U.S.A.) was never separate from its violent opposition to the Zionist colonization and usurpation of Palestine. They were the two sides of one and the same coin.

I turn now to presenting some specific examples from the classic and recognized literature of the Zionist movement in order to illustrate the point of view I have expounded. These examples will show to what great degree leaders and spokesmen of Zionism were conscious of the organic bonds between their political movement and the European middle classes in general and the Jewish bourgeois in particular. They will also show the influence exercised upon Zionism by the other European nationalist movements, in addition to the intimate links which Zionism as a movement had to the expansionistic policies and imperialist projects of the big capitalist powers.

I will start by citing examples from the earliest Zionist writers and propagandists such as Rabbi Yehuda Alkai (1798-1874) and Rabbi Zvi Hirsch Kalischer (1795-1874). The first writer lived in Serbia at the time when the Greeks won their war of independence against the Ottomans, and the Balkan was seething with nationalist movements and feelings against foreign domination. As for Kalischer, he was immensely influenced by the nationalist movements in Poland, Italy and Hungary. Both writers called upon the European Jews to imitate the nationalist movements and uprisings which occurred around them and to follow their example in creating an independent state for themselves in Palestine.

Kalischer urges the European Jews to follow this line in the following words:

"Why do the peoples of Italy and of other countries sacrifice their lives for the land of their fathers, while we, like men bereft of strength and courage, do nothing? Are we inferior to all other peoples, who have no regard for life and fortune as compared with love of their love and nation? Let us take to heart the examples of the Italians, Poles, and Hungarians, who laid down their lives and possessions in the struggle for national independence, while we, the children of Israel, who have the most glorious and holiest of lands as our inheritance, are spiritless and silent. We should be ashamed of ourselves. All the other peoples have striven only for the sake of their own national honor, how much more should we exert ourselves, for our duty is to labor not only for the glory of our ancestors but for the glory of God who chose Zion". (2)

One of the major objectives of the national bourgeois movements in Europe was the liquidation of the traces of feudal dispersion left from the Middle Ages (in order to create the unified market). Similarly, the aim of the Zionist movement was the liquidation of the Jewish dispersion, which the new rising class regarded as a remnant of the Dark and Middle Ages. This explains the message sent out by Kalischer, (it runs through his writings) to the Jews to overcome their dispersion by gathering themselves as a cohesive whole in the "Holy Land".

It is also well known that Moses Hess was greatly influenced by one of the heroes of the unification of Italy: Mazzini. The Zionist leader, activist and terrorist Jabotinsky was influenced by the career of Garibaldi, the sword of Italian unification.

On the other hand the famous ideologues of the various European nationalisms looked favorably on the idea of Zionism and its aspirations, for they saw in it something of themselves. Consequently, we find the great thinker of German nationalism Herder, blaming the Jews strongly for not having preserved enough of their sense of "collective honor", and for not exerting the necessary effort in order to return to their "homeland" Palestine—which according to him is the only place where the Jews can flourish as a nation. (3)

Similarly Mazzini gave the Jews of Europe the following telling advice:

"Without country, you have neither name, token, voice, nor rights, no admission as brothers into the fellowship of the peoples. You are the bastards of Humanity. Soldiers without a banner, *Israelites among the nations*, you will find neither faith nor protection; none will be sureties for you. Do not beguile yourselves with the hope of emancipation from unjust social conditions if you do not first conquer a country for yourselves; where there is no country there is no

common agreement to which you can appeal; the egoism of self interest rules alone, and he who has the upper hand keeps it, since there is no common safeguard for the interests of all, Do not be led away by the idea of improving your material conditions without first solving the National question."⁽⁴⁾

It is clear from the poet's rhapsodizing about "egoism", "self-interest", the "upper hand" and the absence of a safeguard "for the interests of all" that he is expressing in this distilled discourse of bourgeois nationalism, the basic thoughts on which the capitalist ideology rests. He is strongly urging the Jewish middle class to adopt them wholeheartedly and as a matter of vital interest.

