# 1NC

**We negate**

**First, structural violence is priority within the round**

**Winter and Leighton write[[1]](#endnote-1)** that cognitive processes lead us to care about people inside our scope of justice, but rarely care about those people outside. Injustice that would be immediately confronted if it occurred to someone we love or know becomes barely noticed or ignored if it occurs to strangers or people who are invisible or irrelevant to us. We can reduce its nefarious effects by becoming aware of our distorted perceptions.

**The role of the ballot** is to endorse the better educational practices for fighting oppression.

**Espinoza writes[[2]](#endnote-2)** that pedagogy has put forth the notion that classroom practice integrates forms of evaluation that specify a particular version about what knowledge is of most worth and how we might construct a representation of our world along with our place within it. From this perspective, the pedagogical is inherently political and thus, the judge as an educator is obligated to endorse the better educational practice for providing strategies for fighting oppression and moral exclusion.

**We Observe** that the permanent seat is directly the requirement for veto power in the U.N security council

**Now move to the kritik of the Imperialist United Nations Veto**

1. **Link 1:** Congolese Imperialism- **The UN 18 reports[[3]](#endnote-3)** that the Africa continues to be undermined and has no representation in the permanent category, which is the core decision making unit of the Council. **Morly 16 explains[[4]](#endnote-4)** that a notorious example of U.N imperialism is the revolution in the Republic of the Congo in 1960. Like many other leaders of the colonial struggle, Patrice Lumumba, was forced down in his struggle against imperialism. Once free of overt Belgian domination, the Congo immediately found itself fighting a secessionist insurrection. The rebellion was backed by the former colonial power Belgium in an attempt to destabilize the new government and so Lumumba appealed to the UN for help against this meddling in Congo’s internal affairs. In response to his request, the UN Security Council decided to send military assistance to the Congo. ***However***, the leading UN staff that had been sent over had no meaningful connection to the country, its people and their cause. Instead they were upper class Westerners with far more ties to the countries Lumumba was fighting against than with the actual Congo.
2. **Impact 1:** Imperialist Murder and Abuse- **Brennan 06 writes[[5]](#endnote-5)** that the death toll from the conflict in the Congo was approximately 3.9 million deaths. These abuses aren’t unique to the 20th century as crimes by the U.N in Africa continue to go largely unchecked. **Larson and Dodds 17 explain[[6]](#endnote-6)** that if the U.N. sexual abuse crisis has an epicenter, it is the Congo, where the scope of the problem first emerged 13 years ago — and where promised reforms have most clearly fallen short. During a yearlong investigation, the AP found that despite promising reform for more than a decade, the U.N. failed to meet many of its pledges to stop the abuse or help victims, some of whom have been lost to a sprawling bureaucracy.
3. **Link 2:** Zionist Imperialism (Zionism as identified by the Jewish Ethnostate occupation of Israel)- The U.N Security Council Veto protects anti-Palestinian action. **Campos 18 finds[[7]](#endnote-7)** that the United States vetoed a U.N. Security Council resolution that condemned Israel’s use of force against Palestinian civilians in the West Bank. France, Russia, China, Ivory Coast, Kazakhstan, Bolivia, Peru, Sweden, and Equatorial Guinea joined Kuwait in voting in favor of the first draft. Britain, the Netherlands, Poland and Ethiopia abstained. Only the United States voted against meaning that it would have passed otherwise. In fact, **Tamimi 18 writes[[8]](#endnote-8)** that the U.S. vetoed 43 resolutions at the UN Security Council that criticized Israel or denounced the measures it takes against the Palestinians and has only ever allowed the passage of 2 resolutions that criticized Israel. **Rose of the University of Chicago explains[[9]](#endnote-9)** that Zionism suffers from the bigotry of caring for the Jews whilst completely disregarding the native Arab population. Affirming India into the Security Council not only empowers the organization but puts another barrier to progress for the natives of Israel. **Scham of the MEI finds[[10]](#endnote-10)** that the India and Israeli relationship continues to grow stronger from economic and military ties. If there is any risk of bias, it is a non-ideal that must be rejected.
4. **Impact 2:** Ethnic Cleansing- **Karpel 18 indicates[[11]](#endnote-11)** that the Palestinians became a minority ruled by the Jews and victims of Israeli ethnic cleansing. The Israel Defense Forces entered the villages, put the men in groups and shot them. Survivors were forced onto trucks at gunpoint and entire neighborhoods were shelled. What is clear is that the Israeli leadership understood the fewer Arabs the better. The mass slaughter of Palestinians is a result of moral exclusion leading to direct violence and the best way to solve is by morally including them in today’s round.
5. **Alternative:** Reject the Affirmative- The U.N security council is an oppressive has continued to partake and defend horrific abuses of defenseless groups in both Palestine and the Congo. In the case that the judges’ ballot is obligated to fight oppressive structures, negating actively does so. **Opotow writes[[12]](#endnote-12)** that participation in moral exclusion ranges from unawareness to ignoring, allowing, facilitating, executing, and devising the injustice. By allowing or ignoring the suffering of Palestinians and Congolese, the damage of moral exclusion grows, and our framework materializes.

**Negate**

# Frontlines

## **ATAT: Hamas Kills Too**

1. This is an attempt to morally exclude Palestinians which is the root cause of structural violence. **Winter and Leighton find[[13]](#endnote-13)** that one outcome of exclusionary thinking is the belief that victims of violence must in some way deserve their plight. But certainly, it is easy to see that young children of Palestine do not deserve to be victims of ideological differences between governments.
2. Even you buy that this is a war between Israel and Hamas, the war kills disproportionate amounts of innocent Palestinians. **Morris 18 writes[[14]](#endnote-14)** that for every 1 Israeli who was killed in conflict, there were 31 Palestinians killed. While a vast majority of Palestinians who were killed were civilians, only 6 of the Israeli deaths were civilians. Israel was

## **ATAT: India Less Rape**

1. We shouldn’t settle for “less sexual abuse”. Instead, by dissolving the UN security council and its capabilities, you completely terminate all current operations which often result sexual abuse. We do not end sexual abuse, but we do end the UN ability to instigate it.
1. Winter and Leighton, “Structural Violence: Peace Psychology for the 21st Century”

