

The Federation of Palestinian and Hebrew Nations

The Federation of Palestinian and Hebrew Nations

By

Abraham Weizfeld

Cambridge
Scholars
Publishing



The Federation of Palestinian and Hebrew Nations

By Abraham Weizfeld

This book first published 2018

Cambridge Scholars Publishing

Lady Stephenson Library, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE6 2PA, UK

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Copyright © 2018 by Abraham Weizfeld

All rights for this book reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission of the copyright owner.

ISBN (10): 1-5275-1313-0

ISBN (13): 978-1-5275-1313-6

With acknowledgments to the
'Tanweer' Palestinian Cultural Enlightenment Forum,
Nablus, Palestine
and
Dr Uri Davis

TABLE OF CONTENTS

General Introduction.....	ix
Programmatic Considerations	
The Movement of International Solidarity	
Introductory Preface	xxxiii
World Social Forum 2016-08	
Self-determination	
The Transitional Process: The Federation of the Kana'an.....	1
Abstract	
Introduction	
Context	
Prospects and Resolution	
Federation	
Democratic Secular Palestine	
Constitutional Federation	
Conclusions 2016	
In Elaboration of the Transitional Process.....	30
Constitutional Principles	
The Problematic of Bi-Nationalism in One-State	
Confederation	
Federalism	
Bi-National and Inter-National	
The Federal Principle	
National-Cultural Autonomy	
Jamahiriya	
The White Book	
Constituent Assemblies	
Federation of Federations	
Postscript 2018	
Research sources available	

Annex A	76
US President Truman 1948 Letter	
Annex B	77
One State Solution vs. Two-State Solution	
The Argument in Favour of a Hybrid One-State Solution	
by Dr. Uri Davis	
Annex C	86
هل إسرائيل دولة بقومية يهودية؟ ترجمة يوسف الملح	
Israel: A Jewish Nation-State?	
Annex D	107
Les Palestiniens seraient-ils majoritairement d'origine juive?	
Annex E	119
The White Book by Mouammar Kadhafi	
Annex F	137
Presentation International Colloquium, Tripoli, Libya, 1976	
by Abie Weisfeld (Abraham Weizfeld)	
Annex G	147
The Idea of a Bi-National State in the Israeli–Palestinian Conflict	
by Burak Erdenir	
Annex H	156
Jewish People's Liberation Organization (J PLO): A Non-Zionist	
Declaration 1988 by Abraham Weizfeld	
Annex I	168
On Questioning the Jewish State	
by Joseph Levine	
Annex J	174
Lessons from the Warsaw Ghetto	
by Abraham Weizfeld	
About the Author	175

GENERAL INTRODUCTION¹

Palestinian national identity is the ultimate test for the existing geopolitical paradigm. The negligence resulting in the impasse of the various “solutions” towards this particular region of conflict is indicative of the lack of a solution in current geopolitical alignments. The continuing presence of a People which refuses to disappear, despite the lack of a Nation-State,² is a fundamental challenge to the existing States as recognised by the United Nations.

Likewise, we have seen the persistence of the “un-historic Nation”,³ the Jewish People. These two parallel experiences demonstrate the failure of both the liberal and conservative mythologies in the “nation-building” quest.

In the first instance, the Palestinian Nation continues to exist in both exiles and under the apartheid neo-colonialist regime of the Zionist State enterprise, despite the efforts of numerous interventions by international agencies and by a succession of superpowers. The Zionist project had

¹ While this publication is of an academic character, which concerns the interpretation of and the formulation of conceptual thought, it is not a Thesis and will not seek to offer a proof of the propositions here but rather offer, for your consideration, the thinking and experience of an academic with 45 years of work on the nature of Palestine together with 69 years living the condition of the Jewish People in the Occidental States. The deductions here concern the future prospects of the given conditions that are experienced presently and as such are not based on a proof but rather offer the reader a deductive analysis to be considered, as distinct from approaches which only take into consideration a given paradigm or delve into an expression of ‘Hope for the best’ alone.

² Dr Uri Davis, ‘Citizenship and the State’, *Citizenship, the State and the Right to Private Property — The Case of Israel, the EU and the 1948 Palestine Refugees*, < <http://www.uridavis-official-website.info/> >, Submitted to the Norwegian Institute of Human Rights/University of Oslo programme ACCOMMODATING DIFFERENCE: Human Rights, Citizenship and Identity in Diverse Societies (March 2001), “The paradigm of state formation is territorial conquest – not voluntary membership. New states are formed by conquest; or by a process of disintegration of the conqueror administration and the takeover of the state by a native political party or an external invader; or by breakup into component states or new states; or by amalgamation of previously discrete states.”

³ This familiar formulation arises from the Marxist paradigm.

intended to proceed even further than the apartheid schema by the removal of the entire Palestinian Nation from the lands, all of which had been called Palestine. The projection of the “Two-State Solution” delineated by the Oslo Interim Agreement which is pending over decades continues without the realisation of its limited perspective to define and assign each nation with its frontiers. The actuality of those frontiers is now defined by its designated Palestinian “Sector A”, corresponding to municipal boundaries. Such municipalities exist for example in Nablus, where the growing number of generations are confined to layers of housing one upon the other in each house, as is the case in the Yaffa-origin refugee camps of Balata, Askar and Camp Number One. Otherwise, housing is spreading up the sides of the surrounding two mountains of Nablus reaching and surpassing the summits. Permits are not granted for construction outside of Sector A with the penalty of having such housing taken down by the occupying power with its armoured Caterpillar bulldozers and hydraulic de-construction equipment.

Due to the entente with the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan, the principal neighbour of the Zionist State, the Palestinians are not permitted to emigrate to Jordan from the confines of such a limited territorial presence. Since Jordan is already hosting some two million Palestinian refugees since 1948 and 1967, that country will not tolerate even more Palestinian refugees, who together with the Iraqi and Syrian refugees already comprise a majority of the population. All the refugees and their descendants who number several million people today, are divided between Jordan (2 million), Lebanon (427,057), Syria (477,700), the West Bank (788,108) and the Gaza Strip (1.1 million). Another quarter of a million internally displaced Palestinians in the ‘48 State persist as well as many others around the world.

The Zionist State’s compliance with Jordan by not expelling the remaining Palestinian population is reciprocated by Jordan’s agreement to continue hosting the existing refugee population, rather than facilitating their return to the Palestinian territories.

