The Palestinian National Movement and the Anti-Colonial Struggle

Ran Greenstein
Sociology Department
University of the Witwatersrand
ran.greenstein@wits.ac.za

Introduction: historical background

All large-scale historical processes can be divided into periods, characterized by crucial landmark events, developments and dates. These usually play a symbolic role but also serve as indicators of important shifts or new directions. Three such dates stand out in the history of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict:

- The 2nd November 1917: the date of the Balfour Declaration, which recognized the Zionist movement's claim to a 'National Home' in Palestine, and committed Britain to facilitating its realization
- The 29th November 1947: the date of the UN Palestine partition resolution, which led to the establishment of the State of Israel in the following year and to the Palestinian *Nakba* (dispossession of hundreds of thousands who became stateless refugees)
- The 5th June 1967: the date of the war that led to Israel's expansion into its current boundaries, incorporating all of historical Palestine within its system of military and political control.

These dates and the events with which they are associated did not create new realities from scratch, of course. Rather, building on existing trends, they served to consolidate pre-existing developments and to open up new historical possibilities. In particular they helped give rise to new patterns of settlement and resistance, and thus reshaped relations between the main protagonists of the evolving conflict.

The Balfour Declaration was issued towards the end of the First World War, after Great Britain had gained control over much of Palestine and large areas of the Middle East that used to be part of the Ottoman Empire. It followed 35 years of organized Jewish immigration and settlement activity in the country, which resulted in the consolidation of a small but growing Jewish community (known as the New *Yishuv*), spread over dozens of new rural settlements, towns and urban neighbourhoods. Although it made no reference to that community, its existence was an important contextual factor for the Declaration. It granted international legitimacy to the new *Yishuv* and facilitated its further growth under the leadership of the world Zionist movement. Together with the British Mandate for Palestine, officially inaugurated in 1920, it created a new political framework based on boundaries that define the territory to this day. In that way it made the incipient conflict between Jewish settlers and indigenous Palestinian-Arabs more sharply focused on the political future of the country. While Palestinian resistance to Jewish immigration and land settlement preceded the Declaration, going back to the late 19th century, the post-1917 period became crucial in shaping the conflict in its current form. It is also the necessary starting point for discussing the colonial/apartheid question and its relevance for Israel/Palestine.

With the demise of the Ottoman Empire and the British takeover of Palestine, two new and related elements were introduced into the country: European imperial rule and a settler political project. The Ottomans governed the country from present-day Turkey but their domain incorporated much of the Middle East and parts of North Africa and the Balkans in a political framework legitimized by Islam rather than by specific national or ethnic principles of organization. The Ottoman ethos saw the Empire as the continuation of the great Islamic empires of the past. It did not regard Palestine as a foreign territory nor was Ottoman rule seen as foreign by local residents. There was little room for nationalist or anti-colonial resistance in an environment that saw Palestinian locals represented and governed in the same way as all other Ottoman subjects. Even with the beginning of an Arab nationalist movement before the First World War, the vast majority of the population remained loyal to the Ottoman state and did not organize politically on a separate Arab or Palestinian basis.

All this changed in the post-war period, when the Middle East was divided into different political units. These were administered by Britain and France as Mandatory powers, ostensibly working under the League of Nations to guide the territories to independence, but in practice making their own policies with little outside interference. Struggles against this form of imperial control were waged in many places, including Palestine, usually under an Arab nationalist banner. In this respect, Palestinians were similar to their counterparts elsewhere in the region, but with a crucial twist: the main target of their struggle was not Britain's rule in itself, but its role as a facilitator of the Zionist movement and its settlement project. Zionism was increasingly seen as a threat due to ongoing Jewish immigration and land purchases, and consequent fears of dispossession, and also – perhaps primarily – as it embarked on a concerted effort to assert political control over the country as a whole at the expense of local Palestinian Arabs.

These two new components – British imperial rule and the Zionist project – were driven by different imperatives and occasionally came into clash with one another. Yet, from the perspective of radical activists they became fused as forces equally opposed to independence for the country in line with the wishes of its majority Arab residents. How these forces could be disentangled – in theoretical analysis and political practice – was a matter for debate between different orientations. Palestinian-Arab nationalists regarded Zionism as the main opponent, which was able to manipulate the British to do its bidding. Left-wing activists regarded the British as the main culprit, using the Zionist movement to enhance their control of the region and its strategic resources – oil above all, but also transport routes, military bases and so on.

The debate between these activist orientations was expressed in various forms throughout the period discussed here. It divided those who directed most attention to the national conflict from those who adopted a broader framework of analysis and action. The former focused on the struggle against the Zionist settlement project in Palestine before 1948 (and the State of Israel after that), and the latter focused on the struggle against imperialist control of the region, including Palestine, which was exercised by Britain at first and then taken over by the USA from the mid-1950s onwards. These two approaches were not always clearly distinct, however, and some overlaps between them existed at times. Still, for our purposes here they can be distinguished both in their different emphases and in the courses of action that flow from the analysis.

The nationalist approach conceptualizes the question of Palestine as a clash between indigenous Arabs seeking independence and foreign Jewish settlers acting to take their place

and realize their own independence. The solution therefore lies in restoring the rights of the indigenous population by reversing the process of settlement and colonization. This should be carried out for the entire country or, if impossible, for a part of the country at least. The left-wing approach conceptualizes the question as a struggle for economic and territorial control between the global forces of imperialism and local populations. Although settlers frequently join imperialist forces, under the mistaken belief that they would thus enhance their security, their survival can be guaranteed only by local anti-imperialist movements. Settlers can become allies of liberation forces, even if they are not necessarily aware of that.

The nationalist and left-wing approaches presented above are best seen as ideal types, that is to say analytical benchmarks rather than empirical realities. In practice, the picture is more complex since the boundaries between foreign and local populations are not always clear, the alliances between imperial powers and settlers may take different forms with different political implications, and indigenous people are internally divided on social and political grounds. Some indigenous groups may enter relationships of cooperation but also of conflict with some settler groups, and benefit or suffer differentially from imperial policies.

This diversity of conditions leads, in turn, to diverse political strategies: a conservative nationalism opposed to the settler project but willing to collaborate with imperialism; radical nationalism that incorporates elements of left-wing rhetoric; socialist movements that form popular fronts with one type of nationalism or another, and so on. Nationalism itself has assumed partly overlapping and partly contradictory forms: the local-territorial nationalism (*wataniyya*) of Palestinians co-existed with the broader but less structured pan-Arab nationalism (*qawmiyya*), and it was never completely separate from the religious Islamic identity of the majority of the population. At different times one or more of these forms of identity assumed a dominant role in popular consciousness but without eve displacing the other elements permanently.

How do notions of colonialism and apartheid and the struggle against them feature in this context, then? First, let us define these terms: apartheid was a South African system based on the classification of people into distinct racial groups, each of which was allocated specific territories and sets of social and political rights that go with them. The relationship between the groups was hierarchical: whites had access to most resources and were in charge of the system a whole, including the definition and monitoring of the boundaries between groups. The system was in place between 1948 and 1994 but many of its features had been evident for decades if not centuries before it was formalized as an organizing principle of government policies. Despite several changes during that period, it essentially retained its nature until the end.

The struggle against apartheid was based on opposition to the unequal allocation of resources between groups and, more fundamentally, opposition to the very logic of classification into groups. Rejection of the notion that racial boundaries were natural and obvious, and therefore could serve as a basis for social and political arrangements, was a central feature of the anti-apartheid struggle in South Africa, even if such notions did creep into it at times. Crucially, in its later stages the anti-apartheid campaign was consolidated around the slogan of non-racialism, implying the removal of race altogether as a legitimate consideration instead of calling for equality of people organized on a racial basis. The extent to which this idea has dominated popular consciousness varied over time: we must not confuse official rhetoric with massive support by the grassroots, and need to recognize that to some at least there has been a revival of a more explicit racial thinking in the post-apartheid era.

Of most relevance here is that both apartheid and the opposition to it were ways of organizing internal relations within a single, highly unequal, society. Common rhetoric about separation, segregation and the literal meaning of the term apartheid (apartness) must not obscure the incorporation of all groups of people within the same social and economic frameworks. Attempts by the state to entrench separation through influx control laws, forced removals and sham independence to the 'homelands' were important, but ultimately failed to reverse the processes of migration from the countryside to the urban areas and (later on) from the black townships into the 'grey areas' in city centres. And of course, the anti-apartheid movement was based on the recognition that indigenous people had been conquered and there was no going back to pre-colonial independence: the only political alternative was full integration on a basis of equality in the same society and state.

Beyond the details of South African history, apartheid in a generic sense – unbounded in time and space by the case that gave it its name – exists when a system is based on principles that enshrine and entrench social and political inequalities between collective groups, defined in racial, ethnic or national terms. An anti-apartheid movement seeks to overturn such system and undermine the rationale for existing inequalities. The problem tackled in this way is not nationalism or national identity in themselves, nor foreign rule and the need for independence from colonialism. Rather, it is the idea that group membership defined by shared ancestry is the main criterion used to allocate or deny political and civil rights – such as citizenship, free movement, and access to land. Such rights should be granted to all residents as members of the same political community regardless of their origins.

Using this understanding of apartheid, my argument is that the Palestinian nationalist paradigm was an anti-colonial but not an anti-apartheid perspective: it did not break away from racial or national group identifications as the basis for social and political rights, but rather sought to reinforce boundaries between groups. It largely failed to offer a vision of a shared future within the same framework in order to overcome ethnic or national distinctions in the process. Of course, this does not make it illegitimate or invalidate its cause. But, it is important to recognize that transcending nationalism is essential to the anti-apartheid orientation. Radical left-wing perspectives were closer to the anti-apartheid ideal type but usually unable to extricate themselves from nationalism and from thinking in group terms.

In what follows I look at several nationalist and left-wing perspectives that made their mark on the history of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. This is done in order to examine the extent to which they adhered to or deviated from the anti-apartheid paradigm as outlined above, and the ways in which they dealt with issues such as definition of group membership and boundaries, distinctions between internal and external forces, relations to colonial and imperial powers, alliances within and between groups, and so on. This would allow us to consider the relevance of the anti-apartheid paradigm as a global umbrella term for liberation movements in other parts of the world. The focus is not on direct references to South African apartheid – which was unknown or attracted little attention until the 1970s – but to broader issues of colonialism, imperial rule, settler control and indigenous resistance.

I use the three dates noted earlier (1917, 1947, 1967) to divide the discussion into periods which saw radical changes in the physical and political configuration of intergroup relations. My starting point pre-dates apartheid by three decades and I take the discussion beyond 1994, but the bulk of the discussion takes place within the time-frame of apartheid in South Africa. I tend to focus here on the discourse and terms of debate rather than on practical on-the-ground political campaigns.

The British Mandate Period

1. Palestinian-Arab nationalism

One of the early exchanges about the positioning of Palestine within the broader imperial system, and the political relations between different groups in the country, is found in correspondence dating to 1922 between the British Secretary of State for the Colonies (Winston Churchill) and the visiting Palestine Arab Delegation. The Delegation arrived in Britain to contest the terms of the Mandate for Palestine. Speaking as "representatives of the Arab People of Palestine", it called on the British government to abandon the Balfour Declaration and change its course: "revise their present policy in Palestine, end the Zionist *condominium*, put a stop to all alien immigration and grant the People of Palestine … Executive and Legislative powers". Failing to do that would mean British policy would be used "to smother their [Palestinian Arabs] national life under a flood of alien immigration." Only the creation of "a national independent Government" would "command the respect of the inhabitants and guarantee peace and prosperity to all."[1]

In response, Churchill rejected the Delegation's claims to represent "the whole or part of the people of Palestine" and asserted that the government had "no intention of repudiating the obligations into which they have entered towards the Jewish people." This meant that "the creation at this stage of a national Government would preclude the fulfillment of the pledge made by the British Government to the Jewish people." Churchill acknowledged that "the non-Jewish population of Palestine are entitled to claim from the Mandatory not only assurances but adequate safeguards that the establishment of the National Home, and the consequent Jewish immigration, shall not be conducted in such a manner as to prejudice their civil or religious rights." But, he did not recognize that they constituted a group with national – not merely civil and religious – claims, or that their claims were equal in importance to the commitments made to the Zionist movement.

In countering Churchill's approach, the Delegation's main argument did not dispute Britain's overall position in the region or its imperial role. Rather, it dealt with the contradictory commitments made by the British to their Arab allies in 1915 (the Hussein–McMahon correspondence, which pledged support for Arab independence), in 1916 (the Sykes–Picot agreement, a plan to divide war spoils between Britain, France and Russia), and 1917 (the Balfour Declaration with its concessions to the Zionist movement). These were examined in light of post-war international conventions. Without going into the details, which have occupied many volumes of historical and legal analysis, it is clear that the British government secretly made conflicting promises to different parties in order to win their support for the war effort, and started worrying about resolving the inevitable mess only later on.