While structural violence often leads to direct violence, the reverse is also true, as brutality terrorizes bystanders, who then become unwilling or unable to confront social injustice. Increasingly, civilians pay enormous costs of war, not only through death, but through devastation of neighborhoods and ecosystems. Ruling elites rarely suffer from armed conflict as much as civilian populations do, who endure decades of poverty and disease in war-tom societies. Recognizing the operation of structural violence forces us to ask questions about how and why we tolerate it, questions that often have painful answers. The first chapter in this section, "Social Injustice," by Susan Opotow, argues that our normal **perceptual/cognitive processes lead us to care about people inside our scope of justice, but rarely care about those people outside. Injustice that would be instantaneously confronted if it occurred to someone we love or know is barely noticed if it occurs to strangers or those who are invisible or irrelevant to us.** We do not seem to be able to open our minds and our hearts to everyone; **[thus,] moral exclusion is a product of our normal cognitive processes**. But Opotow argues convincingly that **we can reduce its nefarious effects by becoming aware of our distorted perceptions. Inclusionary thinking can be fostered by relationships, communication, and appreciation of diversity**. One outcome of exclusionary thinking is the belief that victims of violence must in some way deserve their plight. But certainly it is easy to see that young children do not deserve to be victims. The next two chapters in this section address the violence experienced by children. In the first, "The War Close to Home: Children and Violence in the United States," Kathleen Kostelny and James Garbarino describe the direct and structural violence which children in Chicago and other urban areas of the United States endure, paralleling that experienced by children who live in countries at war. Children who endure these environments often become battle weary, numb, hopeless, and/or morally impaired. But children not only suffer directly from violence, they also suffer from the impaired parenting and communities which poverty inflicts. The authors describe how community and family support mechanisms can mitigate these effects. For example, home visitation and early childhood education programs provide crucial family and community support. While Kostelny and Garbarino focus on community intervention techniques, Milton Schwebel and Daniel Christie, in their article "Children and Structural Violence," extend the analysis of structural violence by examining how economic and psychological deprivation impairs at-risk children. Children living in poverty experience diminished intellectual development because parents are too overwhelmed to be able to provide crucial linguistic experiences. Schwebel and Christie's discussion concludes that economic structures must provide parents with living-wage employment, good prenatal medical care, and high-quality child-care ifwe are to see the next generation develop into the intelligent and caring citizens needed to create a peaceful world. [↑](#endnote-ref-1)
2. Carlos Tejada & Manuel Espinoza, “Toward a Decolonializing Pedagogy: Social Justice Reconsidered” (PDF in Off-case folder)

Critical **pedagogy has put forth the notion that classroom practice integrates** particular curriculum content and design, instructional strategies and techniques, and **forms of evaluation. [and]** It **argues that these specify a particular version about what knowledge is of most worth**, what it means to know something, **and how we might construct a representation of our world and our place within it** (McLaren 1998). **From this perspective, the pedagogical is inherently political.** For us a decolonizing pedagogy encompasses both an anticolonial and decolonizing notion of pedagogy and an anticolonial and decolonizing pedagogical praxis. It is an anticolonial and decolonizing theory and praxis that insists that colonial domination and its ideological frameworks operate and are reproduced in and through the curricular content and design, the instructional practices, the social organization of learning, and the forms of evaluation that inexorably sort and label students into enduring categories of success and failure of schooling. Thus, an anticolonial and decolonizing pedagogical praxis explicitly works to transform these dimensions of schooling so that schools become sites for the development of a critical decolonizing consciousness and activity that work to ameliorate and ultimately end the mutually constitutive forms of violence that characterize our internal neocolonial condition. For us, a decolonizing pedagogy addresses both the means and the ends of schooling. [↑](#endnote-ref-2)
3. **General Assembly**, 09-22-**2018**, "Member States Call for Removing Veto Power, Expanding Security Council to Include New Permanent Seats, as General Assembly Debates Reform Plans for 15-Member Organ," **United Nations**, <https://www.un.org/press/en/2018/ga12091.doc.htm>

To meet emerging challenges of today’s increasingly complex international security and peace architecture**, the United Nations Security Council must adapt, reform and expand its membership to include underrepresented regions, particularly Africa, the General Assembly heard today**. Assembly President María Fernanda Espinosa Garcés (Ecuador), opening a day‑long debate, stressed **that the Council must adapt to new political realities, with increased representation boosting its legitimacy and the implementation of its decisions**. However, even though the issue of increased Council membership has been on the Assembly’s agenda for two decades, she said no consensus has been reached on how to reform the vital and crucial organ. Pledging full support for Council reform, she recognized that the issue is complex and closely intertwined with efforts to ensure international peace and security. Delegates discussed a range of ideal solutions. Many called for broadening the number of permanent members beyond the current five (China, France, Russian Federation, United Kingdom, United States) and abolishing the permanent membership’s use of veto power to overrule the adoption of draft resolutions. **Sierra Leone’s representative, speaking on behalf of the African Group, spotlighted that most issues discussed in the 15‑member organ are related to his continent. Its 54 nations must be involved in decisions concerning not only international peace and security, but its own very continent. Africa demands no less than two permanent seats, including the veto power, if it remains, and five non‑permanent seats**. Widespread support from Member States for this position means that it is time to “redress the historical injustice of not being represented in the permanent category”. “We cannot afford to remain indifferent,” Algeria’s delegate said. **Despite having the largest number of Member States in the United Nations, Africa continues to be undermined and has no representation in the permanent category, which is the core decision making unit of the Council**. Guyana’s representative, speaking on behalf of Caribbean Community (CARICOM), pointed out that the Council has excluded other regions from permanent membership as well, including Latin America and the Caribbean. Multilateralism and inclusiveness will only strengthen the work of the United Nations and its organs. Member States also highlighted the role of the Assembly in helping to achieve progress in the intergovernmental negotiations on Council reform. India’s delegate, on behalf of the Group of Four (Brazil, Germany, Japan and his country), emphasized that discussions should operate under normal rules of procedure. He added that “nay‑sayers” cannot be allowed to cast a dark shadow and hold the overwhelming majority back. [↑](#endnote-ref-3)
4. Daniel **Morley**, 02-26-**2016**, "The United Nations: a tool of imperialism," **IDM**, <https://www.marxist.com/the-united-nations-a-tool-of-imperialism.htm>