These conditions then comprise the achievement of the “Two-State Solution”, to the extent possible under the prevailing relationship of forces, which are inherent to the Statist paradigm. The formulation “Two-State Solution” itself is a contextual ambiguity. The word “Solution” may be taken to mean the end of negotiations for any other concern or, it may be taken to mean the end of hostilities between the two parties with continuing negotiations for the resolution of the condition of the external Palestinian refugees and the status of Jerusalem. It is the latter interpretation that is conceived by the Palestine Liberation Organization

(PLO) evidently and the former that is presumed by the Zionist governments, at least by pretense. In any case, the recognition of a Palestine State by the United Nations Security Council (UNSC) remains the goal by the principal Palestinian opposition parties namely Hamas⁴ and the PFLP (Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine). Herein lies the purpose of this work. The necessity is one of formulating a negotiating platform that enables the reconciliation of the interests of the populations comprised by each of the Palestinian and Hebrew-Israeli Nation, including the refugees, as a People-Nation—rather than the state that goes by the name of the People. Considering that the interests of a People prevail inevitably, the prospects for such a programme is credible irrespective of the time-frame necessary for its implementation. The delay in achieving a resolution by reconciliation is merely a function of the lack of a methodology to arrive at the deductive mutuality necessary, a delay that is introduced by outdated paradigms and the machinations of international geopolitics.

At the same time, the response to the near extinction of the Ashken'azi Jewish Nation of Europe is the pathetic herding of the Jewish refugee remnants into the modern ghetto given the name of the State of Israel. In effect, the creation of the Zionist State by the Zionist militias and the prevailing occidental powers, including the Stalinist regimes installed in Russia and Czechoslovakia, was an Antisemitic act. The Occidental States' limitation of visas—granted under the legal obligations for the family unification of the resident Jewish citizens of the occidental states—obliged the remaining 48% of refugees to seek shelter in the territories and emptied homes of the Palestinian Nation. The prospect of addressing some needs of one People by negating the needs of another is all that has been offered by the twentieth-century powers. No thought was considered for the prospect of a Jewish homeland in Europe itself or North America for that matter.

In addition to the ghettoisation of the Palestinian population into municipalities under the “Sector A” Oslo Interim Agreement, the division of the Palestinian territories into the West Bank and the Gaza Strip comprises a further handicap upon the viability and political unity of the Palestinian leadership and civil society. The government formed in Gaza by the elected Hamas party in 2006, adopted a view not opposed to the

⁴ Jack Khoury, ‘For First Time, Hamas Prepared to Accept Pre-1967 Borders for Palestinian State’, **Haaretz**, 2017-03-09, <http://www.haaretz.com/middle-east-news/palestinians/.premium-1.775939?utm_content=%2Fmiddle-east-news%2Fpalestinians%2F.premium-1.775939&utm_medium=email&utm_source=smartfocus&utm_campaign=newsletter-most-read&utm_term=20170308-15%3A03>

prospect of the recognition of the independent State of Palestine alongside the State of Israel, even while rejecting the Oslo accords and the limitations of the “Two-State Solution”.⁵ The political differences persisting between the positions of Hamas and the Palestinian Authority (PA) concern the end-game of each perspective. The term “Solution” carries with it the intention of freezing the political programme for national liberation, even while the prospect of an independent state opens up the possibilities for the return of Palestinian refugees to their lands and homes. While Yasser Arafat’s leadership initially launched the Oslo accords as the first stage of a subsequent liberation process, this was not the perspective of the sponsoring powers and their client Zionist State of Israel. The fusion of the two governmental authorities into a government of national reconciliation currently, raises these questions again.

The method to be explored here concerns the prospect of Palestinian political unification incorporating the upcoming international consensus for an independent Palestine State. Such a state would take on the responsibility of negotiating the necessary conditions for the refugees’ return, the territorial unity of Palestinians, together with the economic and political coordination with the existing State of Israel. A coherent Palestinian Authority provides a stable perspective for setting aside the political divisions between the Palestinian governments overcoming the limitations of the immediate geopolitical concerns and undertaking the issues presented by the post-colonial international consensus.

The concerns and needs of the Israeli Jewish-Hebrew Nation taken into consideration are the national identity of this parallel civil society that is integrated into the overall resolution by way of the reciprocal recognition of each national identity. While national identity may be preserved and nurtured in a civil society based on recognition of such attributes as language, schools, security and religion, the historical territorial affinities become a consequence of the cultural integrity of each nation and not a determinate as if it were an “*idée fixe*.”

The preconditions for national liberation are not solely founded on the prevailing relationship of forces, as may be presumed. Such forces are in any case disproportionate and as such only provide for the continuity of the forces which are more powerful, in the physical sense. It is rather the psychological forces and the attributes of consciousness which are more powerful in the ultimate course of events.

⁵ The current revision of the Hamas Charter is a project of interest as the basis for a unified government. The Tunisian process of a Constituent Assembly has not yet taken hold though. The prospect of a Constitutional delineation requires certain preconditions that are lacking.

Given that the powers that be are entrenched and survive based upon the perpetuation of force alone, together with the continual delays to a rational, peaceful course of events, it is a matter of implementing the subversive forces found in consciousness that is crucial to unleashing the social dynamic that negates the existing power relations.

The analysis of such subversive forces is thus fundamental to any process of liberation.

Beyond the forces of repression are various layers of creative dynamics found in both the internal social forces and in the international context. The scholar Averroes among others has said that words have wings and cannot be recalled.

On the one hand, we have the degree of consciousness that is inherent to the given struggle, alongside the degree of Inter-national solidarity on the other. The creative forces cannot be countered by any degree of repression, and those forces determine the duration of the struggle together with its aftermath.

To address the endemic degree of depression and alienation amongst the Palestinian population one should take into consideration the various dynamics at work:

- 1) The internal Palestinian resistance in its various forms against both the Zionist occupation of Palestine, together with the degree of subservience to the Zionist regime by the Palestinian Authority.
- 2) The Inter-national context which is the inverse of the relationship of political forces internally, whereby the State of Israel is subject to the undeniable presence of international law and the influence of solidarity campaigns such as the BDS (Boycott, Disinvestment, Sanctions) campaign.
- 3) The growing Palestinian opposition inside '48 Palestine, both in terms of political representation and by activism.
- 4) The continuing and growing significance of the Jewish-Israeli opposition and the combined nature of its joint actions with the Palestinian-Israeli opposition.
- 5) The growing significance of the internal Jewish political revolution in the Occidental States against the domination of the Zionist parties in Jewish civil society with their presence in the mainstream political culture.

