

Marxist

XXXIX, 3–4, July–December 2023

DOCUMENTS

The Ideological Underpinnings of Zionist Terror¹

As an organized political trend Zionism emerged at the end of the 19th century, in 1897, when the World Zionist Organization (WZO) was founded. Its first president and principal theorist, Theodor Herzl, was a Vienna journalist. Herzl played an important role in the elaboration of a program for a bourgeois-nationalist solution of the so-called Jewish question. At the time the Jewish bourgeoisie was looking for new, more effective ways of regaining control over the mass of the Jewry in order to consolidate its economic and political positions in the capitalist world. It was then that Herzl, in his brochure entitled *The Jewish State*, set for his program for a territorial-political solution of the Jewish question, a book still revered as the “Bible of Zionism”.

Herzl and his supporters were concerned mainly with how best to assure the dominance of the Jewish bourgeoisie so that initially they paid relatively little attention to the question of where the “Jewish State” should be located. Herzl had no objections to Palestine but was ready to consider alternative locations – Argentina, Uganda and other parts of the world. The Zionists advanced the slogan “Give land without people to the people without land”. The slogan drew objections from the adherents of the so-called spiritual Zionism headed by Ahad Ha’am, who as early as 1891 founded the secret Zionist order B’ne Moshe (Sons of Moses) in which many of the future functionaries and leaders of the World Zionist Organization received their training. Being like Herzl a

great admirer of Nietzsche, the German philosopher, Ahad Ha'am took over the "superman" idea, and by linking it with the Judaic dogma on the Jews being the chosen people turned it into the idea of "supernation". For Ahad Ha'am acceptance of the Nietzschean ideal of "superman" by individual Jews was not enough. "If we agree.....that the *Superman* is the goal of all things", he wrote, "we must needs agree also that an essential condition of the attainment of this goal is the *Supernation*: that is to say, there must be a single nation better adapted than other nations by virtue of its inherent characteristics, to moral development, and ordering its whole life in accordance with a moral law which stands higher than the common type."² Ahad Ha'am proclaimed such a nation an "extraterritorial world Jewish spiritual nation".

While accepting the possibility of assimilation of Jews, Ahad Ha'am regarded as a chief weapon for combatting it the creation of a "spiritual centre" of the world Jewish nation in Palestine by establishing Jewish settlements there rather than large-scale Jewish emigration. He wrote: "This Jewish settlement, which will be a gradual growth, will become in course of time the centre of the nation, wherein its spirit will find pure expression and develop in all its aspects to the highest degree of perfection of which it is capable. Then, from this center, the spirit of Judaism will radiate to the great circumference, to all the communities of the Diaspora, to inspire them with new life and to preserve the overall unity of our people. When our national culture in Palestine has attained that level, we may be confident that it will produce men in the Land of Israel itself who will be able, at a favourable moment, to establish a state there – one which will be not merely a State of Jews but a really Jewish State."³

Whereas Herzl was chiefly interested in setting up a strong Jewish state, Ahad Ha'am emphasized the ideological basis of Zionist control over such a state. This was reflected in the WZO program which proclaims the goal of Zionism "...to create for the Jewish people a home in Palestine...."⁴ But Palestine was

anything but a “land without people”. Arabs had lived there for centuries, and the Jewish population there at the beginning of this century did not exceed several tens of thousands. How did the Zionists view this fact?

The Zionist philosopher Martin Buber wrote in his memoirs: “When Max Nordau, Herzl’s second in command, first received details on the existence of an Arab population in Palestine, he came shocked to Herzl, exclaiming: ‘I never realized this – we are committing an injustice!’.”⁵ Well, did this make Nordau revise his views, abandon Zionism or oppose the “injustice” being done to the Palestinian people? Nothing of the sort. Nordau rather quickly overcame his qualms on the matter and remained one of the WZO leaders. What is more, his name was given to a plan that called for the immediate settlement in Palestine of hundreds of thousands of Jewish immigrants. Like other Zionist leaders, Nordau was convinced that the Jew was “more industrious and abler than the average European, not to mention the moribund Asiatic and African.”⁶ Addressing the 1st WZO congress, Nordau praised the Jewish ghetto of the Middle Ages and emphasized: “The opinion of the outside world did not matter, because it was the opinion of ignorant enemies.”⁷

The ideological platform of international Zionism envisaged the right of the “chosen people” to ignore the rights of other peoples and rested on the same racist and chauvinist principles that underlie anti-Semitism. The 17th Congress of the Communist Party of Israel noted in a resolution: “Zionist ideology is a racist ideology, being based on the assumption that under any social system different peoples cannot live in an atmosphere of friendship and brotherhood and that this applies above all to the Jews. Zionism is anti-Semitism in reverse. The Zionist ideologues impute to other people the same characteristics anti-Semites attribute to the Jews. Both theories, Zionism and anti-Semitism, have a common source in racism and their goal is to split working people of different nationalities for the benefit of their class enemy.”⁸

The Zionists made extensive use of the doctrine of Hermann Cohen, the founder of the so-called Marburg school of Neo-Kantianism, for the ideological justification of their expansion. Cohen, while not showing any particular interest in Palestine, sought to prove the existence of a special Jewish community which was, according to him, determined by specific biological characteristics and which was the torch-bearer of a messianic ideal. Besides, Cohen expounded “ethical socialism” which justified the colonial expansion of those peoples who regarded themselves as exponents of a higher ethical ideal. In his *Notebooks on Imperialism* Lenin emphasized that the doctrine of “ethical socialism” “...in point of fact... ENDOWS ANY NATION WITH THE RIGHT TO SEIZE AND ADMINISTER THE TERRITORY OF ANY OTHER nation on the ground of a self-ascribed superiority and self-imputed qualifications for the work of civilization.”⁹

The Zionists quickly mastered the techniques of imperialist brigandage vis-à-vis the peoples of the colonies. Addressing the 3rd WZO congress in 1899, Theodor Herzl said that the “Asian question” was growing more serious every day, and he feared it would become quite bloody in the future. The civilized peoples, therefore, had a stake in seeing that a cultural way station was set up on the shortest road to Asia which all civilized people could rely on. Palestine could well serve as such a station and the Jews were the *Kulturtrageren* who were willing to give their lives to bring this about.