British attempts to assure Palestinians that Jews were not expected to make Palestine as a whole their National Home but rather merely build it *in* Palestine, were dismissed by the Delegation: "It is an incontrovertible fact that public security in Palestine has been greatly disturbed by those Jews who have been admitted into the country from Poland and Russia, that arms are continually being smuggled in by them, and that their economic competition with the Arabs is very keen ... nothing will safeguard their [the Arabs'] interests but the creation of a National Government". The country witnessed "division and tension between Arabs and Zionists increasing day by day and resulting in general retrogression. Because the immigrants dumped upon the country from different parts of the world are ignorant of the language, customs, and character of the Arabs, and enter Palestine by the might of England

against the will of the people who are convinced that these have come to strangle them … it is not to be expected that the Arabs would bow to such a great injustice, or that the Zionists would so easily succeed in realising their dreams."

Palestinian opposition to the Jewish 'National Home' was consistent throughout the period. In particular, the Palestinian-Arab national movement rejected two of its aspects: immigration of Jews into the country and land transfer to Jewish institutions. It urged the British to ban both practices. Together with the call for a representative government, these three demands formed the core of nationalist resistance to the Mandate. As argued by Emile Ghory, secretary of the Arab Higher Committee, during his 1936 visit to Britain, "the Arab sees that day by day he is being driven into the position of a minority, and perhaps into a situation where he could be easily ousted from the country." The Arab Revolt that started in that year was motivated by Jewish immigration and land purchases which increased landlessness among the Palestinians rural masses. The absence of representative institutions aggravated the frustration of elites and masses alike: "We have been appealing to the British people and the British Government for eighteen years. We have had no justice ... The people became desperate and hopeless. They foresaw their fate, and decided on April 19th last [1936] to declare a general strike. That strike has developed into a revolution. It is not the act of terrorists or marauders or snipers: it is a revolution. It is not a revolution designed to threaten the power of Great Britain, nor to force its hand, but to ask for justice. The Arabs have been forced to choose the path they have chosen, because they would not have been heard otherwise."

Speaking in the midst of the Arab general strike – the most radical and persistent act of mass action during the period – Ghory added: "The disturbances in Palestine are not fomented by any foreign propaganda, and they have no foreign finance [a reference to suspicions that the Axis powers were behind the Revolt]. They are not religious. Moslems and Christians are together in this. They are not racial, because we are not anti-Semitic. We have nothing against the Jews as Jews. We have lived with them on the best of terms when they were persecuted in every Christian country. And we are prepared to live with them again provided their political aims do not go any farther."[2]

It is clear from the discussion that British imperial rule was not the object of concern in itself – the Jewish National Home policy was. Arab residents of Palestine might have been content with the British presence if they could have seen a clear way to eventual independence of the country as an Arab state. But, the continued growth of the organized Jewish community made the prospect increasingly remote.

Was it possible then for the Arabs to drive a wedge between the British and the Zionist movement? This would have required of Palestinians to use the British offers of limited representation in government in order to strengthen their own national organization and thereby block the demographic growth and geographical expansion of the Jewish community. Initially, the British offered Palestinians advisory powers within the Mandate framework and the National Home policy. But, by the late 1930s, faced with growing resistance, they had moved to impose limitations on Jewish immigration and land purchases and to open the way for Arab majority rule and independence. The MacDonald White Paper of 1939 was an important move towards meeting Palestinian national demands. However, the Palestinian-Arab leadership, headed by Hajj Amin al-Husseini, consistently rejected the British proposals, though not without internal dissent. It seems the refusal to make any symbolic concession to the notion of a Jewish National Home counted for more than the potential of the proposals to undermine some of the practices associated with it.

We do not know if willingness to compromise on symbols would have resulted in substantive gains for the Palestinian movement. Going along with the British proposals of 1939 – as well as earlier but less generous proposals – might have provided them with an opportunity to build up representative structures, organize on a mass scale, match their opponents' institutional capability and confront political challenges from a solid basis. In retrospect, it is striking how Israel was established on the foundations of the 'state within a state' created during the Mandate period, while Palestinians were unable to mobilize in a similar manner. There were several reasons for this gap between the two communities, and failure to take advantage of political opportunities due to dogmatism most likely was one of them.[3]

With the outbreak of World War II the prospect of political independence for the country was suspended, though the Zionist movement adopted for the first time the goal of statehood as its official position in 1942. By the end of the war much of international opinion had switched to support that position, in large part due to the Holocaust and the resulting large number of Jewish displaced persons in European camps. A Jewish state was seen by many as an obvious solution to this problem. In a last ditch attempt to sway international opinion, distinguished Arab-British academic Albert Hourani outlined the case against a Jewish state in Palestine. In a presentation to the 1946 Anglo-American Committee of Enquiry he asserted “the unalterable opposition of the Arab nation to the attempt to impose a Jewish State upon it”. Such opposition was “based upon the unwavering conviction of unshakeable rights and a conviction of the injustice of forcing a long-settled population to accept immigrants without its consent being asked and against its known and expressed will; the injustice of turning a majority into a minority in its own country; the injustice of withholding self-government until the Zionists are in the majority and able to profit by it.”

At the same time, Hourani acknowledged that Jewish residents were there to stay and had to be accommodated as equals within an overall Arab national framework: “the only just and practicable solution for the problem of Palestine lies in the constitution of Palestine, with the least possible delay, into a self-governing state, with its Arab majority, but with full rights for the Jewish citizens of Palestine”. He promised further that Jews would have “full civil and political rights, control of their own communal affairs, municipal autonomy in districts in which they are mainly concentrated, the use of Hebrew as an additional official language in those districts, and an adequate share in the administration”. In other words, they would gain “membership of the Palestinian community” which is one with an Arab character. The Arab nature of the state – an essential part of its identity – stemmed from “two inescapable facts: the first that Palestine has an Arab indigenous population, and the second that Palestine by geography and history is an essential part of the Arab world.”[4]

While Hourani offered a reasonable balance between majority rule and minority rights, based on liberal political principles, it is doubtful that his position reflected public opinion among the majority of Arabs in the country. He was speaking as a diplomat and a British citizen rather than a popular Palestinian leader, and his attention to possible future arrangements within the framework of a joint state was rare. He conceptualized the conflict as involving the degree of control and power wielded by the different communities – and thus as capable of being solved through rational means. In contrast, the foremost Palestinian leader of the time, Amin al-Husseini, was far less conciliatory. He regarded the conflict from its inception as a fight between irreconcilable opposites, part of a Zionist–British conspiracy to take over Palestine and undermine Arab independence and national identity in the entire region. Unlike other colonial clashes, he argued, “The enemies' plan concerning Palestine is based not only on colonialism; rather there are other dangerous factors – religious, national and strategic –

aimed at replacing one nation with another, completely eliminating the existence of this nation by putting an end to its nationalism, religion and history, and erasing its traces, so that it can be replaced by the other nation".[5] Under these circumstances it was impossible to contemplate conceding any ground to the enemy to conspire with foreign forces against the local population and the Arab world more broadly – an inevitable result of the expansionist dynamics of Zionism in his view.

And indeed, Palestinian Arabs were displaced by Israeli Jews in 1948, those already residing in the country joined by hundreds of thousands of new immigrants from Eastern Europe and the Middle East. Their main national project has become to replace Palestinians and exclude them (physically and figuratively) from the scene. The ways in which these forced population movements made the Israeli-Palestinian conflict intractable is a matter for another study, as is the extent to which the attitude displayed by al-Husseini and his colleagues became a self-fulfilling prophecy, reinforcing the dominant Zionist view of 'us or them' with no possibility of living together peacefully within the same political framework.

In any event, it is clear that there was a big gap between militant rhetoric and the limited capacity of Palestinians to put it into practice, a problem that hampered their campaigns repeatedly. A critical account written by Musa al-Alami, a respected non-partisan activist, outlined the reasons for the outcome, focusing on internal causes and differences between the two sides: "The fundamental source of our weakness was that we were unprepared even though not taken by surprise, while the Jews were fully prepared; that we proceeded along the lines of previous revolutions, while the Jews proceeded along the lines of total war; that we worked on a local basis, without unity, without totality, without a general command, our defense disjointed and our affairs disordered, every town fighting on its own and only those in areas adjacent to the Jews entering the battle at all, while the Jews conducted the war with a unified organization, a unified command, and total conscription. Our arms were poor and deficient; the arms of the Jews were excellent and powerful. It was obvious that our aims in the battle were diverse; the aim of the Jews was solely to win it".[6]

Although al-Alami did not express that in clear conceptual terms, the crucial difference between the two communities was the self-consciously mobilized nature of the Jewish *Yishuv*, which emerged and grew as part of a long-term project that included national and institutional consolidation. Palestinian Arabs, in contrast, continued their lives in a more 'natural' form, and were less able to build up the organizational and political capabilities required to confront their opponents. As the majority of the population in the country, whose presence had not been threatened for many centuries, it was difficult to instil in them the same sense of urgency that prevailed among Jewish settlers, especially acute in light of the Holocaust, which eliminated a large part of their potential resource base but allowed them to mobilize international support for their cause.

Not only was the Jewish settler community better organized than indigenous Palestinians, as could be expected, but it stood out when compared to other groups of settlers in places such as South Africa. The intensity of the transformation process, which saw Jews increasing their numbers eight times in less than 30 years, becoming a third of the population and a decisive economic and political force, is striking from a comparative perspective. The compressed nature of the process made its impact more powerful. To reach a similar position in South Africa it took settlers much longer, in a gradual and uncoordinated process that covered much bigger territory. No wonder Palestinians experienced a profound shock and severe dislocation as a result. The impact of their 1948 defeat has shaped the nature of their struggle ever since.

2. The Communist alternative

The focus on nationalism, Arab identity and political conflict between settlers and indigenous people, as outlined above, was one mode of opposition. The global Communist movement, which emerged with the October revolution of 1917 and the formation of the Communist International (Comintern) in 1919, offered another way of theorizing and organizing anti-colonial campaigns. It targeted British imperial rule rather than the settlement project on its own and, with the use of class analysis it directed additional attention to internal differences within communities instead of only highlighting the gaps between them. Unlike nationalists, who focused on their own country and – to a lesser extent – region, local communists were always linked to an international movement, which shaped their overall perspective.[7]

In Lenin's 1920 *Theses on the National and Colonial Question*, Communist parties were called upon to support "revolutionary liberation movements" in the colonies and combine that with a struggle "against the reactionary and medieval influence of the clergy, the Christian missions and similar elements", against Pan-Islam and "similar currents which try to tie the liberation struggle against European and American imperialism" to local reactionary forces, particularly landowners and "every form and remnant of feudalism". Referring to Palestine, the Comintern noted "the deception of the working classes of that oppressed nation by Entente imperialism and the bourgeoisie of the country in question pooling their efforts (in the same way that Zionism in general actually delivers the Arab working population of Palestine, where Jewish workers only form a minority, to exploitation by England, under the cloak of the creation of a Jewish state in Palestine)."

In the same year, at the Baku Congress of the Peoples of the East, the Comintern argued that Britain, "acting for the benefit of Anglo-Jewish capitalists", drove a wedge between Arabs and Jews. First, it drove "Arabs from the land in order to give the latter to Jewish settlers; then, trying to appease the discontent of the Arabs, it incited them against these same Jewish settlers, sowing discord, enmity and hatred between all the communities, weakening both in order that it may itself rule and command."[8]

These formulations outlined opposition to British imperial rule, condemnation of Zionism in itself but also and primarily for its alliance with imperialism, and exposure of Arab and Islamic forces that collaborated with imperialism. At the same time, many questions that would give rise to intense debates in subsequent years were left open: Did the partnership between Zionism and imperialism serve primarily imperial interests, settler interests or capitalist interests? Were such interests always compatible? When they clashed, what were the implications for progressive forces? Which Arab forces were allies of the revolutionary movement and which its opponents? How should Jewish settlers be treated, as implacable enemies or as potential partners of revolutionary forces?

The rise of a local communist movement in Palestine gave rise to additional challenges. Most members of the Palestinian Communist Party (PCP) were Eastern European Jews who had arrived in Palestine after The Balfour Declaration of 1917. They joined the settler-dominated new *Yishuv* emerging at the time, though as dissidents rather than followers of mainstream politics. Arab nationalists ignored internal Jewish disputes and regarded all new immigrants as intruders. A change in the composition and orientation of the Party was thus essential, to allow it to be accepted as a legitimate local force. The basic contradiction the Party faced was that it was an anti-imperialist force, drawing support from a community that existed and grew thanks to the same imperial force that the Party regarded as its main enemy.

