

The Myth of a Palestinian State

The confusion over the viability or non-viability of a Palestinian state (known as the two state solution) is never ending. In actuality that is not mainly the fault of Israel's apartheid state-terrorist regime. The Israelis' have done the least of any player in this great world tragedy to advance that confusion, doing so only when forced to appear open-minded by others. More often the Zionist state makes it quite clear that it is not open-minded and it won't accept a Palestinian state.

Going back to 1947-8 it was the British and French with backing of the U.S. and the Security Council of the UN that sought to impose this dual state idea into the break-up of British and French colonialism. Certainly the Palestinians got little or no say. Nor even did the Israelis. Moreover, it wasn't even an idea that derived solely from the British theme in the Balfour Declaration. Two states was a later development in diabolical imperialist thinking. "Neither of the two national ideals permits of combination in the service of a single State," concluded the Peel Commission.¹

In recognizing the decline and fall of their empires by the time of WWII, the British (and later the French in Indo-China) created the idea of the "two state solution" out of whole cloth, and first for India. They were developing the ideology of neocolonialism (controlling nations and their labor and natural resources without running their governments with colonial administrations) with a political theory based upon increasing the internal tensions and crises within newly independent regions and nations so that they would not become truly independent forces in the world political-economy. Economic dependence was advanced through the IMF and other investment mechanisms. Britain left India in permanent crisis by fomenting riots and warfare between Muslims and Hindus and then claiming to solve the crisis with the formation of Pakistan in 1947 which led to the displacement of 14 million people (not so ironically, like Palestine today, Pakistan was formed of two separate pieces of territory that, being over a thousand miles apart could not possibly function as a single nation—with the eventual rising of resistance to Western Pakistan's rule in the poorer East that led to the formation of Bangladesh.

In one sense the Jews who formed their guerilla armies in Palestine (Irgun and Stern Gang) were wise to Britain's intentions—even if thankful to have the colony handed to them on a platter. Though earlier agreeing to partition when they were a weak minority, the Zionists later resisted the idea of the Two State Solution which would have granted a large portion of the colony to the indigenous Palestinians. Instead the Zionist militias targeted first the British to get them out of the way, and then promulgated the slaughter of Palestinians and ethnic cleansing of almost all their villages known as the Naqba, or catastrophe. Later Israel would claim that the Palestinians had rejected their generous offer of land for a Palestinian state, but the Palestinians had never accepted the idea of

¹ The British Peel Commission 1937 report aimed at an analysis of militant Palestinian-Arab resistance to the rapidly expanding immigration and land purchases, grabs and development by Jews fleeing persecution in Europe.

a Jewish state being formed from their lands and after the Naqba the idea was even more absurd: They were being asked to negotiate away their land with a militarily stronger invader group which had just spent a year massacring their women, children, and elderly with pogroms not unlike those the Jews had suffered in Eastern Europe before the Nazis.

The unilateral declaration of Israel's independence was the Zionist answer to the U.N.'s call for 2 states, side by side, living in peace. Moreover, the two state solution was never a realistic plan because it is neither consistent with Zionism's full ambitions nor with the role of States in the world—in regulating commerce, migration, finances and defense. It's like supposing that somehow the U.S. could have been induced to give up Manifest Destiny and handed over the western half of the country to the Indians to form their own united nations nation. And, as in India and Pakistan, both weakened by being forced into permanent contention and repeated wars, the Israel-Palestine partition would have led to the same endless confrontations and wars that India and Pakistan have engaged in. The main difference in the case of Palestine is that Israel would always have had the upper hand because it could easily cut off Palestine from outside trade and travel, which it has done, effectively, in any case. Like today Israel would still have attacked and invaded at will.

In other words, the two state solution was a Euro-American ruse that the U.N. went along with. It was a cover for establishing the Zionists, principally European Jews, as a beachhead to replace direct colonial rule with a different type of colonization, a throwback to the days of settlements of the New World and South Africa. That Zionism has not always played by the great power rules that the US and Europe sought to impose should not be surprising, and Israel, though it can be blamed for its many crimes against the Palestinians, cannot be blamed for that. After all, why would Jews (Israeli Jews or any Ashkenazi Jews the world over) trust any of the great powers after suffering the Holocaust to which the nations of Europe and the US essentially all turned a blind eye while the slaughter was in progress.