The emphasis was placed on force as an instrument for achieving the set objectives, and Zionist leaders who have always regarded themselves as the *Kulturtrageren* of the “supreme morality” have never attempted to conceal this. Thus, young David Ben-Gurion who arrived in Palestine early in the century together with a group of Zionist colonists used to say: “The present-day world respects nothing but strength.”¹⁰ Some years later he went further, openly declaring that the Palestinian question would be settled “by force of arms and not through official resolutions.”¹¹

“We were a company of conquistadors,” he recalled likening the Zionist colonists to the Spanish who exterminated millions of Indians in Central and South America. Then in his *Earning a Homeland* written in 1915, Ben-Gurion compared the Zionist settlement to the American settlement in the New World, conjuring up the image of the “fierce fights” the American colonists fought against “wild nature and wilder redskins.”¹² The idea of terror is built into Zionist ideology. Justifying the use of violence Ben-Gurion pointed to the familiar thesis of the “moral superiority” of the Jews: “I believe in our moral and intellectual superiority, in our capacity to serve as a model for the redemption of the human race.”¹³

From its first appearance in Palestine Zionism was the philosophy of colonial aggression aimed at expelling the local population from Palestine and turning this land into the “Land of Israel”. Menachem Begin, in an attempt to justify the “right” of the Zionists to the Arab lands they occupied in 1967 and Tel Aviv’s policy of annexation, declared: “The term the West Bank means nothing. It is Judaea-Samaria. It is Israeli land belonging to the Jewish people. . . . One can only annex foreign lands. This is liberated land.”¹⁴ Thus, using demagogic rhetoric, the former leader of the terrorist Irgun Tz’vai L’umi portrayed Zionism as a “national liberation movement” “liberating” Arab lands from their native population.

Begin and his followers want the world to forget not only the existence of the Palestinian people but also the very word Palestine. Addressing a conference at the Ein Hahoresh kibbutz (a Jewish military-agricultural settlement), Begin harangued his audience: “When you recognize the concept of ‘Palestine’, you demolish your right to live in Ein Hahoresh. If this is Palestine and not the Land of Israel, then you are conquerors and not tillers of the land. You are invaders. If this is Palestine, then it belongs to a people who lived here before you came. Only if it is the Land of Israel do you have a right to live in Ein Hahoresh and in Deganiyah B. If it is not your country, your fatherland, the country of your

ancestors and of your sons, then what are you doing here? You came to another people's homeland, as they claim, you expelled them and you have taken their land."¹⁵

From the very first the racist Zionist leadership quite deliberately pursued a policy aimed at expelling Arabs from Palestine. Herzl made this entry in his diary on June 12, 1895: "We shall try to spirit the penniless population across the border by procuring employment for it in the transit countries while denying it any employment in our own country. ...Both the process of expropriation and the removal of the poor must be carried out discreetly and circumspectly."¹⁶ A quarter of a century later, when this "process" was underway in Palestine Ahad Ha'am, who had visited Palestine, said: "They treat the Arabs with hostility and cruelty, deprive them of their rights, offend them without cause, and even boast of these deeds; and nobody among us opposes this despicable and dangerous inclination."¹⁷

The Zionists, in effect, had from the very start been planning genocide against the Arab people of Palestine. Arthur Ruppin, who directed the Zionist colonization of Palestine, thought that Jews would inevitably live in "a state of perpetual war with the Arabs."¹⁸ R. Weitz, a Zionist leader, who for over 40 years headed the WZO colonization department, made the following entry in his diary: "The only solution is a Palestine, at least Western Palestine (west of the Jordan River) without Arabs.....And there is no other way than to transfer the Arabs from here to the neighboring countries, to transfer all of them: *Not one village, not one tribe, should be left.*"¹⁹

What other Zionist leaders preferred to discuss privately between themselves, the spiritual mentor of Menachem Begin, Z'ev Jabotinsky, who founded a union of "Zionists-Revisionists", preached openly. "The establishment of the Jewish majority in Palestine will have to be achieved against the wish of the country's present Arab majority"²⁰ he declared. As early as 1907, addressing the 7th Congress of the WZO, Jabotinsky set forth the "philosophi-

cal basis” of his policy. He said: “The moral appraisal of the means and methods used by a fighter must be governed exclusively by the measure of real public good or harm they result in.”²¹

Jabotinsky called on the bearers of the “supreme morality” to destroy with an iron fist all those who resisted the Zionists. He said: “Zionist colonization must either be terminated or carried out against the wishes of the native population. This colonization can, therefore, be continued and make progress only under the protection of a power independent of the native population – an iron wall, which will be in a position to resist the pressure of the native population. This is, *in toto*, our policy towards the Arabs...”²² He formulated the “cast-iron law” of Zionist strategy and cynically preached the “morality” of militarism, colonialism and aggression.

This ideological platform is akin to fascism. Analyzing the similarity between Zionism and fascism the Israeli Communists emphasized in the resolution of their 17th Congress that “the reactionary ideology and practice of Zionism provide fertile soil for the emergence and growth of fascist-style Zionist parties and groups which resort to terrorist methods – assassinations and arson – and which form paramilitary organizations for this purpose.”

After the State of Israel was established, power in the newly created state was seized by Zionist circles; they set up a political regime whose aim was to implement Zionist theoretical concepts. Zionist ideology became the dominant ideology in Israel and Zionist dogma formed the basis of Israeli legislation. The hopes of progressive world public that Israel would develop along the path of democracy were dashed when the Zionist leadership converted Israel into a hotbed of racism and aggression in the Middle East and made terror an instrument of government policy. As Naim Ashhab, a prominent leader of the Palestine Communist Party of Jordan, has pointed out: “The class and racist essence of Zionism became only too evident after the Zionist bourgeoisie had

succeeded in converting Israel into its territorial base and begun to use Israel's state machinery and the manpower resources controlled by it for its own selfish ends."²³

Having gained control of the new state, the Zionist leadership proceeded to step up its campaign of aggression and terror. While Israeli diplomats were holding forth about Israel's longing for peace, Israeli government leaders were busy making preparations for new criminal acts. One can get an idea of what went on behind the closed doors of government chambers in Israel from extracts from the diaries of Moshe Sharett (Shertok), which have been published in English translation. Incidentally, there is still no complete translation of the diaries, though normally the memoirs of any Israeli leader of any importance are promptly translated, albeit with some omissions, in the United States. Sharett was head of the Political Department of the WZO Executive, Minister of Foreign Affairs, then Prime Minister of Israel and towards the end of his career, President of WZO. He knew a good deal and, judging by everything, tended to be rather candid in his diaries.