The implication is that bombing Syria, or any other country, is OK if secured through the UN and international law. Indeed it is common to hear the accusation that the Iraq war was illegal, attacking the US and Britain for their unilateralism on this issue. Many on the left see the UN as a force for good, as one of the more enlightened and progressive features of the modern capitalist world. In this view, right-wing leaders are indicted for their disregard or misuse of this instrument for peace, reasonableness and cooperation. The reality of the UN falls far short of its noble image. The sooner our left leaders in the trade unions and Labour Party shed this utopian illusion, the better for our movement. The claim that the UN has the power, if used, to secure peace - despite the enormous conflicts of interest we see everywhere in the world - is simply not true. Diplomacy’s den of thieves Foreign policy is always and everywhere an extension of domestic policy. The bourgeois politicians who slash the welfare state, attack trade union rights and suppress protests at home use the same methods abroad in their pursuit of profits for the banks and big corporations. “Diplomacy” is a means of dividing the loot of the exploited workers of the world, particularly in the former colonies. The UN simply provides a forum for this world diplomacy to express itself. The UN is governed by the main imperial powers, and can only act when these powers agree. UN forces are deployed by the Security Council, a body where the traditional five nuclear powers (France, China, Russia, the UK and the USA) have a veto. There are very few military conflicts in which all these five powers find themselves on the same side and, consequently, the UN very rarely intervenes anywhere. Arguably, the most democratic body in the UN is the General Assembly. In this assembly all recognised nations get one vote, and therefore a number of resolutions have passed against the will of the US and other major powers. The US blockade of Cuba has, for example, been condemned by innumerable resolutions of the Assembly, starting in 1993, but this hasn’t prevented the US from continuing the embargo, deepening it and extending it to other countries. That is not to say that UN resolutions, reports etc. are worthless. In fact, all kinds of horse trading also goes on, in which favours are exchanged. In a recent scandal, the UK backed the Saudis to the UN Human Rights Council in return for the Saudis backing the UK onto the same body. Similarly, votes in the General Assembly are bought with promises of aid, the bulk of which regularly winds up in the pockets of ministers and civil servants. It is part-and-parcel of the games, behind-the-scenes deals and corruption that constitute bourgeois diplomacy and foreign policy. The UN has enjoyed 70 years of existence at the summit of the so-called ‘international community’. How then has it used its position over the decades to prove its peace credentials? Most frequently the UN is discussed in terms of resolutions at the Security Council regarding things like sanctions. However, **in various conflicts and disasters** it **[the security council] has its own forces (‘loaned’ from various member states) that directly intervene**. It is **in this area of direct UN intervention that it most openly displays its own independent characteristics; and if it were an honest force for peace and reconciliation it is precisely here that this should be most unambiguously shown. But its record shows that the UN simply follow the interests of the main powers. In the early stages of the Cold War the UN was far more actively involved in world affairs. In Korea, it played an active role on the side of US imperialism, in support of the bourgeois dictatorship of South Korea, which was conducting a struggle against the revolutionary movement that arose in the struggle against Japanese occupation.** The Korean War was an attempt by the US to impose the regime of Syngman Rhee on the Korean population after it practically collapsed in the summer of 1950. The intervention was approved because the Soviet Union were boycotting the Security Council in protest against China’s exclusion from the same. Intervention in the Congo **Another notorious example is the revolution in the Republic of the Congo in 1960. Like many other leaders of the colonial struggle, Patrice Lumumba, was forced to the left in his struggle against imperialism. Once free of overt Belgian domination, Congo immediately found itself fighting a secessionist insurrection in the mineral rich South-East (Katanga). The rebellion was backed by the former colonial power Belgium in an attempt to destabilize the new government. Lumumba appealed to the UN for help against this blatant meddling in Congo’s internal affairs. In response to his request, the UN Security Council decided to send military assistance to the Congo. However, tellingly the leading UN staff sent over had no meaningful connection to the country, its people and their cause. Instead they were Westerners, and naturally upper class, with far more ties to the countries Lumumba was fighting against (Belgium and the US) than with Congo**. In his 2001 book The Assassination of Lumumba, Belgian writer Ludo De Witte has decisively proven that these UN forces worked to overthrow Lumumba rather than protecting the peace and the legitimacy of its first democratically elected government. The UN only passively requested that the Belgians withdraw from the Republic of the Congo; it never condemned or took real action against blatant Belgian meddling. Rather, its presence made things more difficult for the new regime. It took over the radio station and the airport. It stopped him calling on friendly African nations for support and blocked aid from the Soviet Union. “It is alleged that Hammarskjöld [Secretary General of the UN at the time] played a role in [Lumumba’s] assassination and Lumumba himself confirmed in a letter to his wife few hours before his death that the Belgians were conniving with some high officials at the United Nations to inflict pains on him and his people. The United Nations wanted to overthrow Lumumba’s government in August 1960 and in early 1961...Abstract rights did not inspire the actions of the United Nations and other international institutions and principles and this was shown by the different treatments accorded Lumumba in 1960 and Tshombe in 1961” (Fidelis Etah Ewane, The United Nations in the Congo from 1960-4: Critical Assessment of a Tragic Intervention) Only after Lumumba was removed and assassinated in a coup did the UN take decisive action against the Katanga rebels. Reflecting on the criminal actions of the UN in sabotaging and destroying the first democratically elected government in this most exploited and oppressed of nations, it is immediately obvious why it behaved as it did: the countries carrying out the actions the UN was called on to prevent - that is Belgium and the USA - are highly powerful, influential countries, one of whom has a seat on the UN’s Security Council and hosts its headquarters. It is obvious that that is why the UN helped these countries to destroy a revolution that was against their interests. Lumumba’s tragic mistake was to trust in the UN’s supposed respect for national sovereignty and peace. [↑](#endnote-ref-4)
5. [↑](#endnote-ref-5)
6. Krista **Larson** and Paisley **Dodds**, 5-27-2017, "Peacekeepers as Predators,", **AP News**, https://www.apnews.com/PeacekeepersasPredators

She had been orphaned by a brutal conflict, but **the 14-year-old Congolese girl found refuge in a camp protected by United Nations peacekeepers. The camp should have been safe the day she was raped.** A delegation from the U.N. was paying a visit, and her grandmother had left her in charge of her siblings. That was the day, the girl says, that a Pakistani peacekeeper slipped inside their home and assaulted her in front of the other children. But that was not the end of her story. Even though she reported the rape, the girl never got any help from the U.N. She did become pregnant, however, and had a baby. **If the U.N. sexual abuse crisis has an epicenter, it is the Congo, where the scope of the problem first emerged 13 years ago — and where promised reforms have most clearly fallen short**. Of the 2,000 sexual abuse and exploitation complaints made against U.N. peacekeepers and personnel worldwide over the past 12 years, more than 700 occurred in Congo, The Associated Press found. The embattled African nation is home to the U.N.’s largest peacekeeping force, which costs a staggering $1 billion a year. The raped teenager’s experience is grimly emblematic of the underbelly of U.N. peacekeeping, and the organization as a whole. **During a yearlong investigation, the AP found that despite promising reform for more than a decade, the U.N. failed to meet many of its pledges to stop the abuse or help victims, some of whom have been lost to a sprawling bureaucracy.** Cases have disappeared or been handed off to the peacekeepers’ home countries — which often do nothing with them. The attack on the 14-year-old was so brazen it still haunts the U.N.’s top human rights official more than a decade after hearing the girl’s story. “What on earth would it take for this soldier not to do it — to have all the heads of the U.N. together, and he still does it?” asked Zeid Ra’ad al Hussein, a member of the delegation that heard the girl’s testimony in 2004. One year later, he helped write a landmark report intended to curb sexual abuse and exploitation within the U.N. system. With rare exceptions, victims interviewed by the AP received no help. Instead, **many were banished from their families for having mixed-race children, who also are shunned, becoming a second generation of victims**. The AP even found a girl who was raped by two peacekeepers; she gave birth to two babies by the time she was 14. To this day, the sexual violence by U.N. peacekeepers and personnel continues: Congo already accounts for nearly one-third of the 43 allegations made worldwide in 2017. William L. Swing was in charge of the Congo mission between May 2003 and January 2008, a period when abuse allegations swelled in a country that has been torn by dictatorship, civil war and unrest for the last half-century. “I take full responsibility for what happened,” Swing told the AP. “I knew at the time the buck stopped with me.” Swing said the U.N. at times made it clear he should be relieved of his duties. Instead, he was named the head of the U.N.’s International Organization for Migration. Now, he sits on a new task force appointed to tackle the problem yet again. Swing insists the mistakes made during the early years of the Congo mission provided lessons that could shape new reforms. “You can never make someone who has been sexually violated whole,” he said. “But you can give them a sense that the organization is trying to make them whole.” **The AP found that victims of car accidents involving U.N. vehicles are more likely to receive compensation than victims of rape**. Why? Because those injuries were inflicted during the course of the U.N. worker’s “official duties.” [↑](#endnote-ref-6)
7. Rodrigo **Campos**, 6-1-**2018**, "U.S. vetoes U.N. resolution denouncing violence against Palestinians," **Reuters**, https://www.reuters.com/article/us-israel-palestine-un-vote/u-s-vetoes-u-n-resolution-denouncing-violence-against-palestinians-idUSKCN1IX5UW