The forms of Christian Zionism are to be noted here in the dominant North-American political culture, particularly throughout the media, rather

than a mythical phenomenon of Jewish sole proprietorship of media outlets given the name of a “Jewish or Israel Lobby”.

It is not by historical determinism nor economic determinism that destiny is determined. For example, the Algerian revolution against France’s colonialism endured 132 years and 1.5 million martyrs, to overcome in 1962. The lack of a solidarity movement amongst French civil society is an element in the duration of that struggle, while the international solidarity movement with the Vietnamese revolution succeeded in forcing the retreat of the world’s most powerful military from one of the least powerful counties in the world.

The inter-national context is greater than any given sovereign power, evidently.

Let us then examine the internal attributes of consciousness in conjunction with the conditions necessary for the developing movement of international solidarity with the Palestinian People.

Programmatic Considerations

The Palestinian struggle against neo-colonialism has passed through various phases of development that have arrived at the impasse lacking a qualitative success, in spite of the quantitative advance made by the three revolts since 1948. The first Intifada broke out in 1987 on the twentieth anniversary of the 1967 occupation of the West Bank and Gaza. Although the Oslo accords of 1993 promised a qualitative advance towards a sovereign independent State of Palestine, this legacy of Yasser Arafat Abu-Ammar succumbed to the continuation of the occupation in the West Bank with an accelerating colonisation of those territories, even while the Gaza Strip ended its Zionist colonies. First of all, it is necessary to accurately categorise events and phenomena precisely, to dispel illusions and false strategies. The events named Intifada are a popular offensive in the longstanding Palestinian revolution. In the case of the first Intifada of 1987, the revolutionary offensive ended for the sake of an accord that the occupying power, the Zionist Apartheid State of Israel, had no intention of respecting. While the Palestinian Authority was able to form a government with the trappings of a state in Ramallah and Nablus at the Muqata headquarters, they were destroyed by the General Prime Minister and butcher Ariel Sharon during the outbreak of the second Intifada of 2000. In this manner, the projected stage of independent state building failed when the revolutionary offensive became diverted by the machinations of international diplomacy and the conscious criminal negligence of the occupying power.

The projected stages programme of historical progression is mired in the lack of a mechanism for its application, in the face of the absence of the continuing revolutionary offensive. The liberal theory of state sovereignty assumes that such a semblance is to be respected by not only the existing international apparatus of the United Nations state powers but by the occupying power itself when this is not the case. It is not the intervention of the geopolitical powers that brought about the formally written concessions of 1993 but rather the revolutionary dynamic. The Intifada increased in intensity and intensified its objective until concluded by the desperate Palestinian leadership. A similar defeat was agreed to in 1982 when the US State Department guaranteed the safety of the Palestinian refugee camps in Lebanon in exchange for the withdrawal of the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) militias from those camps and West Beirut. This accord resulted in the massacre of 3,000 Palestinians in the camps of Sabra and Shatila by Israel's General Sharon and the local Phalanges militia.⁶

A second factor in the self-negation of the revolutionary Palestinian struggle is the lack of clarity in the designation of what and who are the subjects of the struggle. While the Leftists of the Palestinian revolutionary forces named their enemy first of all as the "Arab reactionary regimes", Imperialism and then the Zionist regime, the popular misconception was that it was the "Yehudi" (the Jew) that was the object of the struggle. This misconception was endemic especially amongst the Islamist forces such as Hamas, due to the theocratic orientation and leadership that impinged upon the revolutionary movement even though it nonetheless remained open to co-existence.⁷ The current 2017 version of the Hamas Charter has

⁶ Abraham Weisfeld, *Sabra-Shatila*, 1984 & 2009,
<<http://bookstore.authorhouse.com/Products/SKU-000255066/Sabra-and-Shatila.aspx>>

⁷ Hamas, Article Thirty-One, *Hamas Covenant 1988*, The Covenant of the Islamic Resistance Movement, 18 August 1988, "... Under the wing of Islam, it is possible for the followers of the three religions - Islam, Christianity and Judaism - to coexist in peace and quiet with each other. Peace and quiet would not be possible except under the wing of Islam. ... Islam confers upon everyone his legitimate rights. Islam prevents the incursion on other people's rights. The Zionist Nazi activities against our people will not last for long. For the state of injustice lasts but one day, while the state of justice lasts till Doomsday. "As to those who have not borne arms against you on account of religion, nor turned you out of your dwellings, Allah forbiddeth you not to deal kindly with them, and to behave justly towards them; for Allah loveth those who act justly." (The Tried - verse 8)",
<http://avalon.law.yale.edu/20th_century/hamas.asp>

annulled this defect.⁸ The Islamic context provided in this particular programme is as much a primal act of resistance to the Westernisation by colonial influences as it is a method of nation-building. A further methodological error in relying upon such a sectarian criterion is that it ignores the Arab-Jewish composition of the Israeli population. The Mizrachi and Sepharade strata comprising 50% of the Jewish population should otherwise be considered potential allies in the struggle against the Ashken'azi caste elite that operates the state in its particular interests.

In an Islamic perspective it is a theocratic State/Caliphate that is the direction of the struggle rather than the liberty and independence of a People. It is noteworthy that the Hamas movement of the 2006–2018 government in Gaza having reformulated its Charter or organisational Manifesto is building a common national reconciliation perspective with the corresponding formation of the Fatah-led government which retained power in the West Bank.

⁸ Hamas Charter 2017

“8. By virtue of its justly balanced middle way and moderate spirit, Islam – for Hamas – provides a comprehensive way of life and an order that is fit for purpose at all times and in all places. Islam is a religion of peace and tolerance. It provides an umbrella for the followers of other creeds and religions who can practice their beliefs in security and safety. Hamas also believes that Palestine has always been and will always be a model of coexistence, tolerance and civilizational innovation. ...

16. Hamas affirms that its conflict is with the Zionist project not with the Jews because of their religion. Hamas does not wage a struggle against the Jews because they are Jewish but wages a struggle against the Zionists who occupy Palestine. Yet, it is the Zionists who constantly identify Judaism and the Jews with their own colonial project and illegal entity.