According to Sharett, while there were hysterical cries in Tel Aviv about a "mortal danger" posed by the Arabs, the Israeli Army Chief-of-Staff Moshe Dayan, told the Prime Minister: "In reality we face no danger at all from Arab military force. Even if they receive massive military aid from the West, we shall maintain our military superiority for another 8-10 years, thanks to our infinitely greater capacity to assimilate new armaments." Nevertheless, Dayan demanded "a free hand" for the Israeli army as "the 'retaliation' actions are our vital lymph. Above all, they make it possible for us to maintain a high tension among our population and in the army. Without these actions we would have ceased to be a combative people, the settlers would leave the settlements."²⁴ So, Dayan feared that unless the Zionists whipped up war hysteria they would lose their grip on the mass of the Israeli people. "It is necessary to convince our young people that we are in danger", Dayan insisted.²⁵ To achieve that the Israeli military were

prepared to go to extreme lengths and stage any provocation, however bloody.

Sharett made this entry in his diary: “The conclusions from Dayan’s words are clear: This state has no international obligations, no economic problems, the question of peace is non-existent. It must calculate its steps narrow-mindedly and live by the sword. It must see the sword as the main and only instrument with which to keep its morale high. Towards this end it may – no, it must – invent nonexistent dangers, and to do this it must adopt the method of provocation-and-retaliation. And above all – let us hope for a new war with the Arab countries, so that we may finally acquire our space.”²⁶ This might well have come not from the Israeli Army Chief-of-Staff, but from the Nazi general making preparations for the provocation at Gleiwitz radio station or other Nazi criminal acts designed to manufacture a pretext for aggression and gain “Lebensraum”.

But the Israeli military also needed obedient tools for carrying out its criminal plan. Stirring up an atmosphere of racism and militarism in Israel, the Zionist leaders seek to educate the youth to follow the example of such “heroes” and “model Zionists” as Joseph Trumpeldor and Meir Har-Zion.

Trumpeldor, a former noncommissioned officer in the tsarist Russian army, had participated, together with Z’ev Jabotinsky, in the creation during the First World War of the Jewish Legion and later directed the work of forming Zionist paramilitary units in Palestine. He was killed in 1920 in a clash with Arabs. Jabotinsky named the youth organization of “Zionists-Revisionists” after Trumpeldor, “B’rit Trumpeldor” (Sons of Trumpeldor). In his diary, which is widely publicized by Zionists among Israeli youth, Trumpeldor wrote: “We need men prepared to do everything... we must raise a generation of men who have no interests and no habits.....Bars of iron, elastic but of iron. Metal that can be forged to whatever is needed for the national machine. A wheel? I am the wheel. If a nail, a screw or a flying wheel are needed – take

me! Is there a need to dig the earth? I dig. Is there a need to shoot, to be a soldier? I am a soldier....I am the pure idea of service, prepared for everything.”²⁷

Meir Har-Zion, who belonged to a new generation of Israelis, was just such a cog in the machine. In the early 1950s he served in the 101st Company commanded at the time by a young air airborne troops officer, Arik Sharon. The company had a special mission which was to carry out “reprisal operations” against the Arab civilian population in the border areas. The “pure idea of service”, in this case, took the form of sadistic atrocities committed against innocent Palestinian peasants. When one of the officers of the company hesitated for fear that the wanton killings of civilians might diminish the “purity of Israeli arms”, Sharon’s aide berated him: “There are no pure or impure arms; there are only clean weapons that work when you need them and dirty weapons that jam the moment you fire.”²⁸ Har Zion, however, was not among those whom conscience bothered too much. He relished killing Arabs so much that he was not content to take part in routine raids on Arab villages. Even when he was off duty Har-Zion would join his fellow cutthroats on their night forays in order to kill more Arabs.

The Israeli authorities were fully aware of the atrocities committed by gangs of cutthroats of Har-Zion’s type, and they made no secret of it either. Sharett’s diary contains an entry which says that Ben-Gurion once reported such an incident to the cabinet. Ben-Gurion once reported such an incident to the cabinet. Ben-Gurion described “how our four youngsters captured the Bedouin boys one by one and took them to the wadi where they knifed them to death one after the other after having interrogated them, asking them questions in Hebrew which they didn’t understand and could not answer, while none of the group knows any Arabic. The group was headed by Meir Hartsion from kibbutz Ein Harod.” An officer later told Sharett about this crime in more detail: “An officer ...came to tell me that the whole reprisal op-

eration was organized with the active help of Arik Sharon, the commander of the paratrooper battalion. He furnished the four with arms, food, equipment and transportation and ordered their retreat secured by his patrols.”²⁹ The officer did not exclude that Dayan, too, knew of the operation in advance. The four were confident that they would not be punished and later refused to talk about it on explicit orders from Arik Sharon, probably approved by Dayan. The murderers were not prosecuted and Har-Zion became a “national hero”.

Sharett made this entry in his diary: “We justify the reprisals – we removed the mental and moral brakes on this instinct and made it possible ...to uphold vengeance as a moral principle. This has become so among large parts of the public in general, the masses of youth in particular, but it has reached the level of a sacred principle in (Sharon’s) battalion which constitutes the vengeance instrument of the state....”³⁰ We should introduce a correction here – not vengeance but terror that was elevated to the status of government policy.

TERROR AS GOVERNMENT POLICY

Zionist terror is spearheaded against the Arabs. It also represents a form of anti-Semitism since the Arab people belong to the Semitic group.