UNITED NATIONS (Reuters) - **The United States vetoed** on Friday a Kuwaiti-drafted **U.N. Security Council resolution that condemned Israel’s use of force against Palestinian civilians**, underlining Washington’s differences with friends and foes alike over the Israeli-Palestinian issue. U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations Nikki Haley vetoes a vote as Bolivian Ambassador Sacha Llorenty votes for a Arab-backed resolution for protection of Palestinian civilians during a Security Council meeting at U.N. headquarters in Manhattan, New York, U.S., June 1, 2018. REUTERS/Shannon Stapleton Later, a second, U.S.-drafted resolution that blamed Hamas for the violence and upheld Israel’s right to defend itself failed to attract any other country’s support when it was put to vote in the 15-member council. Blasting the council majority, U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations Nikki Haley said the two votes showed it was willing to blame Israel and unwilling to blame Hamas, the Islamist group that dominates Gaza. “It is now completely clear that the UN is hopelessly biased against Israel,” she said in a statement. **France, Russia, China, Ivory Coast, Kazakhstan, Bolivia, Peru, Sweden, and Equatorial Guinea joined Kuwait in voting in favor of the first draft. Britain, the Netherlands, Poland and Ethiopia abstained. Only the United States voted against.** To be adopted, a Security Council resolution needs to receive at least nine votes in favor and no vetoes by any of the permanent members - the United States, Britain, France, Russia and China. Only the United States voted in favor of the second draft resolution, while there were three negative votes and 11 abstentions. At least 116 Palestinians have been killed by Israeli forces in Gaza border protests since March 30. The largest number of killings occurred on May 14, the day the United States moved its embassy in Israel to Jerusalem from Tel Aviv. [↑](#endnote-ref-7)
8. Jumana Al **Tamimi**, 1-22-**2018**, "US has long history of shielding Israel at the UN," **Gulf Wars**, https://gulfnews.com/world/mena/us-has-long-history-of-shielding-israel-at-the-un-1.2160853

Dubai: Since 1970, **the US vetoed 43 resolutions at the UN Security Council that criticised Israel or denounced the measures it takes against the Palestinians.** The last incident was on December 18, 2017, when Washington vetoed a draft UN resolution that rejected President Donald Trump’s move to recognise occupied Jerusalem as Israel’s capital. For decades, the US has defended Israel and protected it with the veto power it has. In one instance in December 2016, however, the US, **under the presidency of Barack Obama, abstained from voting, paving the way for the adoption of UN Security Council Resolution** 2334. The move was hailed by the Arabs and most of the international community. The resolution stated that Israel’s colonial activities in Occupied Palestinian territorities constituted a “flagrant violation” of international law and have “no legal validity”. So far, Trump’s decision on occupied Jerusalem is extremely unpopular. Fourteen out of 15 countries voted against it in the Security Council, and 128 out of 193 in the General Assembly It demanded Israel stop such activity and fulfil its obligations as an occupying power under the Fourth Geneva Convention. **It was the first time the US took such a stand against Israel at the UN Security Council since 1980, under US President Jimmy Carter, when Resolution 465 was unanimously passed**. [↑](#endnote-ref-8)
9. **Jacqueline Rose**, xx-xx-**2005**, "The Question of Zionism: Continuing the Dialogue," **The University of Chicago**, (PDF labeled Rose)

They say it was their liberation movement. They say it was that which gave them sovereignty. They finally had a homeland’.7 But, as you laid it out so clearly in ‘Zionism from the Standpoint of Its Victims’, **Zionism suffers from an internal ‘bifurcation’ (QP, p. 87) or even, to push the psychoanalytic vocabulary one stage further, splitting: ‘between care for the Jews and an almost total disregard for the non-Jews or native Arab population**’ (QP, p. 83). Not only unjust, this splitting is self-defeating for the Israeli nation. In the eyes of the Arabs, Zionism becomes nothing other than an unfolding design ‘whose deeper roots in Jewish history and the terrible Jewish experience was necessarily obscured by what was taking place before their eyes’ (QP, p. 83). Freud of course spoke of the ‘blindness of the seeing eye’ (or in the words of Jean-Luc Godard, ‘shut your eyes, and see’). Zionism, we could say, has done itself a major disservice. So fervently has it nourished the discrimination between Jew and non-Jew, the rationale of its dispossession of the Palestinians, that, while it may have seized the earth, it has also snatched the grounds for understanding from beneath its own feet. This is not, of course, an apology for Israel; that much must be clear. It is more that the Palestinian cause has been weakened by its failure to understand the inner force of what it is up against (as Lenin once famously remarked, you should always construct your enemy at their strongest point). The ‘internal cohesion and solidity’ of Zionism has completely ‘eluded the understanding of Arabs’ (QP, p. 88), as has the ‘intertwined terror and the exultation’ out of which it was born—or in other words ‘what Zionism meant for Jews’ (QP, p. 66). It is the affective dimension, as it exerts its pressure historically, that has been blocked from view. You are analysing a trauma—‘an immensely traumatic Zionist effectiveness’ (QP, p. 83). Terror, exultation, trauma—Zionism has the ruthlessness of the symptom (it is the symptom of its own success). Given this emphasis, your unexpected and rarely commented remarks on the ‘benevolent’, ‘humanistic’ impulse of Zionism towards its own people are even more striking (there is no oneor even two-dimensionality here). You never ceased to insist on the colonial nature of the venture, and the cruel Orientalism of how the Arab people were treated and portrayed. But what if the key to understanding the catastrophe for the Palestinians, of 1948 and after, were to be found in the love that the Jewish people—for historically explicable reasons—lavishon themselves? We have entered the most stubborn and self-defeating psychic terrain, where a people can be loving and lethal, and their most exultant acts towards—and triumph over—an indigenous people expose them to the dan7. Said, ‘What People in the U.S. Know about Islam Is a Stupid Cliché they most fear. For it is not just of course that Israel’s conduct has made it impossible for the Arabs to understand her nor that Israel has been blind towards the Arabs (in fact never true), but that she sees things in the wrong place: ‘Everything that did stay to challenge Israel was viewed not as something there, but as a sign of something outside Israel and Zionism bent on its destruction—from the outside’ (QP, p. 89). Israel is vulnerable because it cannot see the people who—whether in refugee camps on the borders (the putative Palestinian state), or inside the country (the Israeli-Arabs), or scattered all over the world (the Palestinian diaspora)—are in fact, psychically as well as politically, in its midst. Contrast this again, as you do repeatedly, with Israel as a nation for all Jewish people—this passionately inclusive, and violently excluding, embrace. Here time and place are infinite: If every Jew in Israel represents “the whole Jewish people”—which is a population made up not only of the Jews in Israel, but also of generations of Jews who existed in the past (of whom the present Israelis are the remnant) and those who exist in the future, as well as those who live elsewhere. Israel would not be simply the state of its citizens (which included Arabs, of course) but the state of “the whole Jewish people,” having a kind of sovereignty over land and peoples that no other state possessed or possesses. [QP, pp. 104, 84] [↑](#endnote-ref-9)
10. Paul **Scham**, 3-13-**2018**, "Explaining India’s Position on Jerusalem and the Israeli-Palestinian Conflict," **Middle East Institute**, https://www.mei.edu/publications/explaining-indias-position-jerusalem-and-israeli-palestinian-conflict