The way out of the dilemma was an approach known as *Yishuvism*. It rejected Zionism as a political movement and an ideology, while accepted the *Yishuv* as a legitimate community which would continue to grow due to immigration. This strategy aimed to radicalize Jewish immigrants and push them beyond Zionism, while demonstrating to Palestinians that Jews could become allies in a joint struggle against the British.[9] *Yishuvism* – referred to as 'anti-Zionist Zionism' or 'Zionism without Zionism' – increasingly clashed with the main thrust of the Comintern line, which supported "any national revolutionary movement against imperialism" and aimed to mobilize the colonial masses in an "anti-imperialist united front" for national liberation.[10] The Party had to distance itself from the *Yishuv* in order to gain support from the Palestinian-Arab community. This led to an acrimonious debate over the policy of indigenization, known in the local context as Arabization.

The first task for the PCP in the Arabization campaign was "to intensify its activity among the urban Arab proletariat and peasantry", and help them organize to fight Zionism and imperialism.[11] The Comintern repeatedly noted that the Party suffered from 'hypertrophy' in directing its energy to Jewish workers and 'atrophy' in its work among Arab workers and peasants. It urged a course of action that involved "linking the interests of the daily struggle of the Arab toilers with the interests of the daily struggle of the Jewish proletariat, while waging a systematic campaign against Arab and Jewish chauvinism and pooling Jewish and Arab workers into a joint organized fight against the class enemy".[12]

This was not a neutral position between Zionism and Arab nationalism; the Party clearly sided with the latter and prioritized the fight against British rule. Working with left Arab nationalist elements, and also with progressive Jewish workers, was a way of combining an anti-colonial agenda with a socialist class perspective. The two were seen as theoretically compatible, even if reconciling them in practice proved difficult, with Jewish workers showing no interest in opposing British rule. The balance needed to sustain such efforts collapsed, however, when increasing tensions between the organized Jewish and Arab communities led to country-wide violent clashes in August 1929, in which hundreds of civilians were killed. The Party was caught unaware by these events and found itself in difficulty, no longer able to distance itself from the nationalist passions that engulfed the country. The Comintern, experiencing the fervour of the 'Third Period' with its expectations of revolutionary insurrections in the colonial world, used the clashes to push forward Arabization in a decisive manner.[13]

A letter sent by the Comintern to Party members in 1930 asserted that the "Jewish bourgeoisie is the main agent of British imperialism in Palestine", and "counter-revolutionary Zionism is the main system of British imperialism in the country". Imperialism made "the Jewish national minority, which immigrated into the country, into an instrument of oppression of the indigenous Arab population. Zionism, resting on British imperial spears, positioned the Jewish national minority, as a privileged layer, against the Arabs. Zionism thus exposed its true nature as an expression of the Jewish bourgeoisie's desires for exploitation, expansionist nationalism and oppression".[14] It went on to call for a revolutionary struggle of Jewish and Arab workers "for the national independence of Palestine as an Arab country, a struggle against imperialism, Zionism and their Arab allies." Only on the basis of an anti-imperialist and agrarian revolution "can the victory of the Arab masses, as well as the rights of the Jewish national minority in Palestine, be guaranteed."[15]

The Party congress later that year emphasized the colonial aspect of the conflict. It offered a sharp criticism of the leadership as having lived in a "Jewish ghetto" and having failed to

define the Jews in Palestine as a “special dominant minority”: it overestimated the role of the Jewish minority as a progressive and anti-colonial force and underestimated revolutionary developments among Arabs, whose national struggle acquired “a special form”. The Party had to “expose the true aims of the Jewish [Zionist] bourgeoisie and its being, together with the Jewish national minority in Palestine that fell under its influence, the main instrument of oppression wielded by the English occupiers against the indigenous Arab population”. Only by joining the struggle against colonialism and Zionism, led by Arab workers, could Jewish workers expect to resolve the Jewish problem, realize their rights as a national minority in Palestine, and revive their national cultural heritage.[16]

With some differences due to historical contexts, this position was almost identical to that adopted by the Comintern in 1928 regarding South Africa, calling on the Communist Party there to “orientate itself chiefly upon the native toiling masses while continuing to work actively among the white workers. The Party leadership must be developed in the same sense. This can only be achieved by bringing the native membership without delay into much more active leadership of the Party both locally and centrally … the Communist Party of South Africa must combine the fight against all anti-native laws with the general political slogan in the fight against British domination, the slogan of an independent native South African republic as a stage towards a workers' and peasants' republic, with full equal rights for all races, black, coloured and white.”

All this was based on the notion that South Africa was “a black country, the majority of its population is black and so is the majority of the workers and peasants”. Thus, the white masses “must realise that in South Africa they constitute national minorities, and it is their task to support and fight jointly with the native masses against the white bourgeoisie and the British imperialists.”[17]

With its new positions the PCP moved closer to the Arab nationalist mainstream, a process that continued through much of the 1930s, but was reversed – as it was in South Africa – with the rise of Popular Front policies. These focused on the need to fight Fascism by tempering anti-colonial policies and forming alliances with the national bourgeoisie. But, in a country with different national groups in conflict with each other and in complex relations with colonial forces, this principle led to radically different directions. Many Jewish activists moved towards identification with the *Yishuv* (and the Jewish national bourgeoisie), others moved in an opposite direction to join the Palestinian-Arab movement led by Amin al-Husseini (embodying the Arab national bourgeoisie), and still others – Arab intellectuals and activists – supported the national movement but not its leadership, which they regarded as feudal and reactionary. They formed the National Liberation League (NLL), a left-wing party, which did not identify itself formally as communist.

For the NLL, Palestine was an Arab country fighting for independence from foreign rule. Jews residing there deserved equal rights as a minority group, but had no collective political claim to the country. Like the PCP, and unlike all other Palestinian Arab political forces, the League distinguished clearly between the Zionist movement and the Jewish community. It regarded the former as colonial and reactionary, and the latter as a community with internal class divisions and diverse interests, some of which could be reconciled with those of Arabs. The struggle was against the leadership of the community, not its masses. An independent Palestine would allow all its residents equal participation: Arabs were the majority but the country would be democratic and would grant rights to members of all ethnic or national groups.[18]

Whether Jews had *national* rights, in addition to *civil* rights, was not clear. On the one hand, the League argued in 1945 that "in our approach to the problem we accept the responsibility of laying down plans to safeguard the national interests of the Arab people living in the country while guaranteeing at the same time, and not in contradiction, full civil rights and democratic freedom for the Jewish community now residing in Palestine." This formulation seems to distinguish between the two groups' rights. But, they continued, "We recognize the right of the Jewish community to develop whatever legitimate just national interests, Jews living under a democratic regime would be eager to realize".[19] The content of these national interests and the form they might take was not specified. At the same time, the PCP was moving towards integration within the *Yishuv*, advocating a vision based on "the principle of equal right of Jews and Arabs for free national, economic and cultural development, without artificial interruptions and in mutual cooperation and brotherhood of nations".[20] In 1946 it defined Palestine as a bi-national country, in which Jews and Arabs lived together and had no separate territorial basis; partition thus was not a viable option.

The distinct political identity of Jews was recognised by all political trends in the country: Arab nationalists saw it as an outcome of a colonial process that should be reversed. The NLL agreed that the problem was colonial in origin, but asserted that the process was irreversible and therefore Jews deserved individual equality within an Arab country. The PCP took a step further and accepted the legitimacy of the *Yishuv*, to be accommodated as a national group. Meanwhile, the Soviet Union – the patron of both parties – moved to recognize "that the population of Palestine consists of two peoples, the Arabs and the Jews. Both have historical roots in Palestine. Palestine has become the homeland of both these peoples." A just solution would create "an independent, dual, democratic, homogeneous Arab-Jewish State … based on equality of rights for the Jewish and the Arab populations". But, added Andrei Gromyko, Soviet ambassador to the UN in May 1947, deteriorating relations between Jews and Arabs may require "the partition of Palestine into two independent autonomous States, one Jewish and one Arab."[21]

The support for partition of Palestine became the basis for the eventual re-unification of the two parties as the Israeli Communist Party. It also caused a decade-long split between Arab nationalists and communists. Nationalists regarded Israel as a foreign implant in the region, serving to prevent Arab unity and entrench Western domination. Communists opposed the presence and role of the UK and USA, but Arab political unity was not high on their agenda, and neither was the restoration of an Arab Palestine. With the collapse of Palestinian Arab society in 1948, the focus of these movements shifted to regional inter-state relations. Neither of them put forward an anti-apartheid vision that went beyond nationalism to embrace the rights and struggles of all people in a unitary political framework, regardless of their origins. The intensity of the conflict and the growing consolidation of boundaries between groups as a result made such a vision almost impossible to contemplate.

The Post-1948 Period: Fragmentation and Dispersal

The 1948 war led to the destruction of Palestinian society and the dispersal of many of its members in different countries (a process that became known as the *Nakba*). Three different political arenas were created as a result, each with its own demographic composition and political status:

- Israel as a Jewish state, including the remnants of the Arab majority now turned into a minority subject to various legal restrictions but with basic citizenship rights.

- The rest of Palestine, divided into two parts: the West Bank incorporated into Jordan and the Gaza Strip under Egyptian military rule. Their population included the original residents as well as refugees who were displaced from their homes in the areas that became Israel.
- The rest of the refugees, dispersed to various Arab countries and devoid of citizenship rights except for those living in Jordan.

While Palestinians retained their overall ethnic identity and regarded themselves as members of the same national community, of necessity their organization reflected the different political frameworks within which they found themselves. From 1948 onwards we cannot refer to a unified Palestinian struggle without differentiating between its diverse settings. Of most importance in this context is the need of all sections of the people to create new political structures and design new approaches in order to address the challenges of dispersal and fragmentation and to cope with the new conditions.

Palestinians – and Arabs more broadly – were affected by the events of 1948 and the need to learn their lessons and to prepare for new challenges. An important role in this process of reflection was played by a book written in the midst of the war by the Syrian historian Constantine Zurayq. The book's title, *The Meaning of the Nakba*, was the first time the term was used for the 1948 defeat, and it caught on as the standard term for it.[22]

Zurayq bemoaned the lack of national unity, dedicated leadership, public commitment and willingness to sacrifice all for the sake of victory. The remedy in his view consisted first of all in heightening the sense of danger represented by Zionism, worse than imperialism or neo-colonial domination. The latter were a temporary evil, while Zionism was “the greatest danger to the being of the Arabs”, threatening “the very center of Arab being, its entirety, the foundation of its existence”. All media resources must “intensify in the souls of all Arabs an awareness of the danger … so that every thought which we have and every action which we perform will be influenced by this feeling”, reinforcing the will to struggle as that “of one ready to die”.[23]

In addition to such psychological preparation, there was a need for mobilization of military and economic resources, increased efforts to unify the Arabs politically, and gain diplomatic support, and involve the popular masses in the process, all in readiness for “total war, not confined to troops in the field of battle, but involving all the people; not content with some of the resources of the nation, but demanding the mobilization of all them in their totality”. If such mobilization forces the Arabs to halt projects for reform and “building up our countries internally”, and using resources meant for public works, education and agriculture, “in fact all the income of the Arab states – above the minimum necessary for living – so be it!”. Nothing is of any value if the Zionists win and are allowed to “sink their fangs into the body of the Arab nation”.[24]

The way forward then, according to Zurayq, was for the Arabs to match the success of the Zionists by using their example and adopting a progressive, modern, scientific, technologically advanced, committed, participatory and united attitude towards the national struggle. The extent to which these ideas served as a basis for Arab and Palestinian nationalist mobilization in the post-48 period will be explored in the following sections. It is important to look at Zurayq's contribution on both of its contradictory aspects: a call for modernization and against tribalism, dynastic rule and religious prejudices on the one hand, and a call for militarization and sacrifice of development for the sake of nationalist gains on the other.

1. The 'Internal' Palestinians

The smallest part of the Palestinian-Arab people remained within Israeli state boundaries, approximately 15% of the total population of Palestinians and a slightly higher proportion of the Israeli population. Left after the war bereft of leadership – most officials of the national movement had left the country before or were expelled during the war – it lived through the first decade of statehood in a survival mode, seeking to safeguard its existence and avoid expulsion. Initially, its electoral representation consisted largely of government-sponsored lists of 'notables' who did not challenge the discriminatory and oppressive policies to which Palestinians were subjected.