Shortly after the first Arab-Israeli war of 1948-1949 ended, the Zionist leadership in Israel introduced a “state of siege” in those regions of the country where Palestinians remained. In the border zone the Israeli military, under the pretext of stopping Palestinian “infiltration”, waged an undeclared war on Arab villages and refugee camps, killing Palestinians who were trying to return to their homes and fields. In 1952 alone 394 Arabs were killed, 227 wounded and as many as 2,595 captured. In 1953 the Zionists staged a massacre in the Palestinian village of Qibya on the Jordan-Israeli cease-fire line. Forty-five houses were blown up; 66

Palestinians were killed and 75 wounded.

Judging from the memoirs of the then Prime Minister of Israel Moshe Sharett, the country's ruling circles gave their generals "a blank check" and called their criminal deeds "retaliatory actions" in response to alleged "acts of terror" by Palestinian refugees. Thus, after the attack on Qibya Ben-Gurion "...insisted on excluding (from the official communiqué) any mention of the responsibility of the army; the civilians in the border area had taken matters into their own hands."³¹ In fact, however, the slaughter was the work of cutthroats from Ariel Sharon's 101st Company.

To broaden the scale of terrorist operations, in December 1953 the 202nd paratrooper battalion was formed on the basis of the 101st Company. Sharon was appointed commander of the new battalion. In 1954 the 202nd battalion was engaged in almost nonstop terrorist operations along the cease-fire line with Jordan, Egypt and Syria. On March 28 it attacked the village of Nahalin, on April 3 – Gaza, on April 7 – the village of Husan, on May 9 – Khirbet Ilin, on May 27 – Khirbet Jimba, on June 28 - Azzun, on August 1 – Jenin, on August 13 – Sheikh Madhkur and on August 15 – Bir-es-Saka.

In February 1954 David Ben-Gurion was returned to the Israeli cabinet after his temporary retirement and given the post of Defense Minister. As Moshe Sharett who was Prime Minister at the time noted in his diary, Ben-Gurion had said that he would only agree to "join a government that followed a policy of force."³² The Zionist leadership launched a policy designed to provoke a new war. On February 27 Ben-Gurion and Army Chief-of-Staff Moshe Dayan got the "go-ahead" for an "operation" in the Gaza Strip where hundreds of thousands of Palestinians living in refugee camps were under the protection of the Egyptian army. The plan was to attack an Egyptian army base just outside Gaza. To mislead world public opinion, Zionist propaganda subsequently portrayed the attack as "defensive action". Sharett recalled: "The army spokesman, on instructions from the minister of defense,

published a false version according to which a unit of ours, after having been attacked inside our territory, pursued the attackers and engaged a battle which later developed as it did.”³³ In actual fact, the Israeli action was nothing but unprovoked aggression. The Canadian general, E.L.M. Burns, who headed the group of UN observers on the armistice line, wrote:

“On the night of February 28, 1955, two platoons of Israeli paratroopers crossed the Armistice Demarcation Line east of Gaza, advanced more than three kilometers into the Egyptian-controlled Strip, and attacked a military camp near the railway station. Using small-arms, mortars, bazookas, hand-grenades, and Bangalore torpedoes they stormed the camp and completely demolished a stone military building, four Nissen huts, and a pump-house with heavy explosive charges. They killed fourteen Egyptian or Palestinian soldiers, an adult civilian, and a little boy, and wounded sixteen soldiers and two civilians.

“Another group of Israeli soldiers entered the Strip six kilometers south of Gaza and laid an ambush on the main road from Rafah. Into this ambush careered a truck carrying a lieutenant and thirty-five soldiers, mostly Palestinians, coming up from the south to reinforce the defenders of the camp.”³⁴

Carried out in violation of the armistice agreement between Egypt and Israel, this sneak attack further aggravated the Middle East conflict. In this way the Zionist leadership tried to make Egypt and other Arab countries withdraw their support for the Palestinian cause, thus setting the stage for creating a “Greater Israel”.

At a cabinet meeting in late March 1955 the Israeli Defense Minister said that Israel should annul the armistice agreement with Egypt and thus obtain a “right” to renew the war of 1948-1949. “Nasser,” he said, “will not even react to our occupation of the West Bank because if he does, he will be defeated and his regime, which is wholly based on the army, will collapse. The Arab states will not come to Nasser’s aid anyway. Finally, the Western

powers will not react militarily.”³⁵

Sharett, who was considered to be a moderate among the Zionists, did not back Ben-Gurion’s proposal. Not that he was reluctant to assume responsibility for the aggression. What gave him pause was something else: he feared that the seizure of new territory would dramatically increase the Palestinian population under Israeli jurisdiction. And Israel, according to the Zionist theory, was supposed to be a “pure” Jewish State.

This line of argument did not impress Ben-Gurion, who said that “Our future depends not on what the Gentiles say, but on what the Jews do.”³⁶ He once told the government: “Our force is in the accomplishment of facts – this is the only way for us to become a political factor which has to be taken into consideration. This is the right moment because the Arab world is divided.”³⁷ Ben-Gurion believed that Israel could impose its peace terms on the Arabs only after winning a decisive victory in a total war, i.e. by occupying Damascus, Cairo and Amman. But the Israeli cabinet was divided on the issue: six ministers voted for an immediate occupation of the Gaza Strip, six voted against and four abstained. The plan was put aside for the moment, but not abandoned.

Egypt found itself under the threat of an attack, and the Nasser government turned for help to socialist countries after the United States had refused its request for arms following the Israeli attack on Gaza. In September agreements were signed on arms shipments to Egypt (at its request) by the Soviet Union, Czechoslovakia and Poland. This angered Israel’s protectors in the United States. Washington, which had until then maintained a posture of “impartiality” in the Arab-Israeli conflict, was now changing tack. The director of the CIA’s covert operations in the Middle East, Kermit Roosevelt, told the Israeli intelligence chiefs: “If, when the Soviet arms arrive, you hit Egypt – no one will protest.”³⁸

At 5 a.m. on October 29, 1956, without declaration of war, 395 Israeli paratroopers landed near the Mitla Pass on the Sinai

Peninsula. This was the start of the tripartite aggression against Egypt and was at the same time the second Arab-Israeli war. It was followed by a third, fourth and fifth war.

For three and a half decades Israel's ruling elite has almost continually waged wars against Arab countries. Terror has become the chief instrument of Israeli policy towards the Arabs.