17. Hamas rejects the persecution of any human being or the undermining of his or her rights on nationalist, religious or sectarian grounds. Hamas is of the view that the Jewish problem, anti-Semitism and the persecution of the Jews are phenomena fundamentally linked to European history and not to the history of the Arabs and the Muslims or to their heritage. The Zionist movement, which was able with the help of Western powers to occupy Palestine, is the most dangerous form of settlement occupation which has already disappeared from much of the world and must disappear from Palestine. ...

42. Hamas rejects the attempts to impose hegemony on the Arab and Islamic Ummah just as it rejects the attempts to impose hegemony on the rest of the world's nations and peoples. Hamas also condemns all forms of colonialism, occupation, discrimination, oppression and aggression in the world.”

< <http://www.middleeasteye.net/news/hamas-charter-1637794876> >

The lack of cohesion and coherence of the Palestinian resistance is a consequence of the deference to the party system of political struggle that is in effect governments in waiting and mini-states in operation. There is a lack of consideration for the predominance of civil society and its organisation into a Constituent Assembly. The perspective of forming a constitutional project for the unification of the Palestinian People into an independent society is the effective liberation of the occupying power. Palestinian governance rather is burdened with a state apparatus alienated from the population. The constitutional process in Tunisian society, by contrast, exemplifies the consensual social policy that has followed the Arab Spring and has succeeded in a peaceful transition to a unified nation out of the previously centralised state authority. The contrast with its neighbouring Libyan context is remarkable, considering the experiment launched there for the Jamahiriya in 1969.

The founding Charter of the Fatah party, to be found in the 1964 constitutional proposal of the PLO and the declaration of 1969 subsequently, did not call for a Theocratic State but rather a liberal democratic republic exemplified by the formulation of a “Democratic Secular State of Palestine”. Such a formula in the liberal democratic tradition is a contradiction in itself as it seeks to achieve the national liberation of the Palestinian People by instituting a presumably non-national republic. The name Palestine itself simply reveals the inherent nature of the liberal republic as a nation-state in spite of its secularism. The majority will of the population constitutes the republic as a concept, and so becomes a reflection of the majoritarian nationality. In the context of a bi-national or multi-national demographic society, this would in its actuality entrench a contradiction, with the social differentiation found therein. But such is the nature of all such liberal republics as well. The consequence of such a liberal republic is the effort to counterbalance its fundamental demographic nature as a presumably majoritarian national formation, with the definition of individual rights under a human rights charter but without the national rights to language, education and religion as well as auto-determination. While this is the standard occidental practice and the presumed requisite of modernity, the precondition of a Palestinian majoritarian national demographic civil society is in question if the return of the Palestinian refugees is not assured. Given the existing demographic nature of the society in question with the nearly equal weight of each given national formation, the demographic process for the return of the refugees is put into question by the lack of a certain democratic outcome. Considering that the collective national rights of a national minority are not guaranteed

under the provisions of fundamental individual rights, the possibility of a consensus for the return of the refugees is put into question.

The international context and consequences of the conceptual difficulty in the use of the term “Yehudi” or “Jewish” to name the Zionist military forces, have their consequences in practice because there is a lack of distinction made between the active Zionist military forces and the civilian Jewish–Israeli population. The perception that all of the Jewish–Israelis are complicit by having served in the military forces at some point and being subject to recall for reserve duty is a misconception that needs to be overcome since less than half of the Jewish–Israelis serve in the military. As is indicated by recent polls, 44% of the Jewish–Israeli population is opposed to the occupation of the Palestinian territories of 1967.

The forms of resistance carried out as a result of this popular misconception expressed in the generic term “Yehudi” may result in the targeting of some civilians in the State of Israel which only serves to fortify the current governing apparatus and disables the internal Jewish opposition. The hypocrisy of the state terrorist authorities pointing out the isolated acts of terror directed at civilians is the horrible irony of that context.

The International Movement of Solidarity

The division between the proponents of the “One-State Solution” and the advocates of the Oslo “Two-State Solution” impairs the possibility of joint strategies and actions. Whether there is a principled basis for such a division is doubtful, considering that even while the “Two-State Solution” is demonstrably bankrupt, the prospect of the “One-State Solution” has also become nothing more than the current hegemony of the Zionist occupation. This hegemony extends over all of the historic territory of Palestine, except for a limited disengagement with the Gaza Strip.

Although the One State Group is intent on proving its credibility by disproving the credibility of the “Two-State Solution” international consensus, actually neither is capable of demonstrating its potential as an effective solution.

The notion of the “One State” is basically a reference to the course of events in the previous Apartheid State of South Africa (Azania). The South African context has a qualitatively different demographic balance of forces, where the vastly greater proportion of the black African population assured both the defeat of apartheid by the withdrawal of strategic working class services and the impossibility of any campaign of mass expulsion, as was carried out by the Zionist militias in 1948 during the Nakba. Even

while the South African apartheid regime sought to isolate a certain proportion of the population into Bantustans, the demographic weight of the black African population remained predominant. The international solidarity of the Cuban military forces, which assured the defeat of the South African occupation of Namibia and the defeat of the invasion of Angola, further isolated the apartheid regime which consequently could not have considered any expulsion of the black African population into the neighbouring regions.

The notion of a “One-State Solution” is a reversion to the initial perspective of the “Democratic Secular State of Palestine” proposed initially by the PLO. The novelty of this reversion or revision is doubtful.

The actuality of the demographic reality is now one unitary state of a bi-national set of civil societies, however dysfunctional, and living in a stasis of solitary isolation resembling a form of apartheid. Nonetheless, the economies, infrastructure and workforce are inter-dependent to a great extent. These two national solitudes, especially concerning Gaza, are expressed as a state of war by the Zionist mentality which considers all of the Palestinian population to be the enemy, even while collaborating with the Palestinian Authority (PA) in the maintenance of “security”. The PA is limited in its authority to the daytime region of Sector A alone.