Consciousness of the links between Jewish nationalism and the Jewish bourgeoisie is also clear in the writings and practical endeavors of Aikalai. He directed his Zionist call to the distinguished and rich Jews of Western Europe such as the English financier Moses Montefiore and the French politician Adolph Cremieux.⁽⁵⁾ He knew quite well that the realization of his Zionist aim is doomed without reliance on the economic interests, wealth and political influence of a certain class of Jews. Like any ordinary merchant in the age of expanding colonialist commercial enterprises, Aikalai imagines that one can resolve the national Jewish problem by buying the "Holy Land" from its present owners. As for the practical means for realizing that objective he suggests what any mediocre capitalist would have suggested: the establishment of a commercial company to carry out the deal.⁽⁶⁾ In addition he suggests the founding of Jewish colonies in Palestine as a first step in the process gathering the Jews there. The source of his inspiration were the classic programs of colonization devised and carried out by the European capitalists and states in their imperialist conquests overseas.

As for Kalischer, we find that the first expression of his Zionist ideas and aspirations appear in a letter addressed to the head of the Berlin branch of the Rothschild family in 1836. He explains in this letter that the salvation of the Jews via returning to their "homeland" can not come by miraculous or divine means, as prevalent beliefs would have it. The salvation can occur only through "natural causes" such as human effort and the will of governments and states. The Rabbi wrote in this letter the following:

"On the contrary, the Redemption will begin by awakening support among philanthropist and by gaining the consent of the nations to the gathering of some of the scattered of Israel into the Holy Land."⁽⁷⁾

Kalischer also proposed colonialist projects in Palestine after the current fashion among the imperialist powers, viz. the commercial company which exploits and colonizes overseas. He says in this connection:

"I would suggest that an organization be established to encourage settlement in the Holy Land, for the purpose of purchasing and cultivating farms and vineyards. Such a program would appear as a ray of deliverance to those now living in the Land in poverty and famine."⁽⁸⁾

Later, Moses Hess clarified again the inseparable bond between the idea of the independent Jewish state on the one hand, and the role of capital and the possessing class on the other, Hess wrote:

"With the Jews, more than with other nations which, though oppressed, yet live on their own soil, all political and social progress must necessarily be preceded by national independence. A common, native soil is a precondition for introducing healthier relations between capital and labor among the Jews."⁽⁹⁾

Then Hess went on to show in the clearest terms the intimate connection between the objectives of the Zionist movement on the one hand, and the interests of European capitalist commercial expansion and colonialism in the East on the other. He wrote:

"Just as we once searched in the West for a road to India, and incidentally discovered a new world, so will our lost fatherland be rediscovered on the road to India and China that is now being built in the Orient. Do you still doubt that France will help the Jews to found colonies which may extend from Suez to Jerusalem and from the banks of the Jordan to the coast of the Mediterranean."⁽¹⁰⁾

Then Hess returns to the ideal capitalist mode of solving any problems: buying and selling through the medium of money. He says in this connection:

"What European power would today oppose the plan that the Jews, united through a Congress, should buy back their ancient fatherland? Who would object if the Jews flung a handful of gold to decrepit old Turkey and said to her: 'Give me back my home and use this money to consolidate the other parts of your tottering empire?' "⁽¹¹⁾

Again the intimate link between Zionism and the Jewish bourgeoisie shines through the writings of a most important Zionist spokesman: Leo Pinsker. He explains the point in the following fashion:

"Only then, and not before, should the directorate, together with an associated body of capitalists, as founders of a stock company to be organized subsequently, purchase a piece of land which several million Jews could settle in the course of time. This piece of land might form a small territory in North America, or a sovereign pashalik in Asiatic Turkey recognized by the Porte and the other Powers as neutral."⁽¹²⁾

The same ideas, arguments and suggestion are repeated by Herzl himself (the most important figure of the Zionist movement). Herzl was fully aware of the influence of the bourgeois nationalist movements in Europe on the rise and development of the Zionist movement. He was also fully aware of the decisive role of the middle class in this whole operation, as well as of the existing fierce competition between the Jewish bourgeoisie and the local middle classes. He understood more clearly than any one before him the need and necessary for the Zionist movement to completely identify itself with the imperialist interests of a great power like Britain.

Herzl, for example, says:

"To create a new State is neither ridiculous nor impossible. Haven't we witnessed the process in our own day, among nations which were not largely middle class as we are, but poorer, less educated, and consequently weaker than ourselves? The governments of all countries scourged by anti-Semitism will be keenly interested in obtaining sovereignty for us."⁽¹³⁾

In other words the Jewish bourgeoisie is sick and tired of living under the patronage of a "Host-nation" and prefers to have its own "nation" and independent state where it has to compete with no one over the domination of the national market.