The Zionist terrorists also used religious fanaticism to prove their "right" to indiscriminate killings. The headquarters and the Rabbinical Council of the Israeli army issued a booklet in which one of its authors, Rabbi Abraham Avidan, wrote that Israeli soldiers did not have to distinguish between enemy military and civilian personnel even though it was technically possible to do so. According to him, when it came to killing civilians in wartime no religious Jew should trust a non-Jew and should always remember that even civilians may help the enemy. This rabbi-militarist called for virtual genocide when he wrote that when the Israeli army attacked the enemy, its soldiers were allowed, and they were in fact in duty bound, to kill also good civilians because the religious law said that no Gentile should be believed that he would not help the enemy.

When the Israeli newspaper *Al-Hamishmar* carried a report about this booklet, on March 28, 1975, the Tel Aviv authorities, to hush up the scandal, announced that it was being withdrawn from circulation. The Chief Rabbi of the armed forces said that the book "dealt" with abstract aspects of religious law which had nothing to do with everyday life and that no one was putting forward these principles as guidelines for the conduct of Israeli soldiers in time of war or peace. But there is clear evidence that with the blessing of clerics Israeli aggressors perpetrated and are still perpetrating crimes against the civilian Arab population.

An illustration of just how the "philosophical" percepts of the Zionist apologists of murder and terror are put into practice was provided by the tragedy that befell the Arab village Kafr Qassem in Israel on October 29, 1956. On that day, as mentioned earlier,

Sharon's paratroopers launched a war of aggression against Egypt. In accordance with a scenario worked out in advance, the Israeli government issued an official communiqué explaining that the military actions were a limited operation against "terrorists" and not the start of a war to seize the Gaza Strip and the Sinai. It was only later that hostilities began along the entire front with the participation of the Anglo-French army of invasion. But on October 29 the Israeli authorities imposed a curfew on all the Arab villages within Israel. The Zionist leadership regarded Israeli Arabs as the "enemy" who could help neighboring Arab states.

At 4.30 p.m. an Israeli border guard officer told the Mukhtar (elder of the village) of Kafr Qassem that a curfew would be imposed from 17.00 hours and that all villagers should remain indoors. The elder explained that 400 peasants were still out in the fields and could not be informed of the curfew, but the Israeli officer did not accept this explanation. Afterwards for about an hour shots could be heard on the outskirts of the village. Israeli border guards, without prior warning, shot at point-blank range the Arab peasants returning to the village from the fields. Forty-seven people were killed including a 66-year-old man, nine women and seven children. Later another two men were killed.

News of the crime leaked out. Under pressure of the country's democratic forces the Israeli government was forced to put those responsible on trial. It was established that the slaughter had been planned by a group of Israeli army officers. General Zvi Tsur, Commander of the Central Military District, had issued the order on the morning of October 29 to the battalion commanders including Yshishkhar Shadmi who was in charge of the border guards. "The battalion commander (Shadmi) ...told the unit commander (Melinki) that the curfew must be extremely strict and that strong measures must be taken to enforce it. It would not be enough to arrest those who broke it – they must be shot."³⁹

Returning to his headquarters Melinki told his subordinates about the order. "He ...informed the assembled officers that the

war had begun, that their units were now under the command of the Israeli Defense Army, and that their task was to impose the curfew in the minority villages from 17.00 to 06.00, after informing the Mukhtars to this effect at 16.30. With regard to the observation of the curfew, Melinki emphasized that it was forbidden to harm inhabitants who stayed in their homes, but that anyone found outside his home (or, according to other witnesses, anyone leaving his home, or anyone breaking the curfew) should be shot dead. He added that there were to be no arrests, and that if a number of people were killed in the night (according to other witnesses: it was desirable that a number of people should be killed) this would facilitate the imposition of the curfew during succeeding nights.”⁴⁰ He also said that no exception should be made for people returning from their fields, or for women and children.

Lieutenant Joubrael Dahan, who was in charge of establishing “order” in the village of Kafr Qassem, deployed his men on the approaches to the village and calmly watched as the Mukhtar and his relatives ran about in the streets trying to warn as many people as possible and prevent tragedy. But it was too late. At 17.00 hours the slaughter began. The lieutenant who was in charge of the operation and was also himself shooting unsuspecting peasants returning from the fields radioed to Major Melinki: “...one less... fifteen less....many less; it is difficult to count them.”⁴¹

An Israeli court took two years to investigate this crime. The accused were eleven servicemen including Major Melinki and Lieutenant Dahan. Three of the accused were acquitted, eight were sentenced to prison terms ranging from seven to seventeen years. However, the Supreme Military Court intervened and the sentences were reduced. Later the Chief of General Staff again cut the prison terms and finally...the President of Israel himself interceded. As a result, a year after the sentences were passed all the murderers were set free. In 1960 the municipal council of the Israeli town of Ramla appointed Dahan “officer responsible for Arab affairs in the city.”

The battalion commander Shadmi and General Tsur were not prosecuted at all. Incidentally, General Tsur was later appointed Chief of General Staff.

The policy of terror toward the Arab population of Israel is even sanctioned juridically. The whole legislation dealing with the affairs of Arabs in Israel amounts to legalized plunder and terror. The 19th Congress of the Israeli Communist Party noted that the Begin government had “stepped up its policy of discrimination and oppression towards the Arab population of Israel, which is a national minority and part of the Palestinian Arab people. The Likud bloc government has also intensified its policy of confiscation and ejection of Arab population from their lands.”⁴²

The Israeli Knesset has adopted a series of racist laws designed to drive Arabs from their homeland. These include the notorious Emergency Laws (Security Areas) of 1949, the Absentees’ Property Law of 1950, the Law for the Concentration of Agricultural Land of 1965, and other acts “legalizing” the robbery of the Arabs. Thus the Absentees’ Property Law stripped Palestinians who fled the country during the first Arab-Israeli War of the right to retain their property.

In as much as the Israeli authorities have categorically refused to give them permission to return home and present their claims with regard to their property, the meaning of the law is clear enough.