Obviously, that can not in any way justify the Zionist regimes acting like Nazis toward the indigenous Palestinians and also Israel's support for so many of the most ruthless, brutal and reactionary regimes in the world--from Apartheid South Africa to the death squad dictatorships of the Americas. But it does help explain why some people are confused and endlessly hope for a "two state solution." Yet, because the entire Zionist enterprise is based on a different premise—*eretz Yisrael*--and only force will change that premise, there is every historical reason to set an entirely different goal: to envision Israel eventually joining the world community of nations as an integrated nation with a new name, a real Constitution that guarantees rights to all citizens and affords all those who live under its government the full rights of citizenship, internationally recognized borders, and the end to Jewish only settlement areas. Whether that State has some type of bicameral legislature and sharing of cabinet posts among different ethnicities and other such details are trivial in comparison with the need to conceptualize that Israel, like South Africa and the colonial regimes before them, must first be brought to its knees through economic, political and cultural isolation and then be required to re-

constitute itself as a constitutional democracy with full rights for all Palestinians (including in the diaspora). If Jews can have Aliyah (citizenship by birthright as a Jew) who have never set foot in Palestine, so can Palestinians who were forced off their homelands, and their children in exile are entitled as well.

But the most important point is this: the whole idea of two states side by side was a myth, a dream, from the beginning. People all too often can be taught to buy into such myths and to think they hold promise, but in this case that conclusion defies history's logic. Endlessly some who support Palestinian rights point out that a Palestinian state would be made up of isolated Bantustans without access to the sea or to outside commerce except with Israeli permission. This is true. They point out so many other things like the siege of Gaza and the internationally condemned walls and the Israeli intent to maintain military control at the Jordan in the West Bank. This is true too. This and much more evidence shows the improbability of permanently imposing that type of political-geography upon that region so long as the Zionist state exists. And yet some people persist in trying to come up with ways to allow that, to moderate the "plan" so that a "comprehensive" resolution might be acceptable to Israel and the Palestinians and achieved through peace talks. What utter rubbish!

Botha negotiated with Mandela when he was still imprisoned at Robin Island. When Netanyahu or some other reactionary murderous Israeli leader finds himself or herself "born again" and impelled to begin to negotiate with Barghouti and there is talk about letting him out of prison to engage in political activism again, we will know that things are changing. When Israel swears that it will stop assassinating Palestinian political leaders—PA, Hamas or anyone else-- and will stop arbitrary imprisonment and holding thousands without charges, and will cease its political efforts to always divide the Palestinians against themselves, then, at that point, anyone who brings forward the idea of a separate Palestinian state rather than full political and human rights for all Palestinians will be undermining the opportunity, the inevitability, of a peaceful revolution that will occur when shifting demographics and the right of return doom the idea of Zionism's precious chosen people in perpetual dominance. Until then, there is no solution. But at that moment a two state solution will amount to nothing less than a betrayal of the Palestinian people, for it will allow reactionary Zionism to remain in power.

The way to end the captivity of a captive people—Black slaves, Indians (US indigenous), Palestinians-- is to assure their full equal rights and opportunities of citizenship, including the right to maintain and promote their own language and culture. After slavery, U.S. Blacks achieved those rights for barely a decade before Reconstruction was overthrown here. The overthrow of Reconstruction is the strongest evidence that the U.S. was never more than a paper democracy. American Indians never got those rights either, but instead were granted inferior second class status (supposed control over the reservations/ bantustans where they were settled). That is approximately what Palestine is offered. Have we learned anything about taking the fight for rights through to completion? Palestine will teach us whether we have or not. The problem of greatest importance is not some abstract idea about the right to self-

determination under a separate but unequal State, but how to assure that any revolutionary process achieves the full guarantee of social, political and economic rights for any oppressed people. Otherwise this approach also becomes just another ruse, the myth of a phony paper democracy, demonstrated by the rampant impunity that allows a cop or anyone else to administer a death sentence to so many Black youths in the U.S. today. These deaths provide striking evidence that American democracy is itself a myth, not unlike the so-called democracy that is called Zionist State.