Therefore Herzl says clearly that the Jewish question is mainly centered in the middle classes considering that the Jews themselves are a bourgeois people⁽¹⁴⁾ as he states it.

Following is a statement by Herzl about the fierce competition going on between the Jewish and non-Jewish bourgeois classes:

"For in the ghetto we had remarkably developed into a bourgeois people and we emerged from the ghetto a prodigious rival to the middle class. Thus we found ourselves thrust, upon emancipation, into this bourgeois circle, where we had a double pressure to sustain, from within and from without. The Christian bourgeoisie would indeed not be loath to cast us as a peace offering to socialism, little though that would avail them."⁽¹⁵⁾

It should be clear by now that the state which Herzl proposed to establish for the Jews was meant to be a liberal capitalist state; lead, built, and dominated by the Jewish middle class, and protected by some great imperialist power in return for vital services rendered to its interests. Herzl states this in no ambiguous terms:

"We must not visualize the exodus of the Jews as a sudden one. It will be gradual, proceeding over a period of decades. The poorest will go first and cultivate the soil. They will construct roads, bridges, railways and telegraph installations, regulate rivers, and provide themselves with homesteads, all according to predetermined plans. Their labor will create trade, trade will create markets, and markets will attract new settlers—for every man will go voluntarily, at his own expense and his own risk. The labor invested in the soil will enhance its value. The Jews will soon perceive that a new and permanent frontier has been opened up for that spirit of enterprise which has heretofore brought them only hatred and obloquy."⁽¹⁶⁾

It should be noted here that the instruments and methods contemplated and actually utilized by the Zionist movement in the colonization of Palestine were neither new nor original. They were the common stock-in-trade agencies previously utilized by the European capitalist ruling classes in forging their overseas empires. These agencies included such things as commercial companies, banks, institutions and houses of finance, colonies, etc. . . The Zionist movement also had its own terms to do the job of colonizing Palestine. The Ideal imitated by the Zionists in all these colonial ventures and imperialist projects was the East India Company and its role in the exploitation and subjection of India and Southeast Asia. In fact the adoption by the Zionist movement of the well-known agencies and tricks of colonization led the American President H. Truman to make the following comment about the National Jewish Fund: "America's Point Four projected fifty years earlier."⁽¹⁷⁾

The contemporary Israeli politician and writer, Uri Avneri, has acknowledged as much in stating the following:

"Following the example of Cecil Rhodes, Herzl wanted to obtain a charter to establish this national Home which was represented as a Company, incorporated according to the model popularized by British colonization. *Terre ancienne, terre nouvelle* describes in detail the public corporation society of this Charter, society to establish in Palestine instead of a normal state."⁽¹⁸⁾

It should be clear by now that the Zionist projects for the colonization and eventual domination over Palestine were no more than faithful reproductions of the projects devised by the capitalist ruling classes in Europe to build their overseas empires. (To Be Continued)

1. The very wealthy Jewish upper bourgeoisie excepted.
2. *The Zionist Idea*, p. 114.
3. Isaiah Berlin, "Men and Ideas," *Encounter*, July 1965, p. 43.
4. H.M. Kallen, *Zionism and World Politics*, W. Heinemann, London, 1921, p. 47.
5. *The Zionist Idea*, p. 104.
6. *Ibid*, pp. 105-107.
7. *Ibid*, p. 111.
8. *Ibid*, p. 113.
9. *Ibid*, p. 136.
10. *Ibid*, p. 133.
11. *Ibid*, p. 134.
12. *Ibid*, p. 197.
13. *Ibid*, p. 220.
14. *Ibid*, p. 210.
15. *Ibid*, p. 218.
16. *Ibid*, p. 221.
17. B.A. Rosenblatt, *The American Bridge to the Israeli Commonwealth*, 1st ed., N.Y. 1959, p. 35.
18. *Les Temps Modernes*, p. 709.

association of arab-american university graduates, inc.

