

Palestine: Denying the Security of the Oppressed Imperils the Security of the Oppressor

By [Kim Petersen](#)

Global Research, November 06, 2023

Region: [Middle East & North Africa](#)

Theme: [History](#), [Law and Justice](#)

In-depth Report: [PALESTINE](#)

All Global Research articles can be read in 51 languages by activating the Translate Website button below the author's name.

To receive Global Research's Daily Newsletter (selected articles), [click here](#).

Click the share button above to email/forward this article to your friends and colleagues. Follow us on [Instagram](#) and [Twitter](#) and subscribe to our [Telegram Channel](#). Feel free to repost and share widely Global Research articles.

Presumably, if Israeli Jews were not occupying the majority of historical Palestine, laying siege to Gaza, oppressing, humiliating, dehumanizing, liquidating, and refusing statehood to the Palestinian people that Hamas, a Palestinian resistance, would not have been driven to launch an attack on Israelis.

Placing the Palestinians under oppression, occupation, and siege was an undeniable denial of security for Palestinians.

Thus, by denying the security of Palestinians, Israeli Jews were putting their own security at risk by fomenting a [justifiable resistance](#). The Ukrainians and NATO are aware of this as well now. By threatening the security of the Russian state, Russia was forced to react. Hamas was also forced to react.

The choice was stark for Palestinians: continue to live with bowed head and on bended knee or risk their lives resisting oppression. Hamas refused to live on bended knee.

Now Jews elsewhere are incurring a backlash as a consequence of the self-designated Jewish State carrying out open genocide. As the JTA [laments](#), "Dutch Jews are afraid to show their Jewishness right now." Feelings borne of insecurity.

*

Former US marine intelligence officer Scott Ritter has come to realize the dark criminality of the Israeli state. Ritter deserves commendation for switching his stance, as all morally based thinkers do, when their previously held position was found to be based on inaccurate information or was untenable for whatever reason.

Nonetheless, from a [1 November 2023 interview](#), I will quibble with some of the interview with Ritter. First, the interview begins by terming the warring between Israel and Hamas as a “conflict” which is grossly misleading.

The term “conflict” originated with the interviewer. Ritter did not challenge this, and he also referred to it as a “conflict” himself but put it in a proper perspective.

Genocide is not a “conflict.” It is a monstrous war crime.

Second, Ritter states that Israel made a mistake by not recognizing Palestinian statehood.

Fine, when considered solely from the Zionist perspective.

However, in a previous interview together with journalist Eva Bartlett just a few days earlier, Ritter agreed with Bartlett [humbly confessing](#),

“I was late to the [pro-Palestinian] movement and shame on me for articulating support for a two state solution.” [around 59:30]

To be fair, Ritter did not articulate support for a two-state solution, but he did argue that it would have been in the best interests of Israel.

Too often one hears and reads about progressives — for example, Norman Finkelstein and Noam Chomsky — speaking in favor of the two-state solution, a solution that rewards the oppressors. In April 2023, [Chomsky said](#),

I understand the reasoning of the one-state advocates, but I think ... it’s almost inconceivable that Israel will ever agree to destroy itself and become a Jewish minority population in a Palestinian-dominated state, which is what the demography indicates. And there’s no international support for it. Nothing. So *my own personal feeling* is the real options are ‘Greater Israel’, or move towards some kind of two-state arrangement. [emphasis added]

Finkelstein echoes Chomsky to a large extent in [criticizing the Boycott, Divestment, Sanctions \(BDS\) movement](#):

“They don’t want Israel,” Finkelstein declared, “They think they’re being very clever. They call it their three tiers... We want the end of the occupation, we want the right of return, and we want equal rights for Arabs in Israel. And they think they are very clever, because they know the result of implementing all three is what? What’s the result? You know and I know what’s the result: there’s no Israel.”

Finkelstein demanded that Palestinians drop this programme, “Because, if we end the occupation and bring back six million Palestinians and we have equal rights for Arabs and Jews, there’s no Israel.”

Having “equal rights for Arabs and Jews” in Israel/historical Palestine! How terrible is that?

It seems these two gentlemen do not first and foremost seek justice for Palestinians, but instead they prioritize preserving a state for Jews.

Even if it were to be a two-state solution, what would the two states look like? [Chomsky and Finkelstein advocate for the 1967 borders](#) — again rewarding the Jewish land grab over and above the land granted by the United Nations Partition Plan for Palestine in 1947.

Since Chomsky and Finkelstein are both anarchists, they might both emulate John Lennon and propose a zero-state solution.

Imagine there's no countries
It isn't hard to do
Nothing to kill or die for

—John Lennon, "Imagine"

*

Note to readers: Please click the share button above. Follow us on Instagram and Twitter and subscribe to our Telegram Channel. Feel free to repost and share widely Global Research articles.

Kim Petersen is an independent writer. He can be emailed at: kimohp at [gmail.com](mailto:kimohp@gmail.com). He is a regular contributor to Global Research.

Featured image: Children from Aida Refugee Camp carry keys symbolizing the right of return toward the Israeli separation wall during a Nakba commemoration event, Bethlehem, West Bank, May 14, 2014.

The original source of this article is Global Research
Copyright © [Kim Petersen](#), Global Research, 2023

[Comment on Global Research Articles on our Facebook page](#)

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [Kim Petersen](#)

Disclaimer: The contents of this article are of sole responsibility of the author(s). The Centre for Research on Globalization will not be responsible for any inaccurate or incorrect statement in this article. The Centre of Research on Globalization grants permission to cross-post Global Research articles on community internet sites as long the source and copyright are acknowledged together with a hyperlink to the original Global Research article. For publication of Global Research articles in print or other forms including commercial internet sites, contact: publications@globalresearch.ca
www.globalresearch.ca contains copyrighted material the use of which has not always been specifically authorized by the copyright owner. We are making such material available to our readers under the provisions of "fair use" in an effort to advance a better understanding of political, economic and social issues. The material on this site is distributed without profit to those who have expressed a prior interest in receiving it for research and educational purposes. If you wish to use copyrighted material for purposes other than "fair use" you must request permission from the copyright owner.

For media inquiries: publications@globalresearch.ca