There is furthermore a set of “mushkeleh”, erroneous conceptual underpinnings of the programmatic content of the solidarity movement, which derive in part from the alienation of the Palestinian opposition and resistance. First and foremost, the agent of repression in the occupation of Palestine is not well defined. As a result of the Arabic term utilised for the Zionist military presence, which is “Yehudi” – otherwise considered to be the term for “Jew” or “Jews” – the actual agents of the state are consequently obscured since:

- 1) a majority of the world’s Jewish people do not reside in the State of Israel so the Israeli Jewish population can only be considered a minority of the Jewish People, empirically. Rather than the apparent majority of the Jewish People who profess the doctrine of Zionism this proportion is disproportionate, since the balance of political orientations was altered drastically when six million non-Zionist or anti-Zionist Jewish Ashken’azim were lost during the Holocaust,
- 2) a minority of the Jewish citizens of the State of Israel serve in the military forces, considering that about half of those conscripted choose to do national service instead of military service, in addition

- to the fact that the Chasidic ultra-Orthodox were not conscripted and now continue to refuse to be drafted,
- 3) the State of Israel was founded as a *de facto* bi-national entity since its official languages are both Hebrew and Arabic,
 - 4) the State of Israel has not been legally defined to be a Jewish State other than an affirmation contained in the Declaration of Independence (the three attempts to do so by the Knesset-Parliament having failed),
 - 5) the Basic Law of the State of Israel ensures a right to citizenship on demand for only a limited fraction of the Jewish People who are considered to conform to the definition of being a Zionist as specifically mentioned in that law of return being those who do not threaten the security of the State of Israel,
 - 6) the differentiation between Jewish and Zionist is further codified by legislation that seeks to ban and deport those Jewish people who wish to enter the State of Israel while supporting the BDS (Boycott, Disinvestment, Sanctions) campaign internationally,
 - 7) the definition of Zionism is furthermore derived from Protestant Christian theology (Dispensationalism, Restorationism, End of Times, Armageddon), not Judaism and,
 - 8) the Zionist doctrine is aligned with the antisemitic enemies of the Jewish presence in the countries of the occidental regions.

The use of the term “Jew/Jews”, in languages other than Arabic, has an additional flaw in that it is using a term that was originally defined with a derogatory connotation by antisemitic forces to disparage the role of the Jewish People in the world as a whole – as if the Jewish bourgeoisie or Marxists were responsible for all the great tragedies of the occidental countries’ history over hundreds of years. The lack of differentiation between Jewish and Zionist categories in Judaeophobic and Antisemitic propaganda emitted by various Christian denominations permeating the popular consciousness found amongst the working classes, is an additional facet of the *de facto* Antisemitism of some sectors of the current solidarity campaign with the Palestinian struggle against the Zionist occupation. The increasing support for the Palestinian Nation has attracted the attention of the Right-wing populist tendencies and the trend to cater to such supporters is corrupting the solidarity movement in some layers.

The term “Jew” for example is a racist notion as clearly defined by the Oxford English Dictionary of 1933 which concocts a race notion of the Jewish national identity even though there is no such race or “race” itself, in biological terms. The human species is one which is biologically

compatible and diverges in various secondary attributes with a shared history amongst all. For example, the Ashken'azi Jewish Nation was formed from the Jewish slaves brought to Rome by that empire and subsequently intermarried with converted European women, much like the Moabite mother Ruth who gave rise to David and Solomon.

The American political culture though is embedded with racist notions founded in eugenics and race theory, in spite of the biological evidence and the enforced mixture of African and European strains resulting from the impositions of the slave owners. In spite of such empirical evidence the notions of "Black" and "White" persist. The notion of "White" is notably particularly superficial when applied to the Jewish-American national minority, as evidenced by the transition from the 50s to later decades when non-"White" national minorities became considered to be "White", as applied to the Jewish-Ashken'azi-Americans. The same transition took place for Italian- and Greek-Americans. The precise term African-American initiated by the revolutionary thinker Malcolm X el-Hajj Malik el-Shabazz does away with such racialist notions.

A far more problematic connotation to the term "Jew/Yehudi" is the Christian theocratic presumption that such a category is a religious definition alone and does not carry a national identity with it. Christianity tends to project its self-image onto Judaism, and the Jewish People so conceiving of the term "Judeo-Christian values".

Even while the Palestinian solidarity campaign, in general, does indeed usually affirm its opposition to antisemitism, the failure to carry through in explicit and actual instances leads to the acquiescence towards the populist conception that Jewish People as a whole are complicit in and responsible for the Zionist State's occupation of Palestine.

Merely because the Zionist doctrine affirms that the Jewish People are a nation is no reason for oppositionists to adopt the opposite view that there is no Jewish People or Nation, even though the nationalist state identity claims it represents all of the Jewish People as such. The denial of Jewish national identity is certainly an aspect of national oppression, apart from the various manifestations of antisemitism. In much the same manner that the various Arab Nations carry a common perspective in political-culture of a People-Nation and with it a doctrine of Pan-Arabism, a similar phenomenon exists amongst the Jewish People. Only about 20% of Jewish People practice the Judaic religion, and while it is a higher percentage amongst Israelis at 38%, it is nonetheless a minority within the Jewish People as a whole that does practice or adheres to Judaism as a religion. The national identity of the Jewish People is not peculiar to the Zionist doctrine at all since various currents of the Jewish political culture do

identify as a Nation, such as the Jewish Bund, the Territorialists, as well as Judaism itself – the exceptions being the Reform congregations, the Marxist and Anarchist Jewish streams of thought. The Reform religious current, originating in Germany and which flourished in the USA, exemplified the assimilationist perspective that failed drastically in Germany, with only a handful of survivors out of the one million Jewish-Germans. The assimilationist tendencies arising out of the Enlightenment subsequently crashed on the shores of the Protestant Reformation, not only in Germany but France as well.

Considering that the immigration policies of the occidental Christian states denied visas to the Jewish refugees from the insanity of European fascism and Nazism before, during and even after the Holocaust had run its course, the Occident is nonetheless not held accountable. The occidental support for the creation of the State of Israel in the first instance is treated as a nullification or compensation for the antisemitic closed door policy to the Jewish refugees. The 48% of the Ashke n'azi Jewish refugees who were left with no alternative from Europe other than Palestine were a consequence of occidental antisemitism, with the Zionist parties more than willing to offer up Palestine as a place to settle.

The international Palestinian solidarity movement has simply and recently brought its attention to bear upon the most extreme elements who profess Holocaust denial and who seek to justify or trivialise it. Many with the pretention to being pro-Palestinian still reject the prospect of breaking off from the populist propaganda of conflating opposition to the Zionist occupation with the populist alienation to the presence of a Jewish national minority, that is to be distinguished from the State of Israel itself. The mainstream spokespeople amongst the Jewish communities that take the stage front and centre are assumed to be speaking on behalf of the Jewish communities as a whole, an impression fostered by the Zionist movement itself.