FINAL STATEMENT

Released at the conclusion of the
Third Annual Convention of the Association
November 1, 1970

The Association of Arab-American University Graduates, Inc., an organization dedicated to informing the American people as to issues pertaining to the Arab world, at its Third Annual Convention held at Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois, on the 30th, 31st October and the 1st November, 1970, examined the relationship of the Arab people with various European, American and Afro-Asian states of the world. Through its principal addresses and a series of panel discussions by leading Asian, African, European and American scholars and active participants in effecting relations between the Arab people and other peoples of the world (as perceived by the Arab people), the Association recognized the growing collaboration between the Arab and Afro-Asian communities to obtain a greater measure of dignity, equality and justice for all people. Further, the Association recognized the growing hostility between the Arab people and the Western European and American governments resulting from the exploitative practices of the latter and their persistent attempts to continue to deny the developing communities of the world their just demands for a dignified existence. After detailed examination of the totality of the relationship between the Arab people and the rest of the world, the Third Annual Convention, in its efforts to bring to the American people an understanding of the feelings and thinking of the Arab people, unanimously adopted the following statement:

"While the Association salutes the Arab people who struggled for freedom, it notes with serious concern that certain parts of the Arab homeland remain under European and colonial subjugation. The Association, therefore, calls upon the Arab

people to intensify their struggle against vestiges of European imperialism in the Arabian Gulf areas and calls upon the independent Arab States to render full material and moral support to the valiant struggle of the Arab people in South Arabia.

"At the same time, the Association notes anew that the just and inalienable rights of the Palestinian people continue to be denied. In this connection, the Association reaffirms its statement of September 22, 1970 (F.P., Vol. 2, No. 6, p.6):

"The Association salutes the Palestinian people in their just struggle against Zionism/colonialism and their fellow-travelers and assures them of its continued total support. It further calls upon all free people everywhere to rally behind the Palestinian people, to mobilize their efforts to frustrate the attempts of colonialism/Zionism to administer the final solution to the Palestinian people, and to frustrate all military and political efforts which seek the capitulation of the Arab people to Israel and her imperialist supporters.

"Further, the Association notes with alarm that the United States government has been pursuing a policy of duplicity and imperialism in the Middle East and in the Third World. The United States government, against the wishes of the large majority of the American people, has pursued a policy of military and economic support to racist settler regimes, to colonial and Fascist regimes throughout the world. The Association deplores the military support that the United States has been rendering to Israel which has enabled the latter to conduct a racist war against the Arab people. Similarly, the Association deplores the continued support which the United States has been render-

ing to the colonial regime of Portugal which is oppressing the gallant fighters of Mozambique and Angola. Also, the Association feels that the United States should revise its policies with regards to the settler regimes of South Africa and Rhodesia. The Association believes the continued military support which the United States has been rendering to the settler regimes of Israel, Rhodesia and South Africa and to the colonial regime of Portugal lies at the heart of the continued success of these colonial/Fascist regimes in thwarting the principles of liberty, dignity and equality and is a living affront to the best ideals of the American people. The Association, therefore, calls upon the American people to exercise their rights to persuade the Administration to suspend diplomatic relations with these settler regimes. The failure of the United States to do so and to pursue a policy based on the principles of justice, liberty and dignity invites definite alienation of free people throughout the world and may become a factor leading to certain world conflagration.

"The AAUG recognizes the Palestine Resistance Movement as the only legitimate liberation movement of the Palestinian people and as the vanguard of the Arab revolution. As was stated in the resolution of the Second Annual Convention meeting, held in Detroit, Michigan, in December, 1969, and further recognizing that recent attempts by Zionism, Jordanian reaction and Western imperialism to liquidate the Palestine revolution have resulted in the promulgation of a dismembered so-called Palestine entity. The AAUG resolves that:

"1. No Arab or Palestinian speaks for or can enter into negotiation on behalf of the Palestinian revolution. The Palestinian revolution, which is the revolution of the Palestinian people, speaks for itself by having gained the complete support of the Palestinian masses. Its aim is the complete liberation of Palestine, and not a symbolic part thereof.

"2. The Palestinian resistance is part of the Arab revolution and it is only within the context of the Arab revolution that the problem of Israel will be solved. The rights of the minorities, including the Jewish minority, are related to the outcome of the Arab revolution. It is therefore the obligation of oppressed people, Jewish and Arab, and of progressives everywhere to support the Palestine revolution." □

THE PALESTINIAN WOMAN IN THE STRUGGLE



"The Palestinian women feel they earned their rights through their own hard work, and that by competing with the men they are spurred to become stronger and more capable than they had thought possible. Naturally, the women find those who are actively engaged in the resistance movement more receptive to change than Arab society as a whole, but the strategy of protracted war makes it possible that the new ideas will spread. Perhaps a story we heard in Lebanon best illustrates the process . . .