The only legal expression of protest politics went through the Israeli Communist Party (Maki). Former leading members of the NLL – Emil Touma, Tawfik Toubi, Emil Habibi – joined Maki and made a it a prominent voice for the concerns of Palestinian citizens. They could play that role in Israel because Maki never identified as an Arab nationalist party: the majority of leaders and members were Jews, though the proportion of Arabs increased over the years to become a majority by the mid-1960s. Even then Maki retained a Jewish-Arab identity and never considered itself as part of an Arab national movement. It did not openly challenge the notion of Israel as a Jewish state nor did it offer a radical conceptualization of the relations between different groups, although it called for equality to all citizens. It raised the social and civil concerns of Palestinians, and bravely confronted the regime on their behalf, but it worked more to reform the ideological and political system than to transform it (a task that was far beyond its capacity in any event). This caused tensions between Maki and other dissident forces.

Arab regimes and nationalist movements in Palestine and elsewhere in the Middle East suffered a humiliating defeat in 1948. For at least a decade after that the shock-waves of the defeat were still felt, leading to a series of military coups and popular uprisings, and shaping the contours of politics in the region for decades to come. Palestinians were affected in a differentiated manner, depending on their geographical and political position. The one factor uniting all of them in the region was the rise of a new strand of Arab nationalism associated with the leadership of Egypt's president Nasser. The manifestation of this regional movement in Israel emerged in the second half of the 1950s, independently of the Communist Party and at times in opposition to it. It became consolidated as the *al-Ard* [The Land] movement.

While Maki had to reconcile the global Soviet policy imperatives with the local concerns of its constituencies, Arab nationalists could pursue the ideal of Arab unity in a single-minded manner, as the key to the liberation of Palestine. Opposition to Western attempts to form military alliances with friendly Arab regimes – especially the Baghdad Pact of the mid-late 1950s – provided a common political denominator for pro-Soviet and Arab nationalist forces in the region. This proved a short-lived affair, however. The growing influence of Nasserism, with its quest for national unity under Egyptian hegemony, led to the formation of the United Arab Republic (UAR) in 1958 as a result of a merger between Egypt and Syria. Attempts to extend the union to Iraq under a new government led by General Qasim were not successful. Restrictions on the activities of the Communist Party in the UAR, and the openness of the new Iraqi regime to the local Communist Party, gave rise to conflict on a regional scale that affected Palestinian politics as well.

Nationalist activists, who had cooperated with Maki to create a broad Popular Front in order to defend Palestinian citizens' rights, split in 1959 to form a new movement. Operating under

the name of *al-Ard*, the movement aimed to provide an undiluted voice for Palestinians in Israel and assert their links to the rest of the Palestinian people and the Arab nation. It saw the solution to the Palestinian issue within the framework of broader Arab unity, under Nasser's leadership. Like the Communist Party it called for civil equality, return of or compensation for refugees, and Palestinian self-determination, and there was little to tell them apart in this respect. But, it operated without relying on internal Jewish or external Soviet support. This independence from any source of 'legitimate' authority (from the Israeli state's point of view) doomed its chances to work legally and grow as a party competing with Maki for the support of Palestinian citizens. The intense repression it faced from state agencies forced it to close down its operations but its legacy continued to inspire younger activists.

Although the movement published little by way of programmatic guidelines, two documents allow us to identify its key positions: a memorandum to the Secretary-General of the UN and a submission to the High Court of Justice, appealing the state's decision to prohibit its registration. The UN 1964 letter asserted that “the Arabs in Israel are part of the Palestinian Arabs who are an integral part of the Whole Arab nation”. They demanded “total equality for all citizens” and an “end to discrimination and oppression”, within the context of the UN Palestine partition resolution of 1947. Israel must adopt “a policy of non-alignment, positive neutralism and peaceful coexistence” within the region, and recognize the Arab national movement and its quest for unity and socialism as “the most progressive and reliable force on which the future of the region depends”.

Two issues were of specific concern: the systematic campaign of land expropriation, which led to Arab villages losing the bulk of their possessions, and the policy of political oppression – directed at activists as well as the general population – which made it difficult to organize and fight for their rights. Military rule and the use of Emergency Regulations (a relic from British times) were particularly harmful. The UN was called upon to intervene, since neither the legal system nor Jewish public opinion and the mainstream press offered assistance in fighting inequalities of that nature. This was needed because “The authorities are waging an uncomparable mean and violent campaign of terror, persecution and discrimination against the Arabs who are, in spite of all false allegations, the first legitimate owners of the country.”[25]

In its articles of association, *al-Ard*'s key goal was “To find a just solution for the Palestine question, considering it a whole and indivisible unit, in accordance with the wishes of the Palestinian Arab people; a solution which meets its interests and desires, restores it to its political existence, ensures its full legal rights, and regards it as the first possessor of the right to decide its own fate for itself, within the framework of the supreme wishes of the Arab nation”.[26] Other goals included support for liberation, unity and socialism in the Arab world, and support for all progressive anti-imperialist movements in the world, and the oppressed peoples fighting for their liberation.

Looking at these goals, the High Court decided to reject the appeal against the State's refusal to register *al-Ard* as an association. It ruled that the movement's goals amounted to opposition not only to government policies but also to the mere existence of the State of Israel and the Jewish national presence in it. The Court argued that national minorities had a right to equality, and to maintain cultural and ethnic identification with the broader Arab world. But, the insistence that a solution must realize the wishes of Palestinians as the sole group with the right to determine their own fate and the future of the country was code for denying the rights of the Israeli state and its Jewish population. In addition, the Court claimed, Arab national

unity and socialism were another code for support for the Nasser-led Arab national movement denying Israel's existence. In other words, in the Court's view, both the local and regional meanings of the movement's programme were a disguise for its wish to destroy the regime rather than change it.[27]

It must be recognized that the positions of *al-Ard* were indeed ambiguous regarding the core issues of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. It chose a a legal course of action, shunned violence and sought to operate through the established political channels. At the same time, it challenged the foundations of the Israeli state ethos and its dominant Jewish identity. It aligned itself in an unqualified manner with regional Arab nationalism and local Palestinian-Arab identity and, unlike Maki, made no attempt to dilute these with talk about class or other possible bases of commonality with Jewish groups. Its aim was to uplift a specific segment of the population, an oppressed minority that was part of a large regional majority and itself had been part of a local majority before 1948. There was little possibility of a meaningful Jewish-Arab front at that time, before Palestinians re-established their identity and organization on an independent basis. In our terms, it was premature to form an anti-apartheid perspective due to the prior imperative of resurrecting the political existence of Palestinians from the passivity and despair into which they were thrown as a result of the 1948 defeat.

To understand all this we must consider the historical context. In contrast to the national leadership during the pre-1948 Mandate period, *al-Ard* operated from a basis of weakness and marginality, acting as a voice for a community constantly under threat. Although Palestinian citizens survived the Nakba by staying put in their communities, they knew their position was not secure, and that elements of the Israeli political and security establishment wanted to subject them to intensified oppression, bordering on the expulsion of 'subversive' elements. They were cautious to avoid arrest and other forms of harassment by state agencies, and the 1956 massacre of dozens of civilians in Kafr Qasim was probably still fresh on their minds. Their approach was defensive in nature; they realized they stood no chance against state power on their own. The rest of the Palestinian people were recovering still from the 1948 defeat and the only force that could potentially come to their help – the Arab national movement – was beyond the borders, not in a position to intervene directly in Israeli affairs.

2. The 'external' Palestinians

Arab nationalism was the dominant political trend among other segments of the Palestinian people, refugees and those living in the West Bank and Gaza. They did not wait for Nasser to raise the banner of the movement. In fact, the most important organization – like *al-Ard*, more for its legacy than for its concrete achievements – was the Arab Nationalists Movement (ANM, *al-Qawmiyyun al-Arab*). Formed by students at the American University of Beirut in the early 1950s, inspired by Zurayq's teachings, it aimed to create a revolutionary alternative to the parochial movements that failed to defend their people against Zionism and liberate them from Western rule. It was a pan-Arab movement in composition and orientation but, not surprisingly, Palestinians played an important role in it: as stateless activists they found it easy to identify with a movement that organized across states and national boundaries.

The persons associated above all with the movement were George Habash and Wadi' Haddad, Palestinian activists who found themselves in exile after 1948. Particularly in Lebanon and Jordan, the movement enjoyed substantial support from refugees, appealing to them with its focus on return and vengeance. But, although the liberation of Palestine was the main concern of its founders, they focused more on the broad Arab scene: they regarded Arab unity and

independence from foreign rule as a precondition for waging a successful campaign against Israel. In the words of Haddad: “The way to Tel Aviv is through Damascus, Baghdad, Amman, and Cairo”.[28]

Initially, in the early-mid 1950s the ANM repeated themes to be found in Amin al-Husseini's rhetoric. The cause of conflict was defined as “the constant aspiration of the Jews to conquer Palestine and establish their own government”, representing “a danger equivalent to absolute extermination”, which “will not stop within its present borders but will fight a fierce battle against our people”. Although imperialism was clearly a problem in the region, the main danger was the Jewish political movement, which enjoyed the support of many countries and the wealth and resources of International Judaism. To fight it effectively, the problems that caused the 1948 defeat had to be overcome: “the deterioration and corruption of our national conditions, represented in the fragmentation of the homeland, the dominance of imperialism and its allies, the weakness and disintegration of our social existence, and the predominance of the reactionary conceptions among Arab individuals”.[29]

Subsequently the movement became involved deeply in the question of Arab unity, expressed through merger attempts between different countries, and the question of Palestine receded to the background. At the same time, an internal debate started moving it to the left, leading to a new emphasis on social issues: “The age in which the movement of Arab nationalism was separated from the progressive social revolution has ended … There is no longer a political national question standing separately and posing against a specific social question called 'the workers question' or 'the peasants question; or 'the question of social progress'. The Arab question has come to mean an overall revolutionary concept which is the melting-pot of the national, political, economic and social ambitions of the progressive Arab masses”.[30] The debate was not directly related to the Palestinian struggle, but it was the beginning of greater concern with global issues within Arab activist circles, heralding the rise of a political trend that saw links between local, regional and international struggles.

By the mid-1960s, a renewed focus on Palestine had become evident, although it was seen – as before – within a broader regional context: “Our struggle for Palestine is at the very heart of our struggle for the realization of the [Arab nation's] objectives: unity, liberation, socialism, and the redemption of Palestine”.[31] Yezid Sayigh characterises this approach by saying “Palestine was now the means, Arab unity the end”, but as it turned out, Palestine increasingly became prominent as an end in itself while Arab unity faced irreversible decline. It is no coincidence, of course, that the ANM's shift towards Palestine came at the same time that *al-Ard* intensified its activities inside Israel, the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) was established by the Arab League and *Fatah* launched its first military operations.

The generation of 'The Children of the *Nakba'* came of age in those years, having recovered from the defeat of its elders and rediscovered Palestinian local patriotism embedded within pan-Arab nationalism. Different organizational forms manifested themselves in its various arenas, all sharing an assertion of an overall Palestinian-Arab identity, a rejection of Zionism (usually without distinguishing it clearly from Judaism), and a focus on mass mobilization as essential to the restoration of the homeland. All this was accompanied by new analyses of Israel as a colonial phenomenon.

The establishment of the PLO in 1964 symbolized these concerns. Although it was part of an initiative from above, driven by Egypt as a leader of the Arab League, it reflected a growing demand by Palestinians in the West Bank and Gaza, and the Arab Diaspora, to take charge of

their own affairs and embark on a struggle to reclaim their rights. Even forces sceptical of the Arab states and their power politics saw in the event an opportunity to galvanize the masses, and gain support for the Palestinian cause in the region and globally.

The founding document of the PLO, the Palestinian National Charter, outlined the consensus existing at the time in the Arab world. It spoke in the name of the “the Palestinian Arab people”, who struggled against “the forces of international Zionism and colonialism”, which sought to “conspire and worked to displace it, dispossess it from its homeland and property”. The principles guiding the Organization were that “Palestine is an Arab homeland bound by strong Arab national ties to the rest of the Arab Countries and which together form the great Arab homeland”, and that it was an “indivisible territorial unit”. The Palestinian Arab people had “the legitimate right to its homeland and is an inseparable part of the Arab Nation.” It would determine its country's destiny “when it completes the liberation of its homeland in accordance with its own wishes and free will and choice.”[32]

The Palestinians were “those Arab citizens who were living normally in Palestine up to 1947, whether they remained or were expelled.” There was a place for “Jews of Palestinian origin”, if they were “willing to live peacefully and loyally in Palestine”. While the Palestinian people firmly believed in Arab unity, “in order to play its role in realizing this goal, it must, at this stage of its struggle, preserve its Palestinian personality and all its constituents. It must strengthen the consciousness of its existence and stance and stand against any attempt or plan that may weaken or disintegrate its personality.” Arab unity and the liberation of Palestine were “two complementary goals; each prepares for the attainment of the other. Arab unity leads to the liberation of Palestine, and the liberation of Palestine leads to Arab unity. Working for both must go side by side.”