Also, the Zionist definition of Israel as a “Jewish State” adopted by the solidarity movement as a legal designation, is not only capitulation to the Zionist parties but also a *de facto* facet of inherent antisemitism. As such, for all of the reasons provided here, a significant portion of the solidarity movement has isolated itself from facilitating the Jewish revolt against the current Zionist and bourgeois leadership of the Jewish political culture’s civil societies.

The emergence of the Jewish-orientated opposition movements such as the Jewish Voice for Peace, If Not Now (The Jewish Resistance), Not In Our Name, International Jewish Anti-Zionist Network, Neturei Karta International, Satmar, the Jewish Bund, Union Juive Française pour la

Paix, Gush Shalom, Peace Now, Jspace, Jewdas, J-Street, Breaking the Silence, Anarchists Against the Wall, Stand With Us, Givat Haviva, B'Tselem, Machsom Watch and others locally, is necessitated by the failure of the general opposition to take into consideration the differentiation between the Zionist State from the Jewish People as a whole. The populist Jewish tendency that merely seeks a Jewish voice to differentiate itself from Zionism and the Jewish People as such, are at the service of the Zionist project alone and disserve the Palestinian cause by consequence.

Taking into consideration that the initial opposition to the Zionist doctrine was from within the Jewish political culture itself in the form of the Jewish Bund socialist revolutionary movement, founded in the same year of 1897 as the Zionist State project, this is a conclusive repudiation of the denunciations made of not only Jewish people but also the conceptual identity of the Jewish People itself. While it seems as if the Zionist parties exert hegemonic domination over the Jewish People, it is only a superficial, empirical and temporary attribute which resulted from the extermination of the predominantly progressive Jewish milieu during the Holocaust and does not represent the essence of the Jewish identity.

This resulting methodological error of treating the Palestinian struggle in isolation from all other considerations as another single-issue campaign strategy is easily manipulated into self-contradictions that undermine the primary issue itself. One sort of racism cannot and does not nullify another.

Such misconceptions as are integral to the Marxist and Anarchist doctrines have fed into the populist flaws of working-class consciousness. Stereotypes such as the absence of a Jewish working class undermine the formation of an effective solidarity movement that is capable of overcoming the Zionist ideology, together with the Western paradigm of the nation-state. The advance of Zionism is a function of the lack of programme brought forth by the existing socialist currents of thought which had abandoned the Jewish People, ever since the eradication of most members of the Jewish Bundist movement during the Holocaust, as well as during the Stalinist repression beginning in 1924. Even before the Holocaust the sectarian rejection of the autonomous Jewish workers' movement, the Jewish Bund, by both the Bolsheviks (Iskristis-Leninists) and Mensheviks in the Second International Congress of 1903, led to the weakening of the working class as a whole and opened the door to fascism and Nazism.

In particular, the failures in the Stalinist Marxist State led to the alienation of the Russian-Jewish population of some 2 million who have thus turned to the Zionist State as a relief from the denial of Jewish

national identity and culture, as practiced by that dictatorship. As a result, the Zionist campaign of “refusniks” to liberate the Russian and Ukrainian Jewish populations undermined the “Workers’ State” and provided a wave of support for the Zionist State of Israel when that body of 2 million Jewish immigrants had no other avenue to flee to. Subsequently, the Russian Israeli community has thus tended to support the more reactionary of the Zionist parties. The Russian-Jewish preference for Berlin was furthermore cut off, upon the insistence of the Zionist State.

Likewise, the alienation of the Jewish-Arab population of the Maghreb and the Orient previously under “The Millet System” of minority caste differentiation (“dhimmi”), opened the path to their support for the Zionist project during the 1950s. The Jewish Arabs sought a better life in the Zionist State and found nothing but another caste system subordinate to the Ashken’azi bourgeois class domination of that state, as well as enforced assimilation/homogenisation.

One may take note of the stratification of such a Zionist State being far from the mirage of a Jewish homeland. Zionism became a caste system whereby the German Zionist leadership founded a state that was given over to that national bourgeoisie and secured by the transfer of 60,000 German Jewish Zionists during the Ha’avara 1933 accord with the Nazi regime. The Zionist State presides over the subordinate castes of: the Polish Zionists, the Sephardim, Russian-Jewish immigrants, Mizrahim, Chasidim, the Druze nationality, Palestinian-Israelis, Israeli Bedouin, Palestinians under military occupation rule, Palestinian Gazans, Palestinians in internal refugee camps and Palestinians in exile internationally, not to mention the Christian Palestinians and the Palestinian collaborators. To treat the Zionist State as a homogenous phenomenon is obviously an incoherent approach. The resilience of the Zionist State nonetheless endures by: the maintenance of its hegemony over the various factions and castes of the Jewish-Israeli population, the Zionist dominance of the international central Jewish civil society associations by means of the control over the funding agencies, as well as the collaboration of the pro-Zionist Druze nationality in ’48 Palestine, the alignment of a substantial portion of the Christian Palestinian community inside ’48 Palestine, the work of the Preventive Security forces of the Palestinian Authority and a network of Palestinian collaborators among the West Bank Palestinian communities, not to mention the 3.8 billion US dollars provided as a subsidy for US military procurements and the alliances with the neighbouring Arabic regimes.

It should also be understood that considering the elevated level of unemployment and poorly paid labour in the West Bank, 110,000

Palestinians are dependent upon daily jobs inside '48 Palestine. Palestinian workers number 40,000 in illegal Zionist colonies in addition to another 60,000 workers without permits who seek the 250 NIS shekels rather than 50 NIS shekels a day in Palestinian employ (6000 NIS per month rather than the 1500 NIS monthly). It should be known that 43% of youth aged 20–24 in the West Bank are unemployed. The Green Line demarcation of 1967 is the economic and cultural interface between the oriental and the occidental division of the world – so close and yet so far. These are two solitudes within the same economy. The Palestinian level of poverty is defined as 1,500 shekels (NIS) per month while the Israeli one is at least 4,500 NIS.

