

افغانستان آزاد – آزاد افغانستان

AA-AA

چو کشور نباشد تن من مباد بدین بوم و بر زنده یک تن مباد
همه سر به سر تن به کشتن دهیم از آن به که کشور به دشمن دهیم

www.afgazad.com

afgazad@gmail.com

European Languages

زبانهای اروپائی

JUNE 4, 2018

by JIM KAVANAGH

05.06.2018

Sacrificing Gaza: The Great March of Zionist Hypocrisy

The Great March of Return is a startling, powerful expression of Palestinian identity and resistance. Thousands of Palestinians have come out, bravely and unapologetically, to say: “We refuse to remain invisible. We reject any attempt to assign us to the discard pile of history. We will exercise our fundamental right *to go home*.” They have done this unarmed, in the face of Israel’s use of deadly armed force against targets (children, press, medics) deliberately chosen to demonstrate the Jewish state’s unapologetic determination to force them back into submissive exile by any means necessary. By doing this repeatedly over the last few weeks, these incredibly brave men, women, and children have done more than decades of essays and books to strip the aura of virtue from Zionism that’s befogged Western liberals’ eyes for 70 years.

What the Israelis have done over the past few weeks—killing at least 112 and wounding over 13,000 people (332 with life-threatening injuries and 27 requiring amputation)—is a historical crime that stands alongside the Sharpeville Massacre (69 killed), Bloody Sunday (14 killed), and the Birmingham Fire Hoses and Police Dog Repression as a defining moment in an ongoing struggle for justice and freedom. Like those events, this month’s slaughter *may* become a turning point for what John Pilger correctly calls “the longest occupation and resistance in modern times”—the continuing, unfinished subjugation of the Palestinian people, which, like apartheid and Jim Crow, requires constant armed repression and at least occasional episodes of extermination.

The American government, political parties, and media, which support and make possible this crime are disgraceful, criminal accomplices. American politicians, media, and people, who feel all aglow about professing their back-in-the-day support (actual, for some; retrospectively-imagined, for most) of the Civil-Rights movement in the American South and the anti-apartheid struggle in South Africa but continue to ignore the Palestinian struggle for justice against Zionism, because saying peep one about it might cost them some discomfort, are disgraceful, cowardly hypocrites.

You know, the millions of ant-racist #Resistors who are waiting for a quorum of Natalie Portmans and cool elite, preferably Jewish, personalities to make criticism of Israel acceptable before finding the courage to express the solidarity with the Palestinian people they've always had in their hearts. Back in the day, they'd be waiting for Elvis to denounce Jim Crow before deciding that it's the right time to side with MLK, Malcolm, and Fred Hampton against Bull Connor, George Wallace, and [William F. Buckley](#).

Dis/Ingenuity

The bankruptcy of purportedly anti-racist and humanitarian liberal-Zionist ideology and ideological institutions reached an apogee with the eruption of various apologia for Israel in the wake of this crime, not-so-subtly embedded in mealy-mouthed “regret the tragic loss of life” bleats across the mediascape. All the usual rhetorical subjects were rounded up and thrown into ideological battle: “Israel has every right to defend its borders” ([NYT Editorial Board](#)); the “misogynists and homophobes of Hamas” orchestrated the whole thing ([Bret Stephens](#)); the protestors are either Hamas “terrorists” or Hamas-manipulated robots, to be considered “nominal civilians” ([WaPo](#)). And, of course, the recurring pièce de résistance: *Human Shields!*

Somewhere in his or her discourse, virtually every American pundit is dutifully echoing the Israeli [talking point](#) laid down by Benjamin Netanyahu during the Israeli attack on Gaza in 2014: that Hamas uses the “telegenically dead” to further “their cause.” The whole March of Return action is “reckless endangerment, bottomlessly cynical” (Stephens). Women and children were “dispatched” to “lead the charges” although they had been “amply forewarned...of the mortal risk.” It's a “politics of human sacrifice” ([Jonathan S. Tobin](#) and [Tom Friedman](#)), staged by Hamas, “the terrorist group that controls [Gazans'] lives,” to “get people killed on camera.” ([Matt Friedman, NYT Op-Ed](#)). The White House, via spokesman, Raj Shah, adopts this line as its official [response](#) “The responsibility for these tragic deaths rests squarely with Hamas,” which “intentionally and cynically provoke[ed] this response” in “a gruesome... propaganda attempt.”