Since then, **India-Israel relations,** under the stewardship of both the Congress Party and the Bharatiya Janata Party (BJP), **have grown warmer and stronger. Following the 9/11 terrorist attacks** against the United States and in the context of the US-led ‘global war on terror,’ **Indian and Israeli leaders found common cause against Islamic militancy; and extended their bilateral cooperation to the defense, intelligence and security-related spheres**.[17] Therefore, it is incorrect to assume, as many do, that the intensity of Indian-Israeli relations dates only to 2014, with the ascension of a BJP government under the premiership of Narendra.[18] **The growing ties between Israel and India are evident both in the economic and military spheres. Non-defense trade between the two countries climbed from $200 million in 1992 to $4.167 billion in 2016.[19] According to the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI) arms database, India is the destination for 41 percent of Israel’s arms sales, which averaged $1 billion between 2012 and 2016**.[20] Last April, Israel Aerospace Industries (IAI) was awarded a $1.6 billion contract to provide medium-range surface-to-air missiles to the Indian Army.[21] Kumaraswamy[22] has written that India’s relationship with Israel is “delinked” from the conflict with the Palestinians. Similarly, Malhotra calls it “de-hyphenated” since it is less connected to the Palestinians — an increasing feature of Israel’s relationship with other countries as well.[23] In practical terms, this is evident in other ways. Having previously voted on UN resolutions that were supportive of the Palestinians, in 2015 India abstained from the UN’s Human Rights Council report on the previous year’s Gaza war. Last year, Indian policy underwent a “major shift.”[24] First, in July 2017 Modi broke a historic taboo by becoming the first Indian prime minister to visit Israel. Second, during Palestinian president Mahmoud Abbas’s visit to India, Modi omitted any reference to East Jerusalem as the capital of a future Palestinian state, thereby departing from a decade-long practice.[25] At the same time, it is perhaps worth noting that Modi’s failure to mention East Jerusalem is not unique to India. Analysts have reported silence by rising powers in other fora, including in declarations by the BRICS at their most recent summit in September 2017 and the Russia-India-China meeting in New Delhi in December 2017.[26] Opposition in India to the Boycott, Divestment and Sanctions (BDS) Movement Under Modi, India seems set to foster the further development of ties with Israel. Meanwhile, India’s relations with the Palestinians appear to be at a standstill. However, New Delhi's policy regarding the Israeli-Palestinian conflict has encountered some opposition within Indian society. The most visible sources of discontent can be found among those social movements and groups which identify with the Palestinian cause, and especially those who are aligned with the Boycott, Divestment and Sanctions (BDS) movement. The BDS was formed among Palestinian organizations, associations, groups and social movements in July 2005. This was the immediate period after the violence of the Second Intifada (2000-05). Many BDS advocates saw it as an alternative to the Oslo peace process, which they believed had failed to deliver a just and lasting settlement between Israel and the Palestinians. Drawing on the anti-apartheid struggle in South Africa for inspiration, BDS activists focused less on realizing a Palestinian state and more on ending Palestinian discrimination and marginalization by Israel, along with the right of return for all Palestinian refugees. As part of its actions, advocates of BDS lobby governments to impose sanctions, boycotts and divestment in response to illegal Israeli actions. The international dimension is key to the BDS movement. To date, it has been most visible and active in building up links with like-minded individuals, movements and groups in countries which have the closest economic and social ties to Israel like North America and Europe.