Confiscation of Arab land for “military reasons” or under other pretexts was widely resorted to as well. Thus, 78 Arab villages which at one time owned 1.1 million *dunam* of land ended up with just 376,000 *dunam*. All told, the Israeli authorities have done the Arab peasants out of more than 1.2 million *dunam* of land. These figures show how the racist dogma about creating a “pure” Jewish State is implemented.

Another instance is the “Judaization” of Galilee, the Northern District of Israel, which under the UN decision was to have become part of the Arab state of Palestine. Notwithstanding this

decision, Israel occupied Galilee in 1948. This region had no Jewish population to speak of, which was why the Zionist leadership adopted a strategy of “Judaization” of Galilee. It was outlined in a number of secret documents of which the first was a memorandum to Ben-Gurion drawn up by Joseph Nahmani of the Jewish National Fund. It said: “Though Western Galilee has now been occupied, it still has not been freed of its Arab population, as happened in other parts of the country....The Arab minority centered here presents a continual threat to the security of the nation.... At the very least, it can become the nucleus of Arab nationalism, influenced by the nationalist movements in the neighboring countries, and undermining the stability of our state.”⁴³ Nahmani believed that “it is essential to destroy this concentration of Arabs by building Jewish settlements” and subsequently transferring Arab lands to the Jewish National Fund.

In 1962, another Zionist leader, Joseph Weitz, put forward a plan for accelerating the “Judaization” of Galilee, which called for the building of a new town, Upper Nazareth, and outlined measures for establishing new Jewish settlements. In 1976 Israel Koenig, the Northern District (Galilee) Commissioner of the Ministry of the Interior, came up with a new plan for the further “Judaization” of Galilee. Koenig’s report emphasized that the growth of the Arab population in Galilee was a threat to the Israeli authorities’ control of the district, and contained a number of recommendations typical of Israel’s racist policy. One of them suggested “expanding” Jewish settlement in areas “where the contiguity of the Arab population is prominent, and where they number considerably more than the Jewish population”, and examining “the possibility of diluting existing Arab population concentrations.”⁴⁴ Another called for an “investment” policy which would ensure that the Arabs would not make up more than 20 per cent of the employed, for an increase in taxes and for putting an end to the “dependence” of the Jews on the Arab sector of the economy.

Publication of this report caused a scandal in Israel. The gov-

ernment was forced to dissociate itself from the document, at least verbally, but the measures proposed by Koening have since been implemented by the Zionist leadership in Tel Aviv. Significantly, a week after the publication of his report Koening was appointed head of the Commission for the Northern District including Galilee charged with preventing “illegal construction” of Arab houses “on Israeli government-owned land”.

The Arab population of Israel, supported by the democratic section of the Jewish public, has been waging a fight for their rights. Protests against attempts by the Israeli authorities to deprive the Arabs of the land they still own have assumed a mass scale. A major protest demonstration was held on March 30, 1976, on the occasion of the “Land Defense Day” proclaimed by the Arab community.

On that occasion, as on many previous ones, Arab demonstrators were attacked by security forces who opened fire, killing six and wounding dozens. Hundreds of people were arrested, beaten and tortured.

The 19th Congress of the Communist Party of Israel pointed out that the Begin government had stepped up its campaign of terror against Arab youth. This took the form of baiting, fascist-style attacks organized by the Tehya party, and acts of hooliganism carried out by Rabbi Kahane’s gangs and similar groups. Significantly, the administration of most universities in Israel protect and even encourage these fascists.

But the Palestinian population on the West Bank and the Druses on the Golan Heights (which belong to Syria) find themselves in an even more difficult situation than the Arab population of Israel. The local population of Israeli-occupied Arab lands are subject daily to humiliations and terror. Palestinians detained in concentration camps and in prisons are tortured. Even the Western press, which tends to take on trust assertions by Zionist propagandists about the “prosperity” of the Arabs in Israeli-occupied

territories, has acknowledged it. The *Sunday Times* wrote, after a group of its reporters had made a special study of the position of Arab inmates of Israeli prisons:

“1. Israel’s security and intelligence services ill-treat Arabs in detention. 2. Some of the ill-treatment is merely primitive: prolonged beatings, for example. But more refined techniques are also used, including electric-shock torture and confinement in specially-constructed cells. This sort of apparatus, allied to the degree of organisation evident in its application, removes Israel’s practice from the lesser realms of brutality and places it firmly in the category of torture. 3. Torture takes place in at least six centres: at the prisons of the four main occupied towns of Nablus, Ramallah and Hebron on the West Bank, and Gaza in the South; at the detention center in Jerusalem, known as the Russian Compound; and at a special military intelligence centre whose whereabouts are uncertain, but which testimony suggests is somewhere inside the vast military supply base at Sarafand, near Lod airport on the Jerusalem–Tel Aviv road. There is some evidence too that, at least for a time, there was a second such camp somewhere near Gaza.”⁴⁵

The US State Department, which publishes annual reports on the “civil rights situation” in different countries, reports that are crammed with crude allegations about violations of human rights in the USSR and other socialist countries, gives high marks to the Israeli authorities for their human rights record in occupied territories. And this despite the fact that even US consulate staff in Jerusalem have repeatedly informed Washington about the use of torture in Israeli jails. After a visit to the West Bank and Gaza Strip by a delegation of US lawyers from the National Lawyers Guild, the Guild published a report entitled “Treatment of Palestinians in Israeli-Occupied West Bank and Gaza”, which cited cases of violation of Palestinians’ rights by the Zionists. The authors of the report emphasized that the Israeli court procedure was almost wholly based on “confessions” by the accused charged with ‘terrorist’ activities. No other evidence of their “guilt” was re-

quired.⁴⁶ Official Washington, however, preferred to turn a blind eye to such flagrant violations of court procedure. A staff member of the US consulate in Jerusalem who had sent telegrams to the State Department in Washington on the use of torture against Palestinians was fired.