Shmuel Rosner takes this “human shields” trope to its ultimate “no apologies” conclusion in his notorious [op-ed](#) in the NYT, “Israel Needs to Protect Its Borders. By Whatever Means Necessary.” Feeling “no need to engage in ingénue mourning,” Rosner forthrightly asserts that “Guarding the border [or whatever it is] was more important than avoiding killing.” *They want human sacrifice, we’ll give ‘em human sacrifice!*

He acknowledges that Gazans “marched because they are desperate and frustrated. Because living in Gaza is not much better than living in hell,” and that “the people of Gaza ... deserve sympathy and pity.” But the Palestinians were seeking “to violate [Israel’s] territorial integrity,” so “Israel had no choice” but to “draw a line that cannot be crossed,” and kill people trying to leave that hell. It was “the only way to ultimately persuade the Palestinians to abandon the futile battle for things they cannot get (“return,” control of Jerusalem, the elimination of Israel).” The alternative is “more demonstrations — and therefore more bloodshed, mostly Palestinian.”

Though he acknowledges that “the interests of Palestinians are [not] at the top of the list of my priorities,” Shmuel nonetheless feels comfortable speaking on their behalf. He sincerely “believe[s] Israel’s current policy toward Gaza ultimately benefits not only Israel but also the Palestinians.” Following the wisdom of “the Jewish sages” (featuring [Nick Lowe](#)?) he opines: “Those who are kind to the cruel end up being cruel to the kind.”

Fear not, Shmuel, for the pitiable people of Gaza: Knesset member Avi Dichter [reassures](#) us that the Israeli army “has enough bullets for everyone. If every man, woman and child in Gaza gathers at the gate, in other words, there is a bullet for every one of them. They can all be killed, no problem.” For their ultimate benefit. Zionist tough love.

There is nothing new here. Israel has always understood the ghetto it created in Gaza. In 2004, Arnon Soffer, a Haifa University demographer and advisor to Ariel Sharon, said: “when 2.5 million people live in a closed-off Gaza, it’s going to be a human catastrophe. ... The pressure at the border will be awful. ... So, if we want to remain alive, we will have to kill and kill and kill. All day, every day.... If we don’t kill, we will cease to exist.” And when challenged again in [2007](#) about “Israel’s willingness to do what he prescribes... – i.e., put a bullet in the head of anyone who tries to climb over the security fence,” Soffer replied with a shrug: “If we don’t, we’ll cease to exist.”

Soffer’s only plaint: “The only thing that concerns me is how to ensure that the boys and men who are going to have to do the killing will be able to return home to their families and be normal human beings.” A reprise of Golda Meir’s “[shooting and crying](#)” lament;

“We can never forgive [the Arabs] for forcing us to kill their children.” Ingénue mourning, anyone?

We can point out the factual errors and concrete cruelties that all these apologias rely on.

We can point out that Hamas did not “orchestrate” these demonstrations, and that the thousands of Gazans who are risking their lives are not instruments. “You people always looked down at us,” one Gazan [told](#) Amira Hass, “so it’s hard for you to understand that no one demonstrates in anyone else’s name.”

We can point out that the fence the Israelis are defending is not a “border” (What country are the Gazans in?), but the boundary of a ghetto, what Conservative British PM David Cameron [called](#) a giant “prison camp” and Israeli scholar Baruch Kimmerling [called](#) “the largest concentration camp ever to exist.” It’s a camp that tens of thousands of Palestinians were forced into by the Zionist army. The right of those families (80% of Gaza’s population) to leave that confinement and *go home* is a basic human right and black-letter [international law](#).

We can point out that Gazans aren’t just trying to cross a line in the sand, they are trying to *break a siege*, and that: “The blockade is by definition an act of war, imposed and enforced through armed violence. Never in history have blockade and peace existed side by side. ...There is no difference in civil law between murdering a man by slow strangulation or killing him by a shot in the head.” Those were, after all, the [words of](#) Israeli Foreign Minister Abba Eban, when he was justifying Israel’s attack on Egypt in 1967. And they are confirmed today by New York judge Mary McGowan Davis, who [says](#): “The blockade of Gaza has to be lifted immediately and unconditionally.”