The rejection of Zionism must be total since it was “a colonialist movement in its inception, aggressive and expansionist in its goal, racist in its configurations, and fascist in its means and aims. Israel, in its capacity as the spearhead of this destructive movement and as the pillar of colonialism, is a permanent source of tension and turmoil in the Middle East, in particular, and to the international community in general. Because of this, the people of Palestine are worthy of the support and sustenance of the community of nations.”

There can be no doubt that this was a document thoroughly steeped in nationalism, undiluted by any class or social concerns, and asserting Palestinian and Arab exclusive rights to the country and region. The Charter did not approach the issue from a potentially universal recognition of individual rights but from the standpoint of a national group denied and dispossessed of its particular historical rights, and now seeking to restore them. The contrast with the guiding principle of the Freedom Charter, adopted by the 1955 Congress of the People – 'South Africa belongs to all who live it, Black and White' – is striking.

The Palestinian Charter rejected explicitly the notion of common ownership of the country, and protagonists were defined only in collective terms – 'the People', 'the Nation', seen as entities moving through history in an unchanged form – rather than as people who may be clustered into groups but derive their rights as individuals. Of course, such discourse is common to all nationalist movements; it is the non-racial South African anti-apartheid movement rather that stands out in this respect. Palestinian-Arab nationalism was not unique in giving priority to the nation as a collective actor, but its attempt to regain a country from which the bulk of its adherents had been physically excluded was indeed very unusual.

Precisely this distinct feature of the Palestine issue was addressed in a landmark study in the following year, perhaps the first serious scholarly discussion of Zionism from a Palestinian perspective: “Though they have openly disdained the ‘natives’, ruthlessly suppressed them, and methodically discriminated against them, European colonists have as a rule deemed the continued presence of the indigenous populations ‘useful’ for the colonists themselves; and, as such, they have reserved for the ‘natives’ all the menial functions and assigned to them inferior [position] in the settler-dominated societies.” Jewish settlers in Palestine “have found it necessary to follow a different course, more in harmony with their ideological system”, a course followed “nowhere in Asia or Africa – not even in South Africa or Rhodesia”.

As long as they were “powerless to *dislodge* the indigenous Arabs of Palestine (the vast majority of the country’s population)”, settlers focused on “*isolating themselves* from the Arab community and instituting a systematic boycott of Arab produce and labor.” But, “*boycotting* the Arabs of Palestine instead of *evicting* them from their country was, however, only a tactical and temporary suspension of the Zionist dogma”. The aim remained evicting Arabs from Palestine to enable “the incarnation of the principle of racial exclusiveness”. This was put into effect with the “racial elimination” of 1948 (the Nakba). The remnants of Palestine's Arabs under Israeli rule were subjected to racial discrimination “of the kind already made famous by other racist European colonists elsewhere in Asia and Africa.”[33]

The eviction of the bulk of the indigenous population in 1948 was the unique predicament of Palestinians and it shaped their strategy ever since. It was responsible for their reliance on the Arab world, as a territorial and logistical resource, and for their adherence to pan-Arab nationalism. With Nasserism on the ascendancy, in the 1950s and early 1960s, it was possible to hope that a powerful Arab front could challenge Israel from a position of strength. But, the collapse of the UAR in 1961, and subsequent intra-regional clashes, forced a re-think of that strategy. Nasser's reluctance to confront Israeli militarily before the Arabs were ready, made many young Palestinian activists feel they had to take the initiative themselves. Discussions in the Arab League over the issue of a Palestinian Entity seemed a lip service to the goal of liberation and an attempt to exploit the plight of Palestinians to further narrow Arab political interests. Even the creation of the PLO was seen in large part as manipulation by Arab states. As Abu Iyad claimed in 1969, “the purpose of the Organisation was to absorb the discontent which had begun to permeate all sections of the Palestinian people and to give expression to the Palestinian people's unrest and its determination to build a Palestinian national revolutionary movement ... at first an attempt to circumvent this true revolutionary unrest”.[34]

Against this background emerged the most important movement of the period: *Fatah* – the Palestinian National Liberation Movement (which was not part of the PLO at the time). What made *Fatah* distinct were three principles:

- First, its single-minded focus on Palestine. Arab unity, socialism, Islam, class struggle, and other issues were of interest only to the extent that they served the Palestinian cause.
- Second, its aim to mobilize the Palestinian masses and involve them directly in the process of their own liberation. In this sense it was different from the PLO, which was primarily a diplomatic structure within the Arab state system, and the ANM which was self-consciously an elitist organization. *Fatah* was particularly concerned not to let Arab regimes manipulate the Palestine issue to serve their own goals.
- Third, it advocated armed struggle as its core strategy, the only way to liberate the country, drawing primarily on the Algerian, Vietnamese and Cuban examples.

In all these respects *Fatah* put forwards a new approach that quickly gained ground and eventually became the dominant force in the national movement. It appealed to Palestinians to take control of their own affairs: the movement must "originate directly with Palestinians and not be linked to any particular Arab country … it must be a comprehensive movement that would start operating from all Arab countries simultaneously in order the engage the enemy on all fronts". It is interested in practical activities not empty rhetoric because "the Palestinian people no longer believe in talk and speeches. All they want is to see action".[35]

And action must be radical: "The only way to regain the robbed homeland is an organized revolutionary movement, unaffiliated, a movement that flows from the heart of the Palestinian people, that will spring from all the territories surrounding the occupied land simultaneously". It aims to realize one goal: "For us, the Arabs of Palestine, this is the primary goal above all others. Every revolutionary group in the Arab homeland must recognize the revolutionary significance of the willingness of the Arabs of Palestine to stand at the forefront of the Arab struggle for the liberation of their homeland". In their actions, the Palestinian vanguard will open the way to liberation and unity of all Arabs.[36]

The model for the struggle was regional as well as global: "Revolutions all over the world are inspiring us. The revolution in Algeria lights our way like a bright torch of hope. When the Algerians took up their revolution in 1954, they were only some hundred Arabs facing 20,000 French troops and well-armed settlers .... The revolution in Algeria proved to us that a people can organize itself and build its military strength in the very process of fighting".[37] Frequent references to Cuba and Vietnam appeared in *Fatah*'s publications, as it saw itself as a militant alternative to the PLO's sedate style of action, which was coupled with bombastic rhetoric (for which its leader – Ahmad Shuqeiri – was notorious). Having opened an office in Algiers in 1962 *Fatah* used it to establish links with other liberation movements and militants, such as the Vietcong, Che Guevara, and those fighting Portuguese colonialism in Africa.[38]

The specific question of how the Algerian example could help in dealing with the question of settlers was not raised at the time. In his classical study of Israel as a colonial state, written just before the 1967 war, French Author Maxime Rodinson argued that "the colonial origins of the Algerian *Pieds Noirs* did not prevent the FLN from recognizing their rights". They were not expelled but left the country because of their refusal to adapt. And, "no one speaks of chasing the whites out of South Africa because of their colonial origins. They are asked simply to coexist with the Blacks as equals".[39] How this attitude applied in the Israeli case was a question not answered by *Fatah*. Like all Palestinian organizations it did not follow the course taken by the ANC in South Africa, making a distinction between the apartheid regime, seen as the enemy, and the settler population, some of which members were allies in the struggle against the regime. As Nelson Mandela said in 1964: "Above all, we want equal political rights, because without them our disabilities will be permanent … It is not true that the enfranchisement of all will result in racial domination. Political division, based on colour, is entirely artificial and, when it disappears, so will the domination of one colour group by another. The ANC has spent half a century fighting against racialism. When it triumphs it will not change that policy".[40]

Rodinson pointed out that "the relations between the Israelis and the Arabs have in fact been less relations of exploitation than of domination", but that fact did not diminish their colonial character. This raised a crucial issue, which has little to do with theoretical definitions of colonialism. When indigenous people are not exploited by settlers, they become redundant, and therefore targets for dispossession and dislocation. Palestinians in 1948 were displaced

from their homes and replaced by new Jewish immigrants. This situation gave rise to two strategic questions: how would Palestinians gain re-entry into the territory from which they had been physically excluded, and how they would deal with the people who took their place. These questions became even more critical in the period opened in June 1967.

The Post-1967 Period: Occupation and Diplomacy

The June 1967 was a turning point in more ways than one: it created Greater Israel, which has retained its boundaries to this day. It re-unified Palestinians citizens of Israel with residents of the West Bank and Gaza, but subjected them to different legal systems with the latter living under military occupation. It separated the refugees in Arab countries from those remaining within the pre-1948 boundaries. It dealt a severe blow to Nasserist Arab nationalism, which was proven unable to follow up on its stated commitments with action in the battlefield and, at the same time, gave rise to a new wave of armed opposition to Israel in the shape of a large number of Palestinian resistance organizations. Following in the footsteps of *Fatah*, these organizations gained mass support as a fresh and viable alternative to the incompetent and corrupt Arab regimes, and within a few months they managed to take over the PLO leadership.

It seemed that once again a huge gap opened up between the verbal threats and promises made by the Arab regimes and their actual capacity to act upon them. Particularly notorious in this respect was the PLO leader, Ahmad Shuqeiri, who was blamed by many – including Palestinian activists – for playing a major role in the defeat of 1967 (termed Naksa – setback – as opposed to the 1948 Nakba). In a series of interviews, speeches and press conferences, Shuqieri used fiery rhetoric, bordering on threats of genocide against Jews in Israel, which helped mobilize international public opinion on the side of Israel and legitimize its military actions. Voice of the Arabs, an Egyptian state radio station, played a similar role inciting for war and celebrating imaginary victories in the battlefield. Another wave of self-reflection opened up after the war, including a contribution by Constantine Zurayq titled “the Meaning of the Nakba Revisited”, in which he reasserted the need for adopting modern civilization, forging internal unity and increasing the role of science and education, at the expense of religion, as the basis for a national revival.

Beyond regional developments, the war was a global event with far-reaching implications. The radical anti-Zionist Israeli organization *Matzpen* provided the first analysis setting the war in such a context. It identified the 1950s as a decade of progressive victories: “Anti-imperialist forces came to power in many countries in Asia and Africa, and the direct presence of the colonial powers was considerably reduced in these continents. The forces of imperialism were retreating.” In the Middle East this was reflected in the outcome of the Suez war of 1956, the rise of Nasser to global prominence and the retreat of European colonial powers. However the 1960s witnessed a backlash: “American imperialism became a 'world gendarme'; in many countries reactionary coups d’etat took place – inspired, instigated and financed by the United States Central Intelligence Agency – which succeeded in overthrowing anti-imperialist governments”. Recent and ongoing attempts to replace anti-imperialist regimes took place in Congo, Cuba, Vietnam, the Dominican Republic, and so on. As a part of its 'global offensive', the US tried to overthrow the left-wing Ba'ath regime in Syria, and Israel went along for its own interests. Nasser fell into a trap of defending Syria and found himself pulled, against his better judgement, into a war for which Egypt was ill-prepared. The result was a massive defeat and a great victory for the USA/Israel (though it must be recognized that the overlapping interests of the two parties were not identical).[41]

1. The Armed Palestinian Resistance

Few people anticipated at the time that the discrediting of Nasser, the Arab regimes and Shuqeiri would open the way to new modes of resistance, locally as well as globally. The right-wing backlash against liberation forces (which included growing repression in South Africa, with thousands of anti-apartheid activists imprisoned or driven underground and into exile), achieved success but unleashed a counter-backlash of its own. The mid-late 1960s witnessed the rise of the New Left and student rebellions worldwide, campaigns in opposition to US war in Vietnam, the rise of the 'Third World' as a force challenging Western hegemony, and intensification of the struggle for racial equality in the West and against authoritarian regimes in Latin America and Eastern Europe. Both the South African anti-apartheid campaign and the Palestinian resistance fitted into this growing trend.

From a conceptual perspective, the two most important innovations introduced by Palestinians in the post-1967 period, somewhat in contradiction with one another, were the assertion of the role of armed struggle and the identification of a new goal for the movement, that of a secular democratic state that would grant equal rights to all its citizens, Muslims, Christians and Jews.

The revised Palestinian National Charter, adopted by the PLO in 1968, introduced a new notion: “Armed struggle is the only way to liberate Palestine. Thus it is the overall strategy, not merely a tactical phase. The Palestinian Arab people assert their absolute determination and firm resolution to continue their armed struggle and to work for an armed popular revolution for the liberation of their country and their return to it.” Resistance organizations (also referred to as commandos or *fedayeen*) , now in control of the PLO, called for a popular liberation war, which required “its escalation, comprehensiveness, and the mobilization of all the Palestinian popular and educational efforts and their organization and involvement in the armed Palestinian revolution.”[42] In this move, reflecting realities on the ground, the PLO aligned itself conceptually with other armed liberation struggles, Algeria and Vietnam above all. How to implement the strategy under geographical, demographic and social conditions that were very different from those other struggles remained an unresolved question and a challenge never met successfully.

The second innovation was perhaps even more important potentially. It opened the way to a re-conceptualization of the goal of the struggle and its agents. For the first time in its history the Palestinian movement recognized Jews residing in the country as legitimate members of the national community. That the definition regarded local Jews in religious terms rather than as a separate national group made it unappealing to Israeli Jews. Still, it was an important development that brought the Palestinian struggle closer to the anti-apartheid movement.

At the same time there were lingering ambiguities that marred the prospect of change. A *Fatah* document, *Towards a Democratic State in Palestine*, from September 1970, maintained that “All the Jews, Moslems and Christians living in Palestine or forcibly exiled from it will have the right to Palestinian citizenship. This applies to all Israelis, “provided, of course, that they reject Zionist racist chauvinism and fully agree to live as Palestinians in the new Palestine”. In support of this position, senior leader Abu Iyad was quoted to the effect that “not only progressive anti-Zionist Jews but even present Zionists willing to abandon their racist ideology will be welcome as Palestinian citizens”.[43]

Setting ideological criteria for citizenship, especially under conditions in which 99% of the

target population would fail, was not an encouraging sign, and neither was the statement that "the process of the revolution will inevitably increase the tempo of [Jewish] emigration, especially of those beneficiaries of a racist state who will find it very difficult to adapt to an open, plural society".[44] Even if the statement were meant merely as a prediction, it was likely to serve as a self-fulfilling prophecy. We must recognize though that this was the beginning of a shift that had been unthinkable for Arab opinion only a few years earlier. *Fatah* attributed the legitimacy of this new approach to the credibility it gained from its armed struggle, which shielded it from criticism for being too conciliatory towards Israelis: "Had this approach been made before *Fateh* had resorted to arms it would have been received under the then existing circumstances of recession by a strong attack from Arab opinion in general and Palestinian opinion in particular. Thus, this strategic approach has been made possible by the force of *Fateh* as a national liberation movement and political and military strength".[45] However, the expectation that if only Israeli Jews – especially those of Arab cultural origins – were offered the option of living as equals in a re-born Palestine, they would abandon Zionism, and sever the supposedly artificial bonds between Jews of different origins, proved delusional.[46]

After *Fatah*, the biggest Palestinian organization was the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine (PFLP), a successor organization to the Arab Nationalists Movement. Its founding document asserted that "the revolutionary masses must take their responsible leadership role in confronting the forces and weapons of imperialism and Zionism, which history has proved is the most effective weapon to crush all forms of colonial aggression and to give the initiative to the popular masses to formulate the future according to their will and interests". The armed resistance was "the only effective method that must be used by the popular masses in dealing with the Zionist enemy and all of its interests and its presence".

Palestinian resistance was the vanguard of the "Arab front", and the "Palestinian fighting masses on the occupied land are actors of the Arab revolutionary march against imperialism and its proxy forces." There was an "organic link between the struggle of the Palestinian people and the struggle of the masses of the Arab people", as well as "the struggle of the forces of revolution and progress in the world". Imperialism and Zionism were linked to forces of reaction. To confront them there was a need for a "coalition including all the forces of anti-imperialism in every part of the world."[47]

In a more analytical mode, the PFLP developed a strategy aimed at confronting the "organic unity between Israel and the Zionist movement on the one hand and world imperialism on the other".[48] This could be done by "the Palestinian revolution which is fused together with the Arab revolution and in alliance with world revolution is alone capable of achieving victory." This strategy of "the democratic national revolution in this age has become clear through the Vietnamese experience and before it the Cuban and Chinese experience." It relied on "armed struggle to overcome the enemy's technological superiority through a protracted war commencing with guerrilla warfare and developing into a popular liberation war". This did not simply mean copying the Vietnamese strategy, due to "the special nature of our battle both in respect of the nature of imperialist presence, represented by Israel, in our homeland, and in respect of the special nature of the land." How these special conditions would affect the reuiqred strategy was not outlined clearly, however.

Similarly, the need for "full alliance with all revolutionary forces on the world level", to create a "camp whereby we and all enslaved and anti-imperialist forces will be able to find the force which is capable of defeating imperialism", was asserted in the programme. But, this was done without providing details on how such a venture, involving "the liberation

movement in Vietnam. the revolutionary situation in Cuba and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and the national liberation movements in Asia, Africa and Latin America", could be put into practice. Supply of weapons and training by China and the Soviet Union was a concrete form of military support, but the rest remained obscure. No specific mention of South Africa and the struggle against apartheid was made in this context.

The PFLP opposed Zionism "as an aggressive racial movement connected with imperialism which has exploited the sufferings of the Jews as a stepping stone for the promotion of its interests and the interests of imperialism". The Front's aim was "to establish a democratic national state in Palestine in which both Arabs and Jews will live as citizens with equal rights and obligations and which will constitute an integral part of the progressive democratic Arab national presence living peacefully with all forces of progress in the world." Consequently, a basic strategic line "must aim at unveiling this misrepresentation, addressing the exploited and misled Jewish masses and revealing the conflict between these masses' interest in living peacefully and the interests of the Zionist movement". With the growth of armed struggle this would ensure "the widening of the conflict existing objectively between Israel and the Zionist movement on the one hand and the millions of misled and exploited Jews on the other."

Similarly to Abu Iyad, the PFLP anticipated that intensification of the armed struggle would open rifts within the Jewish community in Israel. In fact, the opposite was true: the choice of targets and the manner of execution of armed attacks made all Israeli Jews feel threatened and thus consolidated their opposition to the Palestinian movement instead of mitigating it. That the goal of the struggle was defined as "the liberation of Palestine from the Israeli-Zionist presence", and its replacement by "a progressive democratic Arab society",[49] did not help attract Israeli Jews to the promise of equal rights for all. They saw it as a thinly veiled threat to exclude them regardless of the precise language used by different organizations. There is no doubt that Palestinian attitudes towards Israeli Jews were indeed changing and becoming more positive – seen against the background of the rhetoric used by Amin al-Husseini and Ahmad Shuqeiri – but not rapidly and clearly enough to effect a change in Israeli attitudes.

The one organization that went farther in challenging mainstream Arab nationalist discourse as the foundation for the Palestinian movement was the Popular Democratic Front for the Liberation of Palestine (PDFLP, later known simply as DFLP or the Democratic Front). It emerged as a left-wing dissident faction within the Popular Front, raising themes that had been debated already in the ANM. As part of the Popular Front it was responsible for the notion that "the Vietnamese–Cuban course of action is the only course leading to victory for under-developed countries against the educational and technical superiority of imperialism and neo-colonialism."[50] It went on to assert that "the road to national salvation and liberation of the homeland, together with the solution of the problems of national liberation, requires forces armed with revolutionary arms. These will be capable, in under-developed countries, of defeating the advanced imperialist powers in the fields of military effort and skill".[51]

The Democratic Front was the first to go beyond standard formulas of individual rights within an Arab national state, by advocating "a people's democratic Palestine state in which the Arabs and (Israeli) Jews will live without any discrimination whatsoever, a state which is against all forms of class and national subjugation, and which gives both Arabs and (Israeli) Jews the right to develop their national culture". Due to links of history and destiny, "the people's democratic state of Palestine will be an integral part of an Arab federal state in this area. The Palestinian state will have a democratic content hostile to colonialism, imperialism, and Arab and Palestinian reaction". This will liberate "the Arab and the Jew from all forms of

chauvinistic (racist) culture – liberating the Arab from reactionary culture, and the Jew from Zionist culture". The state will become "a progressive revolutionary fortress on the side of all forces in the world struggling against imperialism and counter-revolution", and "encompass Arabs and (Israeli) Jews enjoying equal national rights and obligations – a state in the service of all the forces struggling for national liberation and progress in the world".[52]

In evaluating the two innovations of the post-67 period discussed above, both the progress made and the unrealized potential are important. From a fragmented mass of people subject to manipulation by Arab regimes – 'a people in itself' – Palestinians became active agents in the service of their own interests – 'a people for itself'. This was the case in particular for the refugee population in Jordan, Lebanon and Syria, which became the main constituency of the resistance movement. The armed struggle and the publicity campaign around it served to mobilize people and give them a sense of purpose. It generated enthusiasm for a model that presumably worked elsewhere – Algeria, Cuba, Vietnam – and therefore could work again.

At the same time, active participation was restricted to relatively few young men and left most of the rest of the population as supportive but largely passive spectators. The rhetoric of popular mobilization of workers and peasants did not fit with the focus on armed struggle: by definition the militants were not engaged in regular production activities, even if some of them may have come from that social background. Regardless of their own class affiliation, there was little sense in which military action was shaped by class relations, conditions or interests. In this respect there was no difference between *Fatah*, PFLP, DFLP and others, their different class rhetorics notwithstanding.

This was a symptom of a more fundamental problem. The Cuban campaign was waged from within Cuba itself, and mobilized peasants in support of guerrilla fighters against government forces. The militants came from the outside initially, but their potential constituency were the majority in the country. In Algeria the rebel movement was based initially outside the country but it managed to gain a foothold inside it and recruit the locals to its campaign. Again, they were the undisputed majority although they had to contend with a substantial minority of settlers backed by overseas French forces. Vietnam was similar to Cuba: the Vietcong were a local force fighting against an unpopular government backed by US foreign troops. Working in parallel with military forces from across the northern border provided strategic depth and increased the cost to the enemy. Even the anti-apartheid movement, which was directed at that period from across the borders of South Africa, was a re-located local movement, forced temporarily into exile from the early 1960 to the mid-1970s. But, once the internal front became alive, with the emergence of black trade unions and the Soweto uprising of 1976, the focus of struggle shifted back inside the country and away from the exiles and their military campaigns.

The case of Palestine was different from all these. It was not just militants and leaders in exile but the bulk of their popular constituency as well. And, this was not a temporary situation but a prolonged one, possibly the only case in modern history of people fighting to liberate their country from colonial conquest, forced to operate from outside its borders. In the process they had to confront not an unpopular regime, a small group of settlers or overseas military forces, but a heavily-militarized and mobilized settler society, which displaced and replaced them. None of the models cited in the literature of the organizations, nor any of the theoreticians of guerrilla and anti-colonial struggle (Mao, Giap, Guevara, Fanon), experienced anything like that. The rhetoric of an 'Arab Hanoi' in Amman or Beirut, and the image of Arab forces

marching behind the Palestinian revolutionary vanguard, were trendy and appealing but did not provide a real solution to the challenge of fighting Israel from beyond its boundaries.[53]

When confronted with the issue, Palestinian leaders and militants could not provide a clear response. Abu Iyad, for example, argued that "The Palestinian people are revolting under objective conditions which are different and quite distinguishable from those of any other revolution in the world. Why? Because the people is disunited socially, politically and geographically. This situation inevitably imposes new, unconventional techniques and forms of struggle. Nevertheless we do not, in the general concept, constitute an innovation among world revolutions … In our Palestinian revolution, we are both inside and outside, which is normal. On the inside we are in our occupied country because we do not recognise the Zionist Israeli presence. Consequently we are in a perfectly natural situation … The external part of our leadership is separated from the occupied territory by a few metres … Our bases are located all throughout this land, and many of them are inside the occupied territory … Our internal and external bases provide the revolution with continued reinforcement".[54]

This account left out the fact that it was not only the leadership but the bulk of the cadres and popular masses supporting the struggle who were largely external to the territory (not in an ideological or historical sense but in practical terms, being based in neighbouring countries). . Palestinians were aware of their unique conditions, but it seems as if they operated on the assumption that evocative slogans and the rhetorical solidarity offered by other liberation movements could compensate for the inadequacy of the analogies they used.

The Democratic Front alone, at that stage, insisted on the need to combine armed struggle with political struggle and alliances with progressive Israeli forces. In this vein it started a dialogue with Matzpen, the leftist anti-Zionist Israeli organization. Although they were in agreement on a number of issues, the stumbling block was Matzpen's recognition of the right for national self-determination of Hebrew-speaking Jews, free of Zionism and integrated into a Middle East socialist federation. This principle was rejected by the Democratic Front since it did not see Jews in Israel as a national collective, although it recognized their individual and civil rights. Subsequent shifts in the position of Israeli anti-Zionist groups, descended from Matzpen, did bring some of them closer to the Palestinian positions, however.[55]

2. The Struggle against the Occupation

As argued earlier, the 1967 war dealt a serious blow to the Arab regimes and facilitated the rise of the armed Palestinian resistance movement in the forefront of the military conflict with Israel. It is ironic then that the biggest battle of the movement was waged in a fight with Arab forces: the battle of Black September in 1970. It was triggered by growing anxiety of the Jordanian regime due to the transformation of the country into a base for spectacular military operations – such as airplane hijackings – particularly by the PFLP. The clash resulted in ousting armed groups from the country and their move to Lebanon. A few years later, Arab regimes took the initiative against Israel. Their military forces managed to drive back Israel in 1973, especially on the Egyptian front. The war ended in a stalemate but it restored Arab pride and the prestige of the existing regimes, which allowed them to contemplate dealing diplomatically with Israel on an equal basis.

The impact on the Palestinian movement was contradictory. On one hand, Arab military gains and the consequent turn towards diplomacy served to marginalize the guerrilla organizations which played no role in the fighting. On the other hand, Arab prestige – combined with the

rising power of the Third World globally – led to a series of diplomatic victories for the PLO. It was recognized as the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people by the Arab League in October 1974, Yasser Arafat addressed the UN General assembly in December of that year, and the UN General Assembly adopted in November 1975 a resolution regarding Zionism as a form of racism and racial discrimination. Previous UN resolutions addressing the collaboration between Israel and apartheid South Africa were invoked there, as well as similar statements by the Organization of African Unity and the Non-Aligned Movement.[56] These developments took place at the same time that apartheid South Africa was coming under intense diplomatic pressure resulting in its suspension from the UN General Assembly in November 1974.

All this went along with an internal shift in the focus of struggle from the Diaspora to the Occupied Territories. In 1974 the Palestine National Council resolved that the PLO "will employ all means, and first and foremost armed struggle, to liberate Palestinian territory and to establish the independent combatant national authority for the people over every part of Palestinian territory that is liberated." But, this was not to be at the price of "recognition, peace, secure frontiers, renunciation of national rights, and the deprival of our people of their right to return and their right to self-determination on the soil of their homeland."[57]

The text of the resolution continued to assert the principles of armed struggle, return and self determination but – for the first time – it did not insist that these applied to the entire territory of Palestine. The prospect of an independent Palestinian state in the West Bank and Gaza was raised as an alternative (at least on a temporary basis) to the liberation of all of Palestine. While the Israeli leadership dismissed the change as merely rhetorical, aimed at destroying Israel in stages, the PFLP-led opposition from within the PLO saw it as a renunciation of the historical goals of the resistance. It formed the Rejection Front, based on the notion that the balance of forces had not changed sufficiently to allow Arabs to negotiate with Israel from a position of strength and make gains. Diplomatic efforts and the creation of a Palestinian state in territories evacuated by Israel would of necessity be conducted in the framework of UN Security Council resolution 242, which advocated peace between all states in the region, including Israel. This might satisfy Arab regimes with their limited territorial demands but would fail to meet the core Palestinian concerns.[58]

Once the idea of an independent state in the West Bank and Gaza was raised, it dominated the political imagination. It quickly became the new international consensus as it was supported by most actors in the region and on the global scene, albeit with the exception of two crucial actors – Israel and the USA. The first USA veto of a UN Security Council resolution calling for an independent Palestinian state dates to that period (January 1976): it rejected the call that "the Palestinian people should be enabled to exercise its inalienable national right of self-determination, including the right to establish an independent state in Palestine in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations", which was based on the demand "that Israel should withdraw from all the Arab territories occupied since June 1967", and the expectation that the UN would guarantee "the sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence of all states in the area and their right to live in peace within secure and recognized boundaries".[59]

Going back to the question of apartheid, it seems that the mid-1970s was a crucial junction in the history of the Palestinian national movement. It did not abandon the quest for a solution that would encompass all the different segments of the people: refugees, occupied residents and Israeli citizens. But, in practice, the focus on the establishment of an independent state re-shaped the struggle by giving priority to the concerns of people living under Israeli military

rule. In effect, this 'normalized' the situation as that of a national liberation movement fighting temporary foreign occupation. The unique features of Israel/Palestine – the total exclusion of the refugees and the qualified inclusion of Palestinian citizens – did not disappear from view but were handled as separate issues. The notion of apartheid, and with it the emphasis on struggle against group boundaries in order to overcome internal inequalities and radically transform society, became less central to the common conceptualization of the issue.

Regional developments strengthened this trend by undermining any lingering hopes for a joint Arab/Palestinian military operation against Israel. Two developments were crucially important: the Lebanese civil war of 1975-76 involved Palestinians in a disastrous military conflict that fractured the Arab front, sapped their energies and created devastating divisions between them and Lebanese and Syrian former allies. The 1970 fall of the first 'Arab Hanoi' (Amman) was followed by the fall of the second Hanoi (Beirut). No longer could they be seen potentially as bases for a coordinated Arab campaign in support of the Palestinian struggle. After a lull in fighting for a few years, with the resumption of Israeli attacks (first in 1978 and then on a much larger and more lethal scale in 1982) Palestinian leaders and cadres eventually had to relocate again: this time to places far from the Israeli front (Tunisia, Yemen, and so on).

In the meantime, the biggest and strongest Arab country – Egypt – culminated the move it had started in 1973 and terminated its military involvement in the conflict by signing a peace agreement with Israel in 1978. The creation of an Arab Steadfastness Front by countries such as Libya and Iraq (led by would-be successors to Nasser, Mu'ammar Qaddafi and Saddam Hussein) was a poor response to this crucial strategic shift. It was not helped much by the Islamic revolution in Iran of 1979, despite its fiery anti-Israel and anti-US symbolism. When the two states leading the regional pro-Palestinian rhetoric – Iraq and Iran – entered into a prolonged internecine war, which drained their resources, the dream of liberating Palestine in a military campaign waged from the outside was finally laid to rest.

With Palestinian citizens of Israel renewing their fight for equal rights and share in resources through their own political structures, above all the Democratic Front for Peace and Equality formed by the Communist Party in 1977, and refugees in the Diaspora largely removed from the scene, the focus of diplomacy and struggle shifted to the Occupied Territories.

Before 1967 the residents of the West Bank and Gaza already had a history of organizing to fight against Israeli incursions and to access land that remained within Israeli boundaries. The 1948 refugees – a majority in Gaza and a substantial minority on the West Bank – were particularly keen not to allow the outcome of the war to become a permanent arrangement. Under Jordanian rule they experienced vibrant party-political life, interspersed with periods of repression, and in Gaza they clashed but also collaborated at times with the Egyptian military authorities over their quest for arms, to repel Israeli raids as well as to enable them to sneak into Israel and their erstwhile property.[60]

The 1967 war changed that. With Israeli forces in control of the newly-occupied territories, no free political activity was allowed. Palestinian resistance organizations and their literature and symbols were banned, and the only legitimate form of expressing dissent was through 'notables' meeting irregularly with military authorities and exchanging opinions and perhaps mild criticisms of Israeli policies. Intense repression, especially in the early post-1967 years, saw thousands of activists driven into exile or underground and imprisoned for long periods.

This had the effect of suppressing open manifestations of resistance.[61] It was only years later in 1973 that attempts at re-organization bore fruit in the shape of the Palestinian National Front. The Front took care not to distance itself or challenge the leadership of the PLO, in order to retain its credibility among the masses, but tensions between the externally-based resistance organizations and local activists were inevitable.[62]

The National Front gained ground quickly on a platform of allegiance to the PLO as the representative of the Palestinian People as a whole. It defined its aims as “to resist Zionist occupation and struggle for the liberation of the occupied Arab territories”, and “to secure the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people and, in the forefront, its right to national self-determination on its own land”. To achieve that, it was committed “to reject all plans that aim to dissolve the national question of our people and ignore its rights, be they Zionist (the Allon Plan), Arab (the United Arab Kingdom of King Hussein), American, or any other defeatist and liquidationist solution that resembles them.”[63] In addition, a range of goals that gave more specific content to its activities was listed, including fighting land confiscation, supporting local economic institutions, protecting culture, heritage and holy places, fighting against detentions and inhuman conditions of imprisonment, support for detainees' families and so on.

By 1976 the Front clearly had become the dominant force in the Occupied Territories and it managed to win municipal elections with large majorities in most towns. The Israeli response was harsh, no doubt reflecting resentment that its intelligence agencies did not anticipate that their favourite pro-Jordanian candidates would be ousted from power so easily. Some of the new mayors and many activists were harassed, detained, deported and restricted in their activities, culminating in banning the Front altogether, as well as its successor organizations.[64]

Despite attempts to suppress PLO-aligned nationalist organization, and Israeli experiments with creating alternative compliant leadership – the Village Leagues – in the early 1980s, no force opposed to the PLO could emerge in the Territories. The relative order re-imposed as a result of the repressive campaign, reinforced by the PLO's ouster from Lebanon in 1982, did not last long. Tensions continued to simmer under the surface until they broke out with the most sustained expression of mass resistance in Palestine since 1936 – the Intifada of 1987, which lasted six years, and led to the Oslo agreements of 1993.

There is no space here to discuss the Intifada in any detail.[65] It was a massive popular uprising that unified Palestinians in the Occupied Territories and forced the PLO to come out clearly in support for independence and statehood in that limited geographical and political framework. The Declaration of Independence of the State of Palestine, which came within a year of the outbreak of the Intifada, was based on the partition of the territory: “Despite the historical injustice done to the Palestinian Arab people in its displacement and in being deprived of the right to self-determination following the adoption of General Assembly resolution 181 (II) of 1947, which partitioned Palestine into an Arab and a Jewish State, that resolution nevertheless continues to attach conditions to international legitimacy that guarantee the Palestinian Arab people the right to sovereignty and national independence.” The Declaration owes most to the “great popular uprising now mounting in the occupied territories”, due to which “the Palestinian conjuncture reaches a sharp historical turning point”, leading to “the establishment of the State of Palestine in the land of Palestine with its capital at Jerusalem.” The state “shall be for Palestinians, wherever they may be therein to develop their national and cultural identity and therein to enjoy full equality of rights.” Whether Jews living in the country could be included in this definition was not made explicit.

It shall be “an Arab State and shall be an integral part of the Arab nation, of its heritage and civilization”. It rejects “the threat or use of force, violence and intimidation against its territorial integrity and political independence or those of any other State”, implicitly including Israel.[66]

Without renouncing any of its historical claims, the Palestine National Council chose to focus on terminating the occupation of the West Bank and Gaza and use these areas as the territorial basis for the state. It is appreciative of, but also sets itself apart from “those Israeli democratic and progressive forces which have rejected the occupation, condemned it, and deplored its oppressive practices and measures”, as well as “Jewish groups throughout the world”, whose voices were raised to call “for Israel's withdrawal from the occupied territories, in order to enable the Palestinian people to exercise its right to self-determination.” It is the principle of 'separate but equal' statehood that is the guiding line of the statement, not statehood that is based on 'one person, one vote', as was the case at the same time for the anti-apartheid movement of South Africa.

Conclusions

It is not surprising that the Palestinian movement emerges from this study as a nationalist project to gain recognition and independence for a specific group identified in ethnic and national terms. Historically it was not aimed at abolishing boundaries between groups but rather asserting their rights in relation to each other. The post-1973 shift from demanding national independence in all of Palestine to only part of it, stemmed from the realization that the larger goal was not realistic under prevailing regional and global conditions. But, it did not change the definition of the struggle as ethnic-national in form and content. In that sense the movement was not an anti-apartheid movement.

Having said that, there were times and trends in that history which saw certain political forces moving towards a conceptualization of identity that could potentially include Jews in Israel in a political framework overcoming ethnic and national boundaries. The Democratic Front for the Liberation of Palestine was perhaps the closest to that idea, but its incipient dialogue with the Israeli Matzpen group was cut short – due to state repression and the civil war in Jordan – and ended up with no tangible results.

Defining the movement as nationalist rather than anti-apartheid is not meant in any way to discredit it. Rather it serves to position it as part of the great historical trend of the post-1945 period, which saw dozens of anti-colonial movements engaged in a struggle for national liberation from foreign rule. That Palestinians have not yet won that struggle (even in part of their land) is due not so much to deficiencies in their organization but to the unique conditions of colonial settlement in the country, and the political challenges that faced them as a result. It is only in the last decade that a true anti-apartheid paradigm began emerging among activists – with a focus on equal rights for all in the same political framework – but this is a topic deserving a study of its own, which cannot be taken up here.

NOTES

[1] This and all subsequent quotations from these exchanges are taken from Correspondence with the Palestine Arab Delegation and the Zionist Organisation, presented to the British Parliament June 1922, cmd. 1700 (London, 1922): http://unispal.un.org/UNISPAL.NSF/0/48A7E5584EE1403485256CD8006C3FBE
[2] Emile Ghory, "An Arab View of the Situation in Palestine", *International Affairs*, 15, 5 (September-October 1936), pp. 691-92.
[3] An argument developed in Rashid Khalidi, *The Iron Cage: The Story of the Palestinian Struggle for Statehood* (Beacon Press, 2006).
[4] Albert Hourani, "The Case against a Jewish State in Palestine: Albert Hourani's Statement to the Anglo-American Committee of Enquiry of 1946", *Journal of Palestine Studies*, 35, 1 (Autumn 2005), pp. 80-90
[5] Amin al-Husayni, "The Solutions Presented by Britain were a Chain of Deceit", 1954, translated in Zvi Elpeleg, *Through the Eyes of the Mufti* (Vallentine Mitchell, 2009), p. 23
[6] Musa Alami, "The Lesson of Palestine", *Middle East Journal*, 3 , 4 (October 1949), p. 374.
[7] Much of the discussion in this section draws on my forthcoming book, *Beyond Nationalist Paradigms: Alternative Paths in Israel/Palestine* (Pluto, 2014)
[8] *Manifesto of the Congress to the Peoples of the East*, http://www.marxists.org/history/international/comintern/baku/manifesto.htm
[9] Nahman List, "Tzadak Hakomintern…" Part 4, *Keshet*, 24 (1964), pp. 111-16 (in Hebrew). List's series of articles – written decades after he had left the Party – is the best source on the early history of Communism in Palestine.
[10] Fourth Congress of the Communist International, Theses on the Eastern Question, 5 December 1922, in http://www.marxists.org/history/international/comintern/4th-congress/eastern-question.htm
[11] Executive Committee of the Communist International [ECCI], "Resolution on Work in Palestine", 10th May 1923, in Leon Zehavi, *Apart or Together: Jews and Arabs in Palestine According to the Documents of the Comintern, 1919-1943* (Keter, 2005, in Hebrew), pp. 40-41.
[12] Letter from ECCI to Central Committee of PCP, 16th June 1928, in Zehavi, *Apart or Together, p.* 144.
[13] On the Third Period with its acute capitalist contradictions and anticipation of 'revolts and revolutions of the colonial and semi-colonial countries', see Theses of the Sixth Comintern congress, 1928 in Jane Degras, *The Communist International 1919-1943, Documents: Vol. II, 1923-1928* (London, 1960), pp. 455-64.
[14] ECCI Political Secretariat to PCP, 23rd October 1930, in Zehavi, *Apart or Together*, p. 235.
[15] *ibid*, p. 241.
[16] "Resolutions of the 7th Congress of the Palestinian Communist Party", in Zehavi, *Apart or Together*, p. 259. Most of these resolutions are found in a Soviet publication, "Documents of the Programs of the Communist Parties of the East", in Ivar Spector, *The Soviet Union and the Muslim World, 1917-1958* (U. of Washington Press, 1959), pp. 111-80.
[17] Resolution on the 'South African Question', ECCI, 1928 in http://www.marxists.org/history/international/comintern/sections/sacp/1928/comintern.htm
[18] On the NLL see Musa Budeiri, *The Palestine Communist Party, 1919-1948: Arab and Jews in the Struggle for Internationalism* (Haymarket Books, 2010), pp. 139-165; Abigail Jacobson, *Between National Liberation and Anti-Colonial Struggle: The National Liberation League in Palestine*, working paper 3, Crown Center for Middle East Studies, Brandeis University (August 2012).
[19] Quoted in Abigail Jacobson, *The National Liberation League: 1943-48* (unpublished MA dissertation, Tel Aviv University, 2000, in Hebrew), p. 38.
[20] From PCP 9th congress, September 1945, in Avner Ben-Zaken, *Communism as Cultural Imperialism* (Resling, 2006, in Hebrew) p. 138.
[21] See Soviet position in Andrei Gromyko's 1947 UN speech. http://unispal.un.org/UNISPAL.NSF/0/D41260F1132AD6BE052566190059E5F0
[22] Translated into English as *The Meaning of the Disaster* (Khayat College, Beirut, 1956).
[23] *ibid*, p. 16.
[24] *ibid*, p. 21.
[25] Quotations from *Memorandum on the Arabs in Israel*, al-Ard, 25th June 1964. Thanks to Shira Robinson and Leena Dallasheh for copy of the document.
[26] In Sabri Jiryis, *The Arabs in Israel* (Monthly Review Press, 1976), p. 190. See also Leena Dallasheh, "Political Mobilization of Palestinians in Israel: the al-Ard Movement" in *Displaced at Home: Ethnicity and Gender among Palestinians in Israel*, edited by Rhoda Ann Kanaaneh and Isis Nusair (SUNY Press, 2009), pp. 21-38.

NOTES

[27] Court Judgment in http://www.constitution.org.il/index.php?class=1&id=544&mytask=view&option=com_consti_comp
[28] Basil al-Kubaisi, *The Arab Nationalists Movement 1951-1971: From Pressure Group to Socialist Party* (unpublished PhD Dissertation, American University, 1971), p. 69
[29] Walid Kazziha, *Revolutionary Transformation in the Arab World: Habash and his Comrades from Nationalism to Marxism* (Charles Knight & Company, 1975), pp. 50-51
[30] *Ibid*, p. 65
[31] Yezid Sayegh, "Reconstructing the Paradox: The Arab Nationalist Movement, Armed Struggle, and Palestine, 1951-1966", in *Middle East Journal*, 45, 4 (Autumn 1991), p. 619.
[32] All quotations from the Charter are taken from the version in http://www.un.int/wcm/content/site/palestine/pid/12363
[33] Fayez Sayegh, *Zionist Colonialism in Palestine* (PLO Research Center, Beirut, 1965), pp. 24-27. Italics in the original.
[34] Interview conducted by Lutfi al-Khuli, Editor of *Al-Tali'a*, with Abu Iyad, June 1969, in *International Documents on Palestine, 1969*, edited by Walid Khadduri (The Institute for Palestine Studies, Beirut, 1972), p. 707.
[35] From the *Fatah* publication *Filastinuna*, 15, March 1961, quoted in Moshe Shemesh, *The Palestinian National Re-Awakening: In the Shadow of Leadership Crisis, from the Mufti to Shuqayri, 1937-1967* (Ben-Gurion Research Institute, 2012, in Hebrew), pp. 247-48.
[36] *Filsatinuna*, 31, May 1963, in *ibid*, pp. 248-49
[37] *Filastinuna*, 11, November 1960 in Helga Baumgarten, "The Three Faces/Phases of Palestinian Nationalism, 1948-2005", *Journal of Palestine Studies*, 34, 4 (Summer 2005), p. 33.
[38] Yezid Sayegh, *Armed Struggle and the Search for State: The Palestinian National Movement 1949-1993* (Oxford, 1997), pp. 100-108. On the Algerian perspective see "Interview: Mohammed Yazid on Algeria and the Arab-Israeli Conflict", *Journal of Palestine Studies*, 1 ,2 (Winter 1972), pp. 3-18
[39] Maxime Rodinson, *Israel: A Colonial-Settler State?* (Monad Press, 1973 [original French in 1967]) p. 90.
[40] Nelson Mandela`s statement from the dock at the opening of the defense case in the Rivonia Trial, Pretoria Supreme Court, 20 April 1964: http://www.anc.og.za/show.php?id=3430
[41] "The Third Round", statement by the Israeli Socialist Organization, 5th July 1967, *Matzpen*, 36 (June-July 1967). English version in http://www.marxists.org/history/etol/document/mideast/toi/doc2.html
[42] Article 9 and 10 of the Palestinian National Charter, 1968.
[43] In *Documents of the Palestinian Resistance Movement (*Pathfinder Press, NY, 1971), p. 5
[44] *ibid*, p. 8.
[45] Interview by al-Khuli of Abu-Iyad, *International Documents on Palestine, 1969*, p. 722.
[46] For such expectations see *ibid*, pp. 732-33.
[47] "Founding Document of the PFLP", December 1969 in http://pflp.ps/english/2012/12/founding-document-of-the-popular-front-for-the-liberation-of-palestine-december-1967/
[48] All subsequent quotes from "Strategy for the Liberation of Palestine", February 1969, http://pflp.ps/english/strategy-for-the-liberation-of-palestine/
[49] Interview with George Habash, May 1970, in *Documents of the Palestinian Resistance Movement*, p. 21
[50] "The Political Report of the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine", August 1968, in Leila Kadi, *Basic Political Documents of the Armed Palestinian Resistance Movement* (PLO Research Center, Beirut, 1969), p. 156. Although adopted by the PFLP, the report was presented by Nayef Hawatmeh, leader of the left-wing faction that split off to become the PDFLP, and has become associated with that latter group.
[51] *Ibid*, p. 169
[52] Statement by the PDFLP, 1969, in *ibid*, p. 11
[53] *The Military Strategy of the PFLP* (Beirut, 1970). Extensive discussion of how the Palestinian struggle was seen by various forces as part of a general anti-imperialist front can be found in Paul Thomas Chamberlin, *The Global Offensive: The United States, The Palestine Liberation Organization, and the Making of the Post Cold War Order* (Oxford University Press, 2012).
[54] Interview by al-Khuli of Abu-Iyad, *International Documents on Palestine, 1969*, p. 717.
[55] See discussion in Ran Greenstein, "Socialist Anti-Zionism: A Chapter in the History of the Israeli Radical Left", *Socialist History*, 35 (March 2009), pp. 20-39.
[56] Text of UNGA resolution 3379 in http://unispal.un.org/UNISPAL.NSF/0/761C1063530766A7052566A2005B74D1

NOTES

[57] “10 point program of the PLO”, June 1974, in http://www.un.int/wcm/content/site/palestine/pid/12354
[58] See in particular George Habash's analysis in the symposium *Palestinian Leaders Discuss the New Challenges for the Resistance*, panel moderated by Mahmoud Darwish (Palestine Research Center, Beirut, April 1974), pp. 17-30. In response, Abu Iyad of *Fatah* said that Palestinians must not give up on an opportunity to make gains, even within such a framework. If they remained united they could ensure their demands were heard and the national authority were formed on the basis of a provisional program independent of the Israel-imperialist alliance, *ibid*, pp. 30-34. A similar argument by Shafiq al-Hout of the PLO rejected the politics of denunciation as futile and leading to demoralization rather than mobilization, *ibid*, pp. 34-39. A similar position was presented by Nayef Hawatmeh of the Democratic Front, who argued that the nature of the Palestinian authority, whether submissive or revolutionary, was not predetermined and would depend on popular mobilization: *ibid*, pp. 39-54.
[59] http://unispal.un.org/UNISPAL.NSF/0/696D540FD7821BCE0525651C00736250
[60] See discussion of oppositional activity in pre-1967 West Bank in Amnon Cohen, *Political Parties in the West Bank under the Jordanian Regime, 1949-1967* (Cornell University Press, 1982), and military organization in the West Bank and Gaza in Shaul Bartal, *The Fedayeen Emerge: The Palestine-Israel Conflict, 1949-1956* (The Author House, 2011).
[61] Israeli half-hearted attempts to build up the pro-Jordanian 'notables' as a compliant local leadership are discussed in Avi Raz, *The Bride and the Dowry: Israel, Jordan and the Palestinians in the Aftermath of the June 1967 War* (Oxford University Press, 2012).
[62] Weldon Matthews, “The Rise and Demise of the Left in West Bank Politics: The Case of the Palestine National Front”, *Arab Studies Quarterly*, 20, 4 (Fall 1998), pp. 13-31.
[63] “The Palestinian National Front”, in *Merip Reports*, 25 (February 1974), p. 22.
[64] “Interview with Palestine National Front”, *Merip Reports*, 50 (August 1976), pp. 16-21; Naseer Aruri, “Resistance and Repression: Political Prisoners in Israeli Occupied Territories”, *Journal of Palestine Studies*, 7, 4 (Summer 1978), pp. 48-66.
[65] For overview of early stages see Zachary Lockman and Joel Beinin (eds), *Intifada: The Palestinian Uprising against Israeli Occupation* (South End Press, 1989).
[66] Full text of the Declaration of Independence as well other components of the Palestine National Council resolutions of 15th November 1988 are in
http://unispal.un.org/UNISPAL.NSF/0/6EB54A389E2DA6C6852560DE0070E392