 [↑](#endnote-ref-10)
11. When he was in the fourth grade in elementary school in the Arab town of Majd al-Krum in Upper Galilee, Adel Manna took part in the preparations to celebrate Israel’s 10th Independence Day. At home, he told his father, Hussein, about how thrilled he was to be in a play about the achievements of the Zionist movement and the young state. His father’s face clouded over. Sitting Adel, his firstborn child, by his side, he explained with much forbearance why the event was not a cause for celebration for the Arabs, rather a day of grief and trauma. “It is not a day of istiqlal [independence] but of istakhlal [conquest, occupation],” he said. >>With his back against the wall, Abbas puts one-state solution on the table | Analysis “My father told me about the murders that Israel Defense Forces soldiers committed in Majd al-Krum in November 1948, and that months after the end of the war, hundreds of residents were expelled, including our family,” Manna tells me during an interview in Jerusalem. In January 1949, his family crossed into Jordan and afterward went on to Ein al-Hilweh refugee camp in southern Lebanon. Sixty years have passed since Manna grasped the difference between those two Arabic words. The circumstances of his family’s exile and subsequent return to the ancestral home have haunted him all his life. Now, following a difficult gestation, those experiences have produced a groundbreaking historical study, “Nakba and Survival: The Story of the Palestinians Who Remained in Haifa and the Galilee, 1948-1956,” which first came out in Arabic and has recently been published in Hebrew. The term Nakba, or “catastrophe,” is used to describe Israel’s War of Independence, when hundreds of thousands of Arabs fled or were expelled from their homes. In the Hebrew version of his book Manna uses the Hebrew word sordim for survivors, i.e., those who remained (as opposed to the term nitzolim, connoting Holocaust survivors, which he says has in essence been appropriated by the Jews). Dr. Adel Manna in his home. Emil Salman I begin our conversation by asking Manna when he arrived at the decision that the book’s protagonists would be those who survived/remained after the events of 1948-49. “Survival is strength,” he replies. “It is the ability to confront a disaster, such as an earthquake, and to hold on and rescue your family and property. That is what happened to the Arabs in Israel, and that disaster did not end in 1948 but went on at least until 1956. **The Palestinians became a minority ruled by the Jews**, with whose language and laws they were not familiar. Formally they were citizens, but effectively they were under occupation. Their rights were trampled, their property was expropriated and plundered, they could not leave their village without a permit, and so on. One needs strength, and above all strategies, to survive. I call it the strength of the defeated: not to yield to despair, and to ensure that your family remains alive. [Israeli] historian Benny Morris and others like him hate my book, because I am taking the story from them and brazenly also claiming that the Palestinians survived, even though after World War II and the Holocaust, the Jews have a monopoly on the word ‘survival.’” Aren’t you actually replacing the [Arabic] term summud – steadfastness – with [the Hebrew] hisardut, or survival? “In the Arabic version of the book, I use the word bakaa, which means remaining alive. The Palestinians did not face extinction in the 1948 Nakba, as I emphasize in the book. Not everyone managed to come through and rehabilitate his life; some despaired and left. **Families [were] split apart and did not see one another for years.** Some Palestinians preferred to remain in the homeland under military rule and to bend in order to survive, despite their private tragedy, which was also a national and political tragedy. “This is also a story of rebirth. The term summud is from the 1980s, and connotes a political and ideological approach: namely, I must hold fast to the land. After the West Bank Palestinians despaired of the possibility of liberating Palestine, they spoke of a commitment to cling steadfastly to the territories that were occupied in 1967.” When did the Palestinians in Israel grasp that it was incumbent on them to survive? “At the start of the war in 1948, many fled for their lives, believing they would soon return. But in short order they understood that central Galilee and western Galilee, which in the United Nations partition plan were supposed to be part of the Arab state, would be lost. When you realize that those who left will not be able to return, and hear that the conditions in the refugee camps in Lebanon are dire, you realize that abandonment is not an option. “The residents of the Arab city of Nazareth and its 20 surrounding villages were not expelled in Operation Hiram [in October 1948, aimed at taking control of the Upper Galilee from the Arab Liberation Army]. When **the Israel Defense Forces** reached locales such as Bana, Deir al-Assad, Nahaf and others” as part of the operation, Manna continues, “the soldiers **entered the villages, put the men in groups, shot a few** and ordered everyone: ‘Yallah, to Lebanon!’ The villagers ostensibly left and started to walk northward. The soldiers did not go with them. Often, after going five or 10 kilometers, and without a soldier in sight, they returned and found people to liaise with the Israeli commanders. People started to develop survival skills.” The book, then, focuses on the Palestinians who were not expelled, and Manna focuses on groups such as the Druze, who joined the IDF as early as June 1948, and others such as the Circassians and some of the Bedouin villages in Galilee. In the main, Manna deals with Nazareth and many of its surrounding villages, which emerged almost unscathed from the Nakba in the wake of an Israeli decision of July 1948. The author analyzes the circumstances that allowed about 100,000 Palestinians to remain in Galilee and Haifa, whereas another 750,000 were dislocated and fled. Christians vs. Muslims “In 1948,” he says, “the high-ranking political decision makers issued explicit directives to IDF officers not to harm or expel the residents of Nazareth and many villages around it. Israel’s policy in regard to the Christians was more moderate than toward Muslims. There is the well-known case of the Christian village of Ilabun, where a massacre was perpetrated and the villagers were expelled to southern Lebanon – but, in a unique instance, those refugees were allowed to return to their homes and their land. In contrast, the Muslims in Galilee were victims of ethnic cleansing.”On what basis do you maintain that most of the deportees were Muslims? “If we focus on Galilee, the fact is that many Christians from Acre and Haifa were also expelled. This contradicts the account of Israeli historians to the effect that Haifa mayor Shabtai Levy drew up an emotional leaflet, urging the Arab residents not to leave the city where they had lived for so many years. I interviewed Haifa residents – members of the Communist Party who are not nationalists and certainly do not hate Israel. Not one of them ever heard of that leaflet, and on the day it was supposedly distributed, the Haganah [pre-IDF paramilitary organization] shelled the Arab neighborhoods from Mount Carmel. In Haifa there was no expulsion in the sense of people being **[and] forced [them] onto trucks at gunpoint**. But when **entire neighborhoods were shelled, people rushed to the port**. The same pattern was repeated in Acre and Jaffa.” Did Prime Minister David Ben-Gurion pursue a policy or issue an order aimed at getting rid of the Muslims? “I am not looking for a directive or a document bearing Ben-Gurion’s signature. He addressed the subject often, and I quote his statements in the book. For example, on September 26, 1948, he declared, ‘Only one task remains for the Arabs in the Land of Israel: to flee.’ **The Israeli leadership understood** and also concurred that, for the Jewish state, **the fewer Arabs the better**. The subject was mooted already in the late 1930s. Yosef Weitz, a senior official of the Jewish National Fund, supported extensive expulsion of Arabs and advocated a population transfer. The IDF commanders at different levels knew what the leadership wanted and acted accordingly. Massacres were not perpetrated everywhere. When you shell a village or a city neighborhood, the residents flee. In the first half of 1948, at least, they believed they would be able to return. When the fighting in Haifa ended, many residents tried to return from Acre in boats, but the Haganah blocked them.” Does your study confirm, or prove, that ethnic cleansing took place? “The book’s goal is not to prove whether ethnic cleansing occurred. My disagreement with [the review of my book in Haaretz by] Benny Morris did not revolve around the question of ‘whether ethnic cleansing took place or not,’ but deals with the question of whether the leadership did or did not make a decision in a particular meeting to implement a policy of ethnic cleansing.” In this connection, Manna quotes Daniel Blatman’s response (Haaretz, Aug. 4) to a review of his book by Morris (Haaretz, July 29). One might think from Morris’ book, Blatman noted, that “when Ratko Mladic decided to slaughter over 7,000 Bosnian Muslim men and boys in Srebrenica in 1995, he made his orders public.” Indeed, Manna points out, “The first historian who uncovered the fact that ethnic cleansing occurred and that there were also cases of massacre, rape and expulsion was Benny Morris. He reached the conclusion that there was no [official] policy, in light of the fact that no authoritative archival documentation exists. In one village, they decided a certain way and in another, differently. Still, there is a pattern: The soldiers perpetrated another massacre and carried out another expulsion, and another massacre and another expulsion, and no one was brought to trial. If there was no policy, why weren’t these war criminals tried?” A case in point: the atrocities that were carried out in the village of Safsaf, northwest of Safed, on October 30, 1948, which included murder, expulsion and [sexually assaulted] ~~rape~~. Manna writes that a member of his wife’s family was [sexually assaulted]~~raped~~ and murdered in cold blood by IDF soldiers: His wife, Aziza, is named for the rape victim. He heard the account nine years ago from a woman named Maryam Halihal, now 80, who was 10 at the time of the events. Rape is considered a dishonoring of the family in Arab society. Did you have qualms about publishing the story and the identity of the victims? “Rape generates deep shame in the victim’s family. Aziza Sharaida is no longer alive – why make her harsh story public and shame her family? When I met the woman who would become my wife, she told me that she was named for a cousin, Aziza Sharaida, without elaborating. As part of my research, I interviewed members of my wife’s family, and Maryam Halihal decided to talk about the incident, over her husband’s angry objections.