"An insult that is often leveled at the female Palestinian activists is the suggestion that they are sleeping with the commandos. Thus, two young women began to hear murmurs of 'may God protect your honor' from a certain group of men every evening when the women passed them on their way to serve their military duty. After hearing the phrase once too often, one of the two women wheeled around, marched up to one of the men, and struck her Kalashnikov in his stomach. 'I am defending my honor,' she said, 'what are you doing about yours? When the Zionists come again, I shall be defending you, because you do not even know how to handle a gun.' "

S. Rose & C. Tackney, "The Birth of a Revolution"

oniz 19d10 the2 19d10 other side

in the Arab world, is ready to maintain the cease-fire. Indeed, a feeling of relaxation along the border [with Jordan] prevails." It is obvious, Mr. Allon goes on to say, that "we are interested in that Egypt have an interest in the cease-fire." With a Hussein in each Arab country, Mr. Allon would hardly be discontent.

But things at present are not quite as Mr. Allon would like them to be. Regarding Mr. Jarring's mission, the deputy prime minister said: "There is no doubt that Israel would want to establish contacts at the moment when strategically and politically, internally and internationally, the situation warrants them." Mr. Allon attacks the opposition for taking an intransigent position that "not a single foot" of land be returned. He, of course, is not so eager himself to return the occupied territories, but he would like the Arabs to appear the intransigent: "Why not impose such a policy on the other side. We have an interest in not shouldering that responsibility." Truly, Mr. Allon wants to seem a "Peace"—monger; and it is understandable why. What might prove harder to understand would be why Mr. Allon's line of policy should be adopted by any Arab government.

Mr. Allon's genius, however, is limitless; not only does he want to stall the Jarring talks and shift the blame onto Arab intransigence, but in the same breath he sets forth the same steel-clad Zionist conditions for Israel's return to the Jarring talks and presents himself on the international scene as an advocate of peace. Mr. Allon is indeed lucky, in the sense that his counterparts in the Arab world at the present time are playing his game. They would all do well to come to terms with reality—no little games are going to decide the destiny of the Palestinian people.

Mr. Allon envisions a map of the future Israel as based on four components: "From the ethical point of view—the historical right of the [Jewish] people to Eretz Israel; from the strategic point of view—defensible borders; from a national point of view—the state must remain Jewish in character; from a political point of view—plans which demonstrate readiness for logical compromise." It is the Zionist leadership's stubbornness in pursuing such irrational visions that has brought about the counteractions of a small segment of leftist Israelis.

By raising the Palestinian flag on the campus of The Hebrew University, the real left in Israel is raising the banner of revolution against what they must consider Zionist pig-headedness. The Israeli New Left has begun to realize the futility of the Zionist pursuit and the suicidal inflexibility of its leadership. They have become tired of paying a ridiculously heavy price for the benefit of "Zionism" and international imperialism. That is why the demonstrators at the pavilion of flags in Jerusalem wanted to lower the flags of the imperialist powers—the U.S. and U.S.S.R. They have come to learn that only by reaching an understanding with Palestinians can their problems be solved. They now know that only by joining in the struggle of the Palestinians will the area be rid of foreign control and local reaction. Naturally, they were roughed-up by fascist Israelis and their hirelings; but so also are the Palestinian freedom fighters.

The Palestine liberation movement has demonstrated its determination to pursue its goal of making Palestine the home of all Palestinians; it remains yet to be seen just how determined the Jewish New Left will be in this respect. □

—Ibn al-Balad



ON A SINGLE PAGE OF THE POPULAR ISRAELI EVENING PAPER, THERE IS MANIFESTED IN MICROCOSM A PICTURE OF WHAT IS GOING ON TODAY . . .

Page four of the November 18, 1970, issue of *Ma'ariv* is the focus of this article. It is an interesting page indeed and well worth careful scrutiny. Several reports appear on it summing up current trends of thought in the Zionist state and methods of operation that the Zionist leadership has persistently employed since the Zionist movement's birth. Noteworthy also is that the same page carries a report indicating the beginnings of a new and seemingly real opposition to Israel's present leadership and to the whole Zionist idea.

In the Zionist camp there is Golda Meir speaking of the "ingathering of the Jews into their homeland"; Dayan, Allon, Begin, and Weisman discussing the ways and means of perpetuating the Zionist ideal.