The “collective punishment” meted out by the Israeli authorities against whole towns and districts in occupied areas is particularly shocking. In May 1980 the Palestinian town of Hebron, with a population of 60,000, was “placed under arrest”. After Palestinian guerrillas had attacked Israeli settlers in the streets of Hebron the town was subjected to “collective punishment”: its Mayor and Qadi (religious leader) were deported; its residents were forbidden to leave town or to have guests or visitors from abroad; a curfew was enforced for over a month, which mostly affected the peasants (the majority of Hebron’s population), who could not work in their fields and orchards or look after their cattle; telephone service was cut off for 45 days; Hebron traders were forbidden from taking their wares to Jordan; all men in the town were detained and interrogated, scores were arrested; every house in Hebron was searched. “Eye-witness accounts of these searches by soldiers who took part in them revealed that in the process food supplies were destroyed, furniture wrecked and parents were beaten and humiliated before their children. All this was done pursuant to specific instructions by their officers.”⁴⁷

From late 1981 to July 1982 “collective punishment” was inflicted on the entire Arab population of the Golan Heights. On December 13, 1981, the Begin government announced this extension of Israeli legislation to this Syrian territory (a move tantamount to its annexation) and tried to force the local Druse population to take Israeli citizenship. But the Druses refused to do so. The Israeli authorities then sealed off four Druse villages and imposed a curfew. Israeli soldiers entered the homes of the villagers and tried to make them accept Israeli papers. The Druses went on strike and burnt the papers.

As the Israeli newspaper *Ha'aretz* reported on March 15, 1982, 12,000 people were actually imprisoned in their homes: "Nobody comes or goes. The telephones have been cut off. The villages are surrounded by barbed wire and road blocks... The local people are trapped in their villages without food supplies (except for what the Israeli army is prepared to sell them), without regular medical services, drugs and other essentials. Sometimes they are also without electricity. Herdsmen are forbidden to graze their flocks. Peasants may not cultivate their fields or look after their orchards."⁴⁸ Day after day, week after week, and month after month the blockade introduced under the notorious Emergency Laws of 1949, was maintained. The defenseless Druses were subjected to humiliations and were terrorized by maddened Israeli soldiers. The *Jerusalem Post* described how soldiers burst into a house to force the family living there to accept Israeli papers. Having failed, the Israelis threw the papers on the floor and left the house. "...A soldier clubbed a three-year-old boy who threw an identity card out of the house, shot the boy's mother in the leg when she attacked the soldier, and grazed the brother's head with a bullet when he rushed to his mother's defence."⁴⁹ Even a former member of Israel's Supreme Court, quoted by the paper, described the behavior of the Israeli authorities as barbaric.

The ultimate goal of Israeli policies in the occupied Arab lands is to turn them into a colony of Israel, and above all, by means of establishing Jewish settlements there. And these are Jewish, not Israeli settlements, for Arab citizens of Israel are not allowed to live in them (but all Jews arriving from the Diaspora have this right).

The expropriation of the property of Palestinians in Israeli-occupied territories was intensified after the Begin government had taken office. At present 40 per cent of all land and over half of all water resources on the West Bank are under Israeli control. The number of Jewish settlers on the West Bank reached 2,500 in 1982. The Zionist leadership plans to have 100,000 Jews settled on

the West Bank by 1986, and 1,000,000 by the year 2010.

Jewish settlements on occupied Arab territories have become not only outposts of Israeli annexation but hotbeds of Israeli terrorism as well. Encouraged by the authorities, Zionist fanatics from the Gush Emunim organization and various other extremist groups attack neighboring Arab villages and towns and carry out pogroms there.

And yet the Israeli government has failed to impose its will on the Palestinians of the West Bank and the Gaza Strip, who have displayed determination to fight for their legitimate rights and who regard the PLO as their sole legitimate representative. Faced with this resistance, the Zionist leadership has tried to implement the “final solution” of the Palestinian question through physical destruction of the PLO in Lebanon, an act of aggression it code-named “Operation Peace for Galilee” to mislead world public opinion.

Here is what Jody Powell, one of President Carter’s aides who was present on many occasions during talks with Begin and Sharon and at the signing of the Camp David deal, wrote in the *Washington Post*: “Operation Peace for Galilee has as much to do with the West Bank as with Galilee. The goal in Lebanon and on the West Bank is to remove the PLO as a political and military factor. Thus unencumbered, Begin and Sharon apparently feel they will be able to induce West Bank Palestinians to accept a fig-leaf autonomy plan and proceed with making the West Bank a permanent part of Israel.”⁵⁰

The aims of this Israeli aggression went well beyond that. Apart from destroying the PLO Begin and his close associates planned to install a puppet regime in Lebanon and to inflict a military defeat on the Syrian forces stationed there. Besides, the Zionists had long regarded Southern Lebanon as part of what they call the “historical land of Israel”. They are particularly interested in its water resources – the Litani river and its tributaries – for irrigation of fields in the north of Israel. As a Gush Emunim ad-

vertisement in the newspaper *Ma'ariv* of October 3, 1982, put it: "We regard the Peace for Galilee Campaign as a holy war, and as a great act of Praise the Lord who intervened in this campaign.... It brought back the property of the tribes of Asher and Naftali into Israel's boundaries."⁵¹ Thus, invoking the Lord and long-disappeared "generations of Israel" the Zionists seek to justify their plans to perpetuate their control over Southern Lebanon.

"Operation Peace for Galilee" escalated into a war of genocide against the Palestinians and Lebanese. According to UNICEF statistics, only during the period between June 4 and August 15, 1982, or by the time agreement on the withdrawal of PLO combatants from Beirut was reached, 11,840 children aged under fifteen had been killed or wounded, along with 8,686 women and 2,409 old men (aged sixty and more). During the siege of West Beirut 300 people starved to death, 2,058 were critically ill, 1,637 suffered from severe food poisoning, 1,845 had nervous breakdowns and 2,372 succumbed to infectious diseases.⁵²

Of the 92,000 Palestinians who lived in Southern Lebanon, 60,000 were left homeless. The number of people left homeless among the Palestinian refugees in Beirut was 20,000, in the Bekaa Valley 12,000 and in Tripoli 4,000. The homes of tens of thousands of Lebanese were destroyed. Six towns, more than 30 villages and 17 Palestinian refugee camps were razed. Senator Charles Percy, Chairman of the US Senate Foreign Relations Committee, reported in the summer of 1982 that 14,000 people had been killed and 55,000 injured in Lebanon.⁵³ Subsequently, the figures grew dramatically.