**The soldiers entered the family’s house and tried to [sexually assault] ~~rape~~ Aziza Sharaida in front of her husband and children**. **She resisted. The soldiers threatened to kill her 17-year-old, firstborn son if she went on resisting. She resisted with force and they shot her son**. The soldiers threatened to shoot her husband, too, but she refused to give in, and they shot and killed him. The two younger sons, who witnessed the atrocity, went into exile in Lebanon. My wife’s mother, a relative of the murdered woman, decided 63 years ago to name her daughter Aziza. As I write in the book, even though Haim Laskov [later a chief of staff] was put in charge of the interrogation of the perpetrators of the horrors in Safsaf, none of them paid the price for war crimes, which included shooting prisoners and acts of abuse and rape.” Manna began his research in 1984. Over the years, he interviewed 120 men and women and compiled documents, diaries and letters from the period, which in some cases had been stashed away in drawers. He also drew on written Palestinian sources, which helped him confirm oral testimonies. Memoirs published in Arabic and newspaper articles form the period, in Arabic and Hebrew, contributed to the research. Manna also made use of many studies by Jewish Israeli historians. However, he says, he did not resort to the sweeping preference for Israeli archives that characterizes such historians as Benny Morris. “The blatant manner in which oral testimonies are disdained and ignored by researchers in Israel reflects a domineering attitude,” he writes in the book’s introduction. He will not deposit the material he’s collected over the years in an Israeli archive. It will go either to Bir Zeit University, near Ramallah, or to the Beirut-based Institute for Palestine Studies. “Palestinian students can’t get to the Hebrew University [of Jerusalem],” he says. Palestinian ‘illegals’ As a Muslim born in 1947 in Majd al-Krum and as a historian who researched the special story of his village in the 1948 war, Adel Manna decided that it was his obligation to write the history of the 120,000 Arabs who remained in Israel – the generation of his parents, Hussein and Kawthar. “They survived the policy of a military government under which their rights were trampled, and despite that were able to raise nine children and instill in us the message that no one is entitled to treat us as inferior people,” he says. Turning to his parents’ ordeal in the 1948 war, Manna relates, “The first person in Majd al-Krum who was blindfolded and made to stand against a wall in the village square – before being shot to death by a squad of six soldiers – was the husband of my grandmother, Zahra,” he explains. Subsequently, “In January 1949, 536 residents were expelled, including members of her family and her children, and became refugees in Lebanon. Her brother was murdered by a resident of [the Jewish community of] Pardes Hannah; her son, Samih, was killed when he stepped on a land mine. After the war, she worked as a maid in Haifa with her daughter. For two years, my father ‘infiltrated’ into Israel to visit them and take back a little money that grandmother had saved up for him and for his brother in Lebanon.” Manna was a year old when he and his parents were among the many from Majd al-Krum who were herded onto IDF trucks that took them west to the village of Al-Birwa (today, the location of Moshav Ahihud), then south toward the Jezreel Valley and Wadi Ara.The trucks stopped there,” he relates. “The people were ordered to get off amid shouts of ‘Yallah, go to King Abdullah’ [in Jordan]. My parents spent one night in a mosque in Kafr Ara and from there walked to Nablus [then part of Jordan]. We spent the hard winter of 1949 there. People were crowded into tents under grim hygienic conditions. In April, the Jordanians encouraged the refugees to leave. My parents decided to go north and reached Ein al-Hilweh [in Lebanon]. I almost died in the refugee camp, like other infants.” Due to an intestinal ailment, Manna did not stand or walk until he was 2 and a half. “A woman in the camp deduced that this was why I couldn’t stand and made me a potion from herbs and castor oil. It eradicated the parasites, and within a day or two I was walking. We returned to Israel in 1951 in a fishing boat that set out from the port of Tyre in Lebanon and brought us, the Palestinian ‘illegals,’ to the beach of Shavei Tzion [returners to Zion], north of Acre. How symbolic,” Manna says with a smile. How did you manage to get back? “Like many Galilee Palestinians, my father had repeatedly ‘infiltrated’ into Israel. On one such occasion he learned that a lawyer, Hana Naqara, had petitioned the High Court of Justice on behalf of 43 Majd al-Krum residents, each of whom had returned to the village more than once but had been expelled back to Lebanon each time. Naqara argued that these people had [Israeli] ID numbers – a population census had been conducted in Majd al-Krum in December 1948, the month before they were originally deported. [Those who received an official ID number were considered citizens.] Like them, my parents also had ID numbers. Back in Lebanon, my father told my mother: ‘Prepare what’s needed – tonight we’re going back to the village.’ “My mother was seven months pregnant, how was she going to walk 40 kilometers? Father told her that a Palestinian fisherman from the village of Az-Zeeb [Hebrew name: Achziv] had discovered that transporting refugees by boat was more profitable than fishing. As a child I believed that my father was a great hero, who had thought up the idea of our return by boat. While researching the book I learned that many Galileans had returned to Israel via the sea – a subject that awaits historical research.” ‘Don’t be a donkey’ “Nakba and Survival” is dedicated to the memory of Manna’s father. His mother, Kawthar (“pure water”), 89, lives in the family home in the village, and contributed considerably to the book. Manna recalls that the first Jews he met as a boy were women. At the time, he traveled to the Haifa suburbs of Kiryat Motzkin and Kiryat Bialik to sell figs from the family grove. There he discovered not only that the Jews lived in apartment buildings and that shade trees had been planted along the road, but also that Jewish women were very affable. One of them, Mrs. Miller by name, treated him warmly, and when police officers showed up to confiscate wares of Arab peddlers, she hid his baskets of figs in her home. Adel remembers his father telling him, “Don’t be a donkey like me, who works as a manual laborer all his life from morning to evening and has a hard time providing for his nine children. Get an education, so you can get a job with a good salary.” Manna obtained a B.A. in history from the University of Haifa, then his master’s and doctorate from the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, writing his dissertation on the history of the Jerusalem district in the Ottoman period. His adviser, Gabriel Baer, advised him to steer clear of issues such as the Nakba and the conflict, he recalls: “Prof. Baer intimated that the topics I had in mind would not help a student like me forge an academic career. In retrospect, I appreciated his advice.” Manna’s political awareness was honed in the 1970s, when he was a student in Haifa, living in the dorms. He was elected secretary of the Arab Students Union, whose activity included organization of cultural and political events. His political activity exacted a price, he says: “I came under pressure from Shin Bet [security service] agents, who tried to recruit me as a collaborator and promised that in return I would be allowed to become a teacher. ‘What are you going to do with a B.A. in history?’ a Shin Bet agent named Carmi said to me. Instead of giving in or being afraid, I told Gideon Spiro, the editor of the student newspaper, about it. “The newspaper published a report headlined ‘Shin Bet harassing Arab student,’ on February 2, 1972, a week before I received my degree. The article stirred a furor in the university and in the Hebrew press. In its wake, the weekly magazine Haolam Hazeh ran a follow-up article. I didn’t panic. I began M.A. studies at the Hebrew University and was elected to the Arab Students Union there, which led the resistance to the forced ‘protection’ of Arab students in 1974-1975.“All along I was haunted by the story I’d heard from my father and from others in the village. When I told [Jewish] students about it, I always got the same response: ‘We didn’t expel anyone and the only massacre was in Deir Yassin [outside Jerusalem, in 1948]. The Palestinians simply fled.’ The silencing and denial of the Nakba prompted me to write an article titled ‘Letter to an Israeli Friend,’ which was published in Haaretz in June 1984.” The article began with a concise description of the events in his village in 1948, his philo-Zionist schooling and the shock Manna endured when he learned, while taking part in demonstrations against Israel’s 1982 invasion of Lebanon, that two of his cousins from Ein al-Hilweh were incarcerated in the IDF detention facility at Ansar in southern Lebanon. Shattered by the news, he decided to abandon his doctoral studies and devote himself to writing a book about the Nakba. “My wife was shocked,” he recalls. “‘Are you out of your mind? What will you do with a book like that? You have to finish your doctorate,’ she insisted. It was a rough year, 1984. There was a stormy campaign for the Knesset elections, the members of the Jewish underground who perpetrated terrorist acts in the territories were arrested – all of which diverted my attention [↑](#endnote-ref-11)
12. Susan Opotow, “Peace, Conflict, and Violence: Peace Psychology for the 21st Century”, (PDF in Off-Case folder)