Of the other camp, small as it is, we read that members of the "Israeli New Left" made an attempt to raise the Palestinian flag next to the Israeli flag on the University campus.

It was at a funeral ceremony—in which the bones of 163 would-be-immigrants (who had died after attempting illegal entry into Israel) were brought from Cyprus for burial in Haifa—that Golda Meir was preaching Zionism and said, "Our vengeance is unique: here we are free and proud citizens of an independent state that is still fighting and being victorious. These tombs are only a small part of the price which we have had to pay in order to be here. There shall nevermore be a Jew who wants to return to his homeland but somebody stands in his way." Mrs. Meir's assertions are very revealing. She pretends to ignore the fact that the real struggle against the settlers has just begun. She seems to discount the fact that the freedom fighters in Palestine will continue to stand in the way of her dreams of ingathering and will persist in obstructing her designs.

Golda Meir's confidence in the ability of the Zionist state to achieve its aims, however, is not without foundation. Among the most important factors in molding the Zionist leadership's thinking and method of operation is the character of its counterpart in the Arab world. How Zionist leadership views Arab governments and how it plans to deal with them is clear from the two reports on speeches made by Messrs. Dayan and Allon.

On the surface it looks as though there are differences between the two pretenders to the premiership (after Golda). It does not take much to see that these differ-

ences are merely matters of strategy as to how to force the Arab governments into surrender—a matter on which there is complete agreement.

Dayan wants now to go back to the Jarring talks "as a means of preventing renewal of the fighting." He also wants "the U.S. to guarantee the agreement so that the guarantees be concrete." Dayan assured his audience that really the "Soviet Union is not willing to supply Egypt with the wherewithal to renew the war." The minister of defense does not specify the pre-conditions for his government's return to the Jarring talks. However, he holds "that the new regime in Cairo, which is still weak and unstable, aspires, because of that weakness, to reach a political agreement with us." It becomes necessary, thus, to help that regime to proceed with its plans, especially "since extreme forces in Egypt, particularly among the high officers, may drag the new regime into renewed fighting." Simply put, with big-power support and collaboration, Dayan wants to impose on weak Arab governments his conditions for settlement; but this must be done soon before things get out of hand and "extreme" elements take over.

Dayan takes issue with the leaders of *Gahal*, Messrs. Begin and Weisman. He rejects their view that "only when a quarter-million Russians are stationed in Egypt, will there be reason to worry." He also attacks their suggestion that "only after we occupy Cairo and Damascus, will we be able to reach peaceful agreement with the Arabs." To be sure, Dayan's objection to *Gahal's* policy does not emanate from rejection of the idea of expansion as such, but rather from questions of present feasibility. Such an undertaking, according to Dayan, might well bring the Israeli army face to face with the Russians. Dayan urges his government to re-evaluate its policies in the light of "the collapse of the Arab-Eastern Front and late events in Jordan and Syria." As to what this might mean, Mr. Allon supplies some answers.

The deputy prime minister builds his hopes around King Hussein and wishes for Egypt an enlightened and strong leadership like that of Jordan. According to Mr. Allon, "King Hussein, whose regime has always been considered unstable, now, after crushing the commandos in Jordan and [after] the tremors which shook Iraq and Syria, is the most stable regime in the Arab Middle East. Hussein, who has lately become one of the central figures

COMING OUT SOON

a lover
from
palestine AND OTHER POEMS

\$3.00 (postpaid)

an anthology of Palestinian poetry. Translations in English appear parallel to the original Arabic text.

EDITED BY ABDUL WAHAB AL-MESSIRI
ILLUSTRATED BY KAMAL BOULLATA

Reserve your copy today by
sending your check or money
order to:

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

A CALL TO THE PEACE MOVEMENT



The conflagration in Jordan in September 1970 between the Jordanian monarchy and the Palestinians, having bordered on civil war, revealed to the American peace movement that speculation and conjecture about the possible deployment of American armed forces personnel in the Middle East had passed to the stage of contingency planning and actual preparation for that deployment. American troops and carriers were alerted in Europe and Turkey for an ostensible "rescue operation" of American nationals from Jordan, while the American Sixth Fleet in the Mediterranean was readied for action on the side of the Jordanian monarchy.