An additional defect in solidarity work is the use of inflated language which corresponds to the delusions of the populist mentality.⁹ In particular, the use of the Holocaust to compare the treatment of the Gazan Palestinians, during the three massacres inflicted since the withdrawal of Zionist implantations, is counter-productive to any rational understanding of the genocidal militarism constantly inflicted upon the Palestinians. The differentiation to be made is between the massacre of a given national entity with the project of the eradication of such a Nation. The facile attempt to counter the Zionist argument which seeks to justify its violations based upon the subjugation of the Jewish People during the Holocaust, by countering with the argument that Zionism is carrying out the same practice, is an obvious misrepresentation that only serves to bolster the Zionist projection. The conflation of the Holocaust with the occupation is an indication of the lack of an argument to counter the Zionist rationale. The more outrageous contention that the Holocaust is a myth is a more elaborate misrepresentation alongside the trivialisations made of the Holocaust itself. To provide some context, more than 90% of the 3.5 million Jewish Polish population, including my parents' families, were murdered during the Nazi occupation of Poland and subsequently burned to conceal that historic crime.

The single issue fixation as methodology also tends to adopt whatever is perceived to be the position of the Palestinian opposition and so arises the misuse of the religiously adopted term "Yehudi", which in the hands of the international opposition becomes an assault on the Jewish identity *per se* in the oftentimes erroneous slogan of "End Israeli Apartheid", as if all Israelis favour and support such a policy. When translated the term "Yehudi" is made into "Israeli", and the resulting confusion is ignored as if no further thought is necessary to oppose the Zionist misrepresentation

⁹ Elaborations found at – abraham Weizfeld, 2009-02-02,
https://www.academia.edu/4612973/Inflated_Language_and_Holocaust_Theory

that it is defending and representing the Jewish People as a whole. Such a populist propagation is excused by the semblance of progressive thought in Marxist verbiage initiated by Marx's incompetent pamphlet of 1848 entitled "On The Jewish Question". This absence of argumentation leaves little hope that such opposition will ever serve to aid the Palestinians in directing the opposition to the actual source of the problem, which is the state and its Zionist parties.

To conflate "Yehudi" and Israeli is in effect a cover-up of the complicity in implicating the Jewish People as a whole in the crimes of the Zionist regime, since the term Israeli is assumed to be indicative of the Jewish People. The more ominous extrapolation that is made by using the term "Israeli" in various slogans, is that either the transfer, expulsion or extermination of Israelis, in general, is a solution to the crisis of the Zionist Occupation.

At the same time the populist paradigm that defers to or seeks to conflate the Zionist regime with a Jewish identity, also rejects the concept of a Jewish People, claiming that Jewishness is merely an obsolete religion doomed to disappear one day together with that Jewish identity. This is known in Marxist terminology as an "un-historic nation", even while denying that the Jewish People do indeed form a sociological nation. The self-justifying allusion to Judaism as being the only valid Jewish identity, as a means to counter the Zionist identification with the Jewish People is a pathetic denial of the self-identification of Jewish people in all the various contexts that Jewish people are to be found, other than Zionism. Even while the criterion of self-identification is considered the valid form of political identification for African-Americans, Québécois and Palestinians, it is not considered to be valid for the Jewish People. This political error is due to the assumption that such a criterion only applies to an oppressed People and by the further assumption that the Jewish communities are not oppressed, and so the Jewish identity as a People-Nation is not sanctioned. Here the error is based in an economistic definition of oppression, as if racism were not a valid phenomenon, or that antisemitism is not a form of racism and as if all Jewish people were wealthy, even though 20% of Jewish communities live in poverty, much the same as other communities in the North-American capitalist economies. The status of the Jewish People in the occident and the USA in particular, is rather public now in the Charlottesville neo-Nazi anti-Jewish chants which were allowed to stand unopposed by the US President.

The poverty of thought in the populist mentality is evident when it simply seeks to counter the Zionist rationale by claiming the very opposite, as if this were a sufficient methodology in itself, without regard

for a pertinent analysis. It is rather convenient to discount the concept of a Jewish People and its national identity where there is little idea of how national identity exists other than by a nation-state. The default position accorded Jewish national identity assumes it would be the State of Israel, since there were no other national programme considered, such as Jewish Bundist National-Cultural Autonomy, in a potentially integrated society. The separatist conception of the nation still permeates the Left even though the African-Americans have made headway in proposing a programme of integration together with maintaining such an identity.

The term Jewish People is itself made to be an object of contention by the notion that it is equivalent to the nationalist definition of a nation. While the concept of an Arab People is considered to be legitimate, that of a Jewish People is not, for some undefined reason. Considering that the Arab People comprise a number of differing nations and that the Jewish People are also composed of various national components, there should be no problem in considering the Jewish People as a valid concept. However, the religious mentality only cares to compare the concept of the Jewish People to the Islamic People or Ummah, so as to remove any national identity of the Jewish People or for any of its national components. Considering that the Jewish People were first defined as “a Nation within a Nation” in Egypt it should be evident that the Jewish People are more than a religion. The actuality is that only some 20% of Jewish People are religious practitioners even while in the Zionist State some 38% are. Even among the religious practitioners with a large community of Anti-Zionists present in Jerusalem amongst the ultra-Orthodox Jerusalem Satmar community of 1.5 million in Meah She’arim there exists a consciousness of national identity which is apart from the Zionist State. The current struggle of the traditional Orthodox against the military draft is indicative of the difference to be recognised between Jewishness and Zionism.

The contention that there is no national identity to the Jewish People is also the simplistic response rejecting the newly adopted European Union definition for antisemitism¹⁰ which conflates the Jewish People with the State of Israel. The rejection of the Jewish People-Nation definition with

¹⁰ On June 1, 2017, the Parliament of the European Union approved a resolution adopting the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance (IHRA) working definition of anti-Semitism, < <http://www.jewishvirtuallibrary.org/eu-adopts-anti-semitism-definition>>, including the reference of May 26, 2016, “Denying the Jewish people their right to self-determination, e.g., by claiming that the existence of a State of Israel is a racist endeavor”, <https://www.holocaustremembrance.com/sites/default/files/press_release_document_antisemitism.pdf>.

the intention of denying the legitimacy of the Jewish People's self-determination is in contradiction to the very same right affirmed on behalf of Palestinian self-determination. When the right to self-determination is invoked for one People, it cannot be denied for another. Self-determination as a principle must be reciprocal. The equivalent methodological error is committed by denying the self-determination of the Palestinian Nation by the Zionist invocation of that right exclusively for the Jewish People, in a violation of the very right claimed on its behalf, so nullifying itself in consequence. Of course, this is only a logical deduction and logic has little to do with geopolitical maneuverings. The Zionist claim invoking self-determination on behalf of the Jewish People alone in exclusion of that right on behalf of the Palestinian People is by consequence without foundation and has no legitimate standing. To summarise the argument, the right to self-determination may not be invoked in the case where such a nation-state contradicts the national self-determination of the Palestinian People-Nation. Also, there is no rationale for the Zionist State positioning itself in place of the Jewish religious-culture, as demonstrated by the Jewish Orthodox Satmar protests in Jerusalem and the Neturei Karta International rejecting the authority of the State of Israel.