We can point out that there can be no excuse in terms of modern international law or human rights principles for Israel’s weeks-long “[calculated, unlawful](#)” (HRW) mass killing and crippling of unarmed protestors who were standing quietly, kneeling and praying, walking away, and tending to the wounded hundreds of meters from any “fence”—shootings carried out not in any “fog of war” confusion, but with precise, targeted sniper fire (which, per standard military practice, would be from *two-mant* teams).

As the IDF [bragged](#), in a quickly deleted tweet: “Nothing was carried out uncontrolled; everything was accurate and measured, and we know where every bullet landed.” Indeed, as Human Rights Watch [reports](#), senior Israeli officials [ordered](#) snipers to shoot demonstrators who posed no imminent threat to life, and many demonstrators were shot hundreds of meters, and walking away, from the fence.

We can point out that the IDF's quick deletion of that tweet indicates its ~~consciousness of~~ ~~guilt~~-awareness, in the face of proliferating images of gruesome, unsupportable casualties, of how bad a Rosner-like “no apology, no regrets” discourse sounds. After all, it's hard, since they “know where every bullet landed,” not to conclude the Israelis deliberately targeted journalists and medical personnel, who were never threatening to “violate [Israel's] territorial integrity.” There have been at least [66 journalists wounded and 2 killed](#) wearing clearly marked blue “PRESS” flak jackets. And everyone should see the powerful [interview](#) with Canadian doctor, Tarek Loubani, who was shot in the leg, describing how, after six weeks with no paramedic casualties, suddenly:

“in one day, 19 paramedics—18 wounded plus one killed—and myself were all injured, so—or were all shot with live ammunition. We were all... away during a lull, without smoke, without any chaos at all, and we were targeted... So, it's very, very hard to believe that the Israelis who shot me and the Israelis who shot my other colleagues... It's very hard to believe that they didn't know who we were, they didn't know what we were doing, and that they were aiming at anything else.”

It was on another day that this 21-year-old “nominal civilian” nurse, Razan al-Najjar, was [killed](#) by an Israeli sniper while tending to the wounded.

Of course, pointing all this out won't mean anything to these apologists or to those who give them a platform. Everybody knows the ethico-political double standard at work here. No other country in the world would get away with such blatant crimes against humanity without suffering a torrent of criticism from Western politicians and media pundits, including every liberal and conservative Zionist apologist cited above. Razan's face would be shining from every page and screen of every Western media outlet, day after day, for weeks. Even an “allied” nation would get at least a public statement or diplomatic protest; any disfavored countries would face calls for punishment ranging from economic sanctions to “humanitarian intervention.” Israel gets [unconditional praise](#) from America's UN Ambassador.

Indeed, if the American government “defended” its own actual international border in this way, liberal Zionists would be on the highest of moral saddles excoriating the Trump administration for its crime against humanity. And—forgetting, as is obligatory, the thousands of heavily-armed Jewish Zionists who regularly force their way across actual international borders with impunity—if some Arab country's snipers killed hundreds and wounded tens of thousands of similarly unarmed Jewish Zionist men, women, children, and paraplegics who were demonstrating at an actual international border for the right to

return to their biblical homeland, we all know the howling and gnashing of morally outraged teeth that would ensue from every corner of the Western political and media universe. No “Guarding the border was more important than avoiding killing” would be published in the *NYT*, or tolerated in polite company, for that scenario.

Nathan J. Robinson got to the bottom line in his wonderful [shredding](#) of Rosner’s argument, it comes down to: “Any amount of Palestinian death, however large, was justified to prevent any amount of risk to Israelis, however small.” Western governments and media have fashioned, and are doing their utmost to sustain, an ethico-political universe where Israel can “lay siege to a million people, ‘bomb them occasionally,’ and then kill them when they show up at the wall to throw rocks.”