**Participation in moral exclusion ranges from unawareness to ignoring, allowing, facilitating, executing, and devising**. At the more passive end of the engagement dimension, crimes of ignoring and allowing occur when people have the social, intellectual, or financial resources to hinder moral exclusion, or aid those who are harmed, but remain aloof, uninterested, or uninformed. At the more active end of this dimension, are crimes of devising and executing violent acts. Architects of genocide, despots such as Pol Pot of Cambodia, are at the extreme end of the engagement scale, even when they themselves do not carry out the policies they devise and set into motion. [↑](#endnote-ref-12)
13. Susan Opotow, “Peace, Conflict, and Violence: Peace Psychology for the 21st Century”, (PDF in Off-Case folder)

While structural violence often leads to direct violence, the reverse is also true, as brutality terrorizes bystanders, who then become unwilling or unable to confront social injustice. Increasingly, civilians pay enormous costs of war, not only through death, but through devastation of neighborhoods and ecosystems. Ruling elites rarely suffer from armed conflict as much as civilian populations do, who endure decades of poverty and disease in war-tom societies. Recognizing the operation of structural violence forces us to ask questions about how and why we tolerate it, questions that often have painful answers. The first chapter in this section, "Social Injustice," by Susan Opotow, argues that our normal perceptual/cognitive processes lead us to care about people inside our scope of justice, but rarely care about those people outside. Injustice that would be instantaneously confronted if it occurred to someone we love or know is barely noticed if it occurs to strangers or those who are invisible or irrelevant to us. We do not seem to be able to open our minds and our hearts to everyone; [thus,] moral exclusion is a product of our normal cognitive processes. But Opotow argues convincingly that we can reduce its nefarious effects by becoming aware of our distorted perceptions. Inclusionary thinking can be fostered by relationships, communication, and appreciation of diversity. **One outcome of exclusionary thinking is the belief that victims of violence must in some way deserve their plight. But certainly it is easy to see that young children do not deserve to be victims**. The next two chapters in this section address the violence experienced by children. In the first, "The War Close to Home: Children and Violence in the United States," Kathleen Kostelny and James Garbarino describe the direct and structural violence which children in Chicago and other urban areas of the United States endure, paralleling that experienced by children who live in countries at war. Children who endure these environments often become battle weary, numb, hopeless, and/or morally impaired. But children not only suffer directly from violence, they also suffer from the impaired parenting and communities which poverty inflicts. The authors describe how community and family support mechanisms can mitigate these effects. For example, home visitation and early childhood education programs provide crucial family and community support. While Kostelny and Garbarino focus on community intervention techniques, Milton Schwebel and Daniel Christie, in their article "Children and Structural Violence," extend the analysis of structural violence by examining how economic and psychological deprivation impairs at-risk children. Children living in poverty experience diminished intellectual development because parents are too overwhelmed to be able to provide crucial linguistic experiences. Schwebel and Christie's discussion concludes that economic structures must provide parents with living-wage employment, good prenatal medical care, and high-quality child-care ifwe are to see the next generation develop into the intelligent and caring citizens needed to create a peaceful world. [↑](#endnote-ref-13)
14. Brett **Morris**, 3-5-**2018**, "It’s Time for the United States to Stop Supporting Israel," **Medium**, <https://medium.com/s/just-world-order/its-time-for-the-united-states-to-stop-supporting-israel-1fc88a41492b>

“We are here to stay, forever,” as Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu told West Bank settlers last year. Israel’s occupation of Palestinian territory is extremely brutal. As Amnesty International’s latest report on Israel and the Occupied Territories for 2016/2017 explains: Israeli forces unlawfully killed Palestinian civilians, including children, in both Israel and the Occupied Palestinian Territories (OPT), and detained thousands of Palestinians from the OPT who opposed Israel’s continuing military occupation, holding hundreds in administrative detention. Torture and other ill-treatment of detainees remained rife and was committed with impunity. The authorities continued to promote illegal settlements in the West Bank, including by attempting to retroactively “legalize” settlements built on private Palestinian land, and severely restricted Palestinians’ freedom of movement, closing some areas after attacks by Palestinians on Israelis. Israeli forces continued to blockade the Gaza Strip, subjecting its population of 1.9 million to collective punishment, and to demolish homes of Palestinians in the West Bank and of Bedouin villagers in Israel’s Negev/Naqab region, forcibly evicting residents. The latest report from Human Rights Watch likewise states that throughout 2017, “The Israeli government continued to enforce severe and discriminatory restrictions on Palestinians’ human rights; restrict the movement of people and goods into and out of the Gaza Strip; and facilitate the unlawful transfer of Israeli citizens to settlements in the occupied West Bank.” The leading Israeli human rights organization, B’Tselem, explains that in the Gaza Strip, “Israel applies a callous policy and assumes no responsibility for the devastating effects it has on the lives of the local residents. Israel denies Gaza residents any possibility of independent subsistence, yet is willing to meet only their barest needs, even on essentials such as water and electricity.” In the West Bank, B’Tselem says, Israel “treats the West Bank as if it were part of its sovereign territory: grabbing land, exploiting natural resources for its own needs and building permanent settlements designated for Israelis only. At the same time, for the past 50 years, Palestinian West Bank residents have been living under rigid military rule that primarily serves the interests of the State of Israel and Israeli settlers.” Occasionally, open conflict erupts between the two sides. The last such incident was in 2014, in what Israel called Operation Protective Edge. Usually, some form of violence by Hamas or another Palestinian faction is used as a pretext by Israel to engage in what amounts to a systemic massacre. Israel refers to this as “mowing the lawn**.” According to the UN report on the 2014 conflict**, **72 Israelis were killed, as opposed to 2,271 Palestinians— a ratio of about 1:31. The majority of the Palestinians killed were civilians — 1,462 — while six of the Israelis killed were civilians.** More than 11,000 Palestinians were injured, including more than 3,400 children. About 1,600 Israelis were injured. As the UN report describes, “as Palestinians struggled to find ways to save their own lives and those of their families, they were confronted with intense attacks, with no way of knowing which locations would be hit.” The “enormous destruction of civilian infrastructure” included 18,000 housing units “destroyed in whole or in part,” “much of the electricity network and of the water and sanitation infrastructure,” as well as “73 medical facilities and many ambulances.” Often, Israel justifies its incursions into Gaza — as it did in 2014 — because of rocket attacks emanating from there, and therefore Israel says it has a “right to defend itself.” This doesn’t make sense because, as Jerome Slater writes for Mondoweiss, “aggressor states have no ‘right of self-defense’ when it is their criminality that has provoked violent resistance.” If Israel were to end its illegal occupation and accept a political settlement, then it would have a right to defend itself. The political settlement that would solve the conflict is well-known and accepted by virtually the entire world: the two-state solution on the pre-1967 borders. The relevant Palestinian factions accept it — including Hamas — but Israel rejects it by building more and more settlements. The United States officially supports it, but through its actions and support for Israel effectively opposes it. Israel could not do what it does to Palestinians without U.S. support. The United States provides diplomatic cover for Israel at the United Nations, and the United States also supplies Israel with most of its weapons and military hardware. Since 1972, the United States has vetoed more than 40 resolutions critical of Israel at the UN Security Council — usually being the only one of the body’s 15 members to vote against the resolution. Most recently, the United States vetoed a resolution in December 2017 condemning the Trump administration’s decision to recognize Jerusalem as Israel’s capital. The vote was 14–1. In the UN General Assembly, the United States is routinely only one of a few countries in the world to vote against resolutions regarding Israel and the Palestinians. In 2012, the General Assembly voted 138–9 to admit Palestine to the United Nations as a non-member observer state. The countries opposed were the United States, Israel, Canada, the Czech Republic, the Marshall Islands, Micronesia, Nauru, Panama, and Palau. [↑](#endnote-ref-14)