Further, recent statements by high administration officials that the placement of anti-aircraft missiles in the Suez canal zone and the growing Russian presence in Egypt constitute a direct Russian challenge to the U.S., that the Russians must be "expelled" from Egypt and that the Arabs want to "drive the Jews into the sea," must all be seen as an attempt to prepare the war-weary American public for American military intervention in the Middle East on the side of an Arab regime against the Palestinian commandos or on the side of Israel against a deterioration of her clear military superiority in the area.

It is clear that American policymakers and some members of Congress are concerned that the isolationist and pacifist sentiment in the United States engendered by American involvement in Southeast Asia and the mass movement in the United States against that has rendered direct American military involvement in the Middle East politically unpalatable, if not impossible, in terms of domestic order. For this reason a concerted and well-orchestrated attempt has been made by the Nixon administration to "educate" the American people that American interests in the Middle East

are vital to the U.S. national welfare, and that Israel faces possible annihilation at the hands of the savage Arabs. Some members of the anti-Vietnam war coalition in Congress have even suggested that American interests in the Middle East considerably surpass those which the U.S. has in Southeast Asia, but American military involvement in Southeast Asia forestalls America's ability to respond militarily in the Middle East.

This picture appears against the background of the continuing impasse in what has been referred to as the Arab-Israeli problem. With the Arab States calling for complete Israeli withdrawal from territories occupied by her as a result of the June 1967 war, and Israel responding that she will only return to "secure and recognized boundaries" and, in this context, Israeli incorporation of Arab Jerusalem, Sharam El-Sheikh, and the Golan Heights in Syria are non-negotiable, it is highly unlikely that any settlement of the conflict is imminent between the existing Arab states and Israel. Further, the announced rejection by the Palestinian commando organizations of any peaceful settlement that does not restore the Palestinians to their homeland and create of Palestine a democratic and secular state, and the demonstrated ability of these commando groups to sabotage any settlement, points to the reality of continued Palestinian operations against Israel and the persistence of the Palestinian movement for national liberation.

Certain parallels can be drawn between America's involvement in Vietnam in the early 1960's and America's involvement in the Middle East today. In both cases the U.S. has taken announced positions favoring one side in a conflict. In both cases the U.S. supplied substantial amounts of military equipment to parties to the conflicts. In both cases the U.S., as a world power, is stepping into the shoes of a former colonial power which

had been compelled to withdraw from the area. In both cases, American involvement is justified on the basis of its strategic interests and the desire to allow the peoples of the areas self-determination against the efforts of "international communism" to subjugate them. In short, all of the indicators which pointed to American involvement in Vietnam are now pointing to direct American involvement in the Middle East. What lends particular credibility to this view is the campaign launched to prepare the American public for this intervention.

In light of these facts, the American peace movement must clearly explain to the American people that U.S. involvement in a Middle Eastern Southeast Asia means a new investment of American youth and material resources into a conflagration that seemingly has no definable limits in time. The human and material costs of the Vietnam war, not only for the U.S. but for the people of Southeast Asia, are of such proportions that no amount of justification can obliterate the fact that the U.S. and the peoples of the Middle East would likewise pay the same human and material cost.

It is particularly important that at this point in time an effort be made to delineate why we, concerned with preserving the lives of American youth and protesting the expenditure of American produce and wealth in the literal devastation of other countries and peoples, are unequivocally opposed to American military intervention into the Middle East on any pretext or any side. No amount of vaunted "American interest" can alter the terrible consequences taken in its name. We reject the concept that these terrible consequences, this shattering of human lives, is the inevitable cost for keeping America strong or keeping America free. On the contrary, it is just these consequences which weaken America and divide her and create a more repressive society.

The American peace movement would be shirking its hard-won gains and responsibilities if it were not to respond to the current rapid movement to American involvement in the Middle East in a clear and forthright manner in calling to the attention of the American people what is occurring, and protesting to the government of the U.S. the deepening American involvement in the problems and affairs of the Middle East. Our position is straightforward. American military involvement is not bad in Southeast Asia and good in the Middle East. The American people are unwilling to continue to be dragged into one involvement after another under the guise that "this one is different." The deployment of American troops in the Middle East would undoubtedly have innumerable repercussions including a generalized revulsion against the U.S. by the Arab people and the quickening of the transformation of the Middle East into another Vietnam. Regardless of the so-called special circumstances in the Middle East, Vietnam has demonstrated that the United States may not impose its will, or the will of another country, on a whole people united against that effort for imposition. □

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