Is there a way anymore of not seeing the racism of Zionism? Can we just say, once and for all, that the interests of Palestinians—not as pitiable creatures but as active, fully, enfranchised human beings—are not *anywhere* on the list of Soffer’s or Dichter’s or Rosner’s (or the Western media’s or governments’) priorities, and refuse any of their pitifully disingenuous expressions of concern for the Palestinians’ benefit? Nobody gets to put “For your own benefit,” in front of “Surrender or I’ll put a bullet in your head.” The *only* concern any of these commentators have for the people of Gaza is that they submissively accept their forced displacement and imprisonment in “the largest concentration camp ever to exist.”

Does the vulgarity of it shock you?

The “human shields, human sacrifice” trope, which all these apologias hang on, is particularly mendacious and hypocritical as used by Zionists. It’s also a classic example of *projection*.

This is a “human shield”:



It is *Israel* which has repeatedly used the specific, prohibited tactic of *using children as “human shields”* to protect its military forces. According to the U.N. Committee on the Rights of the Child, Israel is guilty of the “*continuous use of Palestinian children as human shields and informants.*” Besides this namby-pamby UN Committee that no red-blooded American/Zionist would pay any attention to, the High Court of Justice *in Israel* identified and denounced the “human shield” procedures the IDF acknowledged and defended using *1,200 times*. These include “the ‘neighbor procedure,’ whereby neighbors of wanted Palestinians are forced to go into the wanted man’s house ahead of troops, in case it is booby-trapped,” and Israeli “soldiers forcibly position[ing] members of [a] family, including the children, at the windows of [a] home and proceed[ing] to fire from behind them.”

So, when Zionists use a “human shields” argument as a moral cudgel against unarmed civilian protestors, and a moral justification for a powerful army, which brazenly uses children to shield its own soldiers, killing scores of those protestors by the day—well, it’s not a stretch to see this charge is a projection of Zionists’ own pattern of thought and behavior.

Besides being an ongoing tactic of today’s Israeli army, “human shields” and the “human sacrifice” they imply were an integral element of the Zionist narrative—expressly articulated and embraced, with no apology, as a necessity for the establishment of a Jewish State.

Take a look at what Edward Said in 2001 called: “the main narrative model that [still] dominates American thinking” about Israel, and David Ben-Gurion called “as a piece of propaganda, the best thing ever written about Israel.” It’s *the* “Zionist epic’...identified by many commentators as having been enormously influential in stimulating Zionism and support for Israel in the United States.” In this piece of iconic American culture, an American cultural icon—more sympathetically liberal than whom there is not—explains why he, as a Zionist, is not bluffing in his threat to blow up his ship and its 600 Jewish refugees if they are not allowed to enter the territory they want:

–You mean you’d still set it [200 lbs. of dynamite] off, knowing you’ve lost?...Without any regard for the lives you’d be destroying?...

Every person on this ship is a soldier. The only weapon we have to fight with is our willingness to die.

–But for what purpose?”

Call it publicity.

—**Publicity?**

Yes, publicity. A stunt to attract attention....Does the vulgarity of it shock you?

More Zionist tough love.

In the face of the scurrilous “human shield” accusation against Palestinians now being used to denigrate the killed, maimed, and still-fighting protestors in Gaza, we would do well to recall Paul Newman’s Zionist-warrior, “no apology,” argument for 600 telegenically dead Jewish men, women, and children as a publicity stunt to gain the sympathy of the world.

Lest we dismiss this as a fiction, remember that Paul Newman’s fictional boat, *Exodus*, is based on a real ship, the SS Patria. In 1940, the *Patria* was carrying 1800 Jewish refugees from Nazi-occupied Europe whom the British authorities refused entry into Palestine. While the *Patria* was in the port of Haifa, it was blown up and sunk by Munya Mardor on the orders of the *Haganah*, which did not want Jewish refugees going anywhere but Palestine. At least 267 people were killed. The *Haganah* put out the story that the passengers had blown up the ship themselves – a story that lasted 17 years, nourishing the imagination of Leon Uris, author of the *Exodus* fiction. This wasn’t a commander or leading organization urging people to knowingly take a deadly risk in confronting a powerful enemy; it was “their” self-proclaimed army blowing its people up with no warning—and then falsely claiming they did it to themselves! Nobody who wouