

taken as an exaggerated gesture made by an overzealous religious fanatic. Closer examination of the petition reveals that it was signed by 400 of the most prominent US citizens of that time - names that could veritably comprise a 19th century *Who's Who*. It had the signatures of chief editors of major US publications, members of Congress, conservatives, business representatives and major US capitalists like John Pierpont Morgan, John Rockefeller, William Rockefeller, magistrates, and judges, including the chief justice of the US Supreme Court, Melville Weston Fuller. Far from being an overzealous effort of a fanatic, this document indicated which way the wind was blowing in US politics.

The US media rushed to expound the 'moral importance' of this appeal, as well as the political benefits which the US stood to gain in supporting such a project. Thus, six years before the convening of the first Zionist Congress in Basel, the idea of establishing a Jewish Palestine had been woven into the fabric of American culture.

It is important to note that at the end of the 19th century, Zionism was still in its infancy as a political movement, and

did not enjoy widespread support among Jews. Jews were still engrossed in the process of assimilating in the European and American societies. Even in 1917, when debate on the Balfour Declaration was at its height, Lord Edwin Samuel Montague, the representative of the Jewish community in England, rejected absolutely the Zionist idea of a distinct Jewish state. He also condemned Zionism as being a miserable political belief and a form of anti-semitism.

Comprehending non-Jewish Zionism and its history provides a deeper understanding of western support for the Zionist entity in Palestine. It also serves to dispel the widely accepted view that western support for 'Israel' is largely due to the influence of the Jewish minorities within the western political systems, especially in the US. Neither the weight of the Jewish vote nor the pressure of the Zionist lobby are the real reason for the support to non-Jewish Zionism. The latter had enjoyed a well-established status in the western world long before the broad campaign for recruiting Jewish support to Zionism was launched in the wake of the second world war.

On the other hand, the overwhelming majority of westerners do not consider Zionism as a racist ideology, but as a 'moral strength'. This 'moral strength', deeply rooted in the history of western civilization, first arose as a religious belief. The implicit hypotheses of Zionism were first conceived and conveyed by non-Jews under various religious, social, economic and strategic guises.

If one scrutinizes the current conflict, one finds that non-Jewish Zionism is a main element in the process of foreign policy decision-making in the US and Western Europe. Moreover, the only constant factor in US Middle East policy is unwavering support for the Zionist entity. Given the overall effective political factors in US policy-making, there is no logical way to change this policy. The strong partiality reserved for 'Israel' by its western allies is directly proportional to the animosity reserved for the Arab nation. Therefore, non-Jewish Zionism not only paved the way for the colonization of Palestine, it brought with it a firmly established hatred towards the original Arab inhabitants of Palestine.

'International Terrorism' and the West

This essay was sent to *Democratic Palestine* by Raafat Georgy, a graduate student at the University of Berkeley. In his own words, it was written «to negate the mythological perspective which the American media presents» of the Middle East in particular. We greatly appreciate the main trend of thought expressed in the essay. However, we do have points of disagreement which we explain in a box below.

According to the West, international «terrorism» is threatening the foundations of «civilized» society and, therefore, all «freedom loving» nations must come together to combat this evil of «barbarism.» This Manichean view of the world depicts the West and its allies as «civilized,» and those who oppose Western encroachment or express their inalienable right of self-determination as «barbarians» bent on

the destruction of all things Western. Upon analysis we shall see that it is this self-righteous West who, primarily through indirect means, is the architect of terror.

No single issue has been more distorted by the West than the Arab-Israeli conflict and no single people more maligned than the Arabs. This distortion has been largely shaped by the systematic «pro-Israel» bent of the

media. Arab «terrorism» is over dramatized and reported without any historical juxtaposition, political context, or any explanation that mirrors reality. Arab violence is portrayed in such a way that it conforms to the «barbarian» model; hence, this ethnocentric construction of the West vis-a-vis the Arabs precludes critical discussion of the problem and only allows blind condemnation. In contradistinction to this pejorative depiction of the Arabs, the state of Israel, from its inception, has received overwhelming support from the West. This support, which has been and continues to be at all levels, political, economic (primarily the U.S.) and social, enables the Zionist state to commit numerous acts of «terrorism» without any measurable treatment from the media. Israeli «terrorism» is euphemistically termed retaliation and, according to