It is not acceptable to minimise or even trivialise the matter of antisemitism in the populist verbiage of the so-called progressive layers of the multi-faceted public opposition. It is imperative that we take this critique further to consider the naïve laissez-faire racism that permeates the occidental Western societies, in spite of its self-conception as a haven of liberty and democracy.

The populist conception to be considered is the notion that the wars and occupations of the Arab and Islamic countries are due to the control or influence of Jewish agents in the countries that have initiated the invasions or otherwise, as has gripped Iraq or the uprising in Syria. Notwithstanding during the previously allied relationship between the USA and Iraq under the Baathist leader Sadaam Hussain during the war against Iran and the concurrent opposition to that regime by the State of Israel, the populist imagination gave rise to a myth of the manipulation of the USA by "the Jews" to destroy that perceived threat to Israel. The question poses itself, that if the power of Jewish-Americans was so great as to turn around US foreign policy to bring down the Hussain Baathist regime, then how was it that the USA had supported the Hussain government in the first place. And yet the notion of the "Israel Lobby", transformed into a "Jewish Lobby", is held to be more of a determinant than the centre of gravity in US imperialism which is the Military-Industrial Complex. A reference to the Rothschild myth follows here.

We may also take note of the infamous common references to the name “Rothschild”;

It states that 'The Rothschilds are commonly believed to have engineered WWI and waited until 1917 when Britain showed signs of trouble. The Zionist family then promised the British Government that they could convince the US to enter the war and ensure Britain's victory over Germany on the basis that the British government handed control of Palestine to the Zionists. Thus, the Balfour Declaration was created'.

It is wrong in virtually every respect.

i. WWI came about because the French and British wanted to carve up the Middle East and found themselves in an inter-imperialist dispute with Germany. Nothing to do with the Rothschilds.

ii. The greatest supporters of the Declaration, Arthur Balfour and Lloyd George were ardent imperialists and Balfour was an Evangelical Christian. It was the latter who more than anyone drove the Zionist enterprise since they saw a Jewish settlement as being a fulfillment of Biblical promises.

iii. The US entry into the war had nothing to do with the Balfour declaration since the US entered in April 1917 and the Balfour Declaration was in November. A minor reason for the latter might have been to try and make US Jews less hostile to the already existing entry of the US, things like not opposing the draft, but this was because most Jews opposed the Allied war on account of the alliance with Czarist Russia, from where they had escaped.

iv. The Rothschilds, although long a bogeyman of anti-Semitic conspiracists, had long been a minor bank by 1917 and were dwarfed by their American counterparts. However why let go of a useful fiction?

v. This junk article says that '**Lord Jacob Rothschild had admitted that his family were 'crucial' in the creation of Israel, in a *Times of Israel* interview.**' No, Jacob Rothschild might have tried to take the credit on behalf of his family for something he is very proud of (unfortunately) but that is not the same.

vi. It overemphasises the role of Dorothy Rothschild whom Chaim Weizmann mentions but once in his autobiography, Trial and Error. On pp. 160-1 he says that she was 'enormously helpful' to him without saying how. He also mentions that the Rothschild's were a divided family with Leopold Rothschild described as 'furiously anti-Zionist' and his wife Lady Rothschild as 'pathologically anti-Zionist' with other family members like Lord and Lady Crewe also opposed. The original Baron Edmond Rothschild helped support settlements in Palestine but as part of a philanthropic but not Zionist enterprise. Herzl and the Rothschild's fell out and Herzl penned the viciously anti-Semitic 'Mauschel' essay as a consequence of the Rothschilds spurning them.

Of course, it is easier for simpletons to ascribe the creation of the Israeli state to a conspiracy theory about the wicked Rothschilds rather

than as a consequence of Britain's imperial interests in safeguarding the strategic route to India etc. A good conspiracy theory saves you the trouble of having to think too deeply about things like why the US today supports Israel. It is much easier to say that it is because of the Bildeberg or some other conspiracy rather than that Israel comes cheap at the price to US imperialism.¹¹

In close association with the myth of the “Jewish Lobby”, sanitised by the name-change to “Israel Lobby”, the baggage of the Tsarist propaganda piece called “The Protocols of the Elders of Zion” continues, since it contains the reference to Zion so lending some credibility in the Arabic and Muslim public mind. In the Western Christian mind, the association with “Rothschild” is rampant as the supposed manipulator of the world’s economy and the source of all economic ills. The conflation made of Rockefeller with Israel, economic crises etcetera is the myth at its most irrational. This sort of economic populism was evident in the New York City Occupy action, infiltrated under cover of freedom of speech, in spite of its hate speech. While it is evident that the powerhouse of the US economy is the Military-Industrial Complex, as pointed out by US President Eisenhower, the myth of Jewish bankers’ control of America is a strong element in the current populist wave that has swept the opportunistic Donald J. Trump into the US presidency. A simple search for the top 500 wealthiest persons in the world is revealed by Forbes to include perhaps eight Jewish people among them, two of whom are not in the Zionist stream of things.¹² No mention may be found of a Rothschild in that list of the wealthiest. In the popular consciousness, no notice is made of the Anglo-American and the German-American powerhouses in banks and the “Military-Industrial Complex”, such as the Koch brothers military goods peddlers.

What we have dominating the geopolitical hegemonies are the self-identified Christian Nation-States of the United States of America with its junior partners of the United Kingdom, Canada, Australia and oftentimes the European Union. The role of such powers in the colonial epoch is well known. This role of the occidental powers in the neo-colonial economic imperialist schema is merely the continuity of such power seekers. The original Crusades included the expulsion of the Jewish minority

¹¹ Tony Greenstein, JewsWhoSpeakOut List, lists.riseup.net, 2017-02-16, <<https://lists.riseup.net/www/arc/jewswhospeakout/2017-02/msg00004.html>>

¹² Mar 1, 2016 @ 09:25 AM, Forbes Billionaires: Full List Of The 500 Richest People In The World 2016, <<http://www.forbes.com/sites/kerenblankfeld/2016/03/01/forbes-billionaires-full-list-of-the-500-richest-people-in-the-world-2016/#250511396c24>>