Following in the footsteps of the Hitlerites, Begin and Sharon extended their reign of terror to genocide proportions. They set up the Ansar Camp, a huge concentration camp in Southern Lebanon, where 9,000 to 15,000 Palestinians, aged from 14 to 60, were confined. According to Amnon Rubinstein, a Knesset member, conditions inside the camp "are intolerable and are a stain on Israel's reputation. Prisoners are walking about barefooted in

the bitter cold and there have been numerous assaults on them.”⁵⁴ Palestinians were rounded up and taken to the camp like cattle, inside huge cages hitched to helicopters.

The International Commission of Inquiry Into Israeli Crimes Against the Lebanese and Palestinian Peoples at its Geneva session in February-March 1983 emphasized that the Zionist leadership, relying on US support, continued to violate international law, the UN Charter and the Geneva Convention on the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War and that its intolerable behavior was an insolent challenge to world public opinion.

(Extracts from “Zionism Counts on Terror” by Sergei Sedov of the Anti-Zionist Committee of Soviet Public Opinion, Novosti Press Agency Publishing House, 1984)

NOTES

- 1 Extract from ‘Zionism’ by Sergei Sedov, *Novosti Press Agency, 1984*.
- 2 Michael Selzer, *Zionism Reconsidered: The Rejection of Jewish Normalcy*, London, the Macmillan Company, Collier – Macmillan Ltd., 1970, pp. 164-165.
- 3 Arthur Hertzberg, *The Zionist Idea, A Historical Analysis and Reader*, Westport, Connecticut, Greenwood Press Publishers, 1970, p. 267.
- 4 *Program of the World Zionist Organization*, Encyclopedia of Zionism and Israel, New York, 1971, Vol. 1, p.114.
- 5 Quoted in Arie Bober, *The Other Israel, The Radical Case Against Zionism*, Garden City, New York, Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1972, p. 37.
- 6 Hertzberg, *Op. cit.*, p. 241.
- 7 *Ibid.*, p. 238.
- 8 *17th Congress of the Communist Party of Israel*, Moscow, 1972, p. 173 (in Russian).
- 9 V.I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 39, p. 421.
- 10 *Zionism and Racism*, London, International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, 1976, p. 30.
- 11 *Ibid.*
- 12 Abdelwahab M. Elmessiri, *The Land of Promise, A Critique of Political Zionism*, New Brunswick, New, Jersey, 1977, p. 113.
- 13 Hertzberg, *Op. cit.* p. 94.
- 14 *L’Express*, May 23-29, 1977, p. 55. Quoted from *Who is Menachem Begin? A Documentary Sketch*, The Institute for Palestine Studies, Beirut, 1977. P. 60.

- 15 Bober, *Op. cit.* p. 77.
- 16 *Middle East International*, January 1973, p. 21.
- 17 *Zionism and Racism*, Guildorf, London & Worcester, Billing & Sons, 1976, p. 218.
- 18 Chomsky, *Op. cit.*, p. XLI.
- 19 Bober, *Op. cit.*, p. 13.
- 20 Alan R. Taylor, *The Zionist Mind, The Origins and Development of Zionist Thought*, Beirut, The Institute for Palestine Studies, 1974, p. 86.
- 21 *Ibid.*, p. 90.
- 22 Lenni Brenner, *The Genesis of Menachem Begin. A Supplement to AJAZ (American Jewish Alternatives to Zionism) Report*, No. 44, pp. 110-111.
- 23 *World Marxist Review*, August 1977, p. 80.
- 24 *Journal of Palestine Studies*, Vol. IX, No. 3, Spring 1980, p. 20.
- 25 *Ibid.*
- 26 *Ibid.*, pp. 20-21.
- 27 Amos Elon, *The Israelis: Founders and Sons*, New York, Bantam Books, 1972, p. 180.
- 28 Bober, *Op. cit.* p. 72.
- 29 *Journal of Palestine Studies*, Spring 1980, pp. 13-14.
- 30 *Ibid.*, p. 14.
- 31 *Journal of Palestine Studies*, Spring 1980, p.6
- 32 *Journal of Palestine Studies*, Autumn 1980, p. 52.
- 33 *Ibid*, Spring 1980, p. 19.
- 34 E.L.M. Burns, *Between Arab and Israeli*, Beirut, The Institute for Palestine Studies, 1969, p. 17.
- 35 *Journal of Palestine Studies*, Spring 1980, pp. 23-24.
- 36 S. Aronson, *Conflict and Bargaining in the Middle East. An Israeli Perspective*, Baltimore, London, 1978. p. 380.
- 37 *Journal of Palestine Studies*, Spring 1980, p. 24.
- 38 *Journal of Palestine Studies*, Spring 1980, p. 26.
- 39 Sabri Jiryis, *The Arabs in Israel 1948-1966*, Beirut, The Institute for Palestine Studies, 1969, p. 98.
- 40 Sabri Jiryis, *The Arabs in Israel, 1948-1966*, Beirut, The Institute for Palestine Studies, 1969, pp. 98-99.
- 41 *Ibid*, p. 102.
- 42 *19th Congress of the Communist Party of Israel*, Moscow, 1982, p. 152 (in Russian).
- 43 MERIP (Middle East Research and Information Project) Reports, No. 47, p. 13.
- 44 *Journal of Palestine Studies*, Autumn 1976, p. 193.
- 45 *The Sunday Times*, June 19, 1977, p. 17.
- 46 *Treatment of Palestinians in Israeli-Occupied West Bank and Gaza*, New York, National Lawyers Guild, 1978, p. 110.

- 47 *The West Bank and the Rule of Law*, International Commission of Jurists, 1980, p. 81.
- 48 Quoted from *Middle East International*, March 26, 1982, p. 13.
- 49 *The Jerusalem Post*, April 18-24, 1982, p. 2.
- 50 *The Washington Post*, June 13, 1982, p. C8.
- 51 Quoted from *Middle East International*, October 29, 1982, p. 18.
- 52 *Al-Safir*, September 18, 1982.
- 53 *Political Focus*, July 15, 1982, p. 6.
- 54 *Middle East International*, January 7, 1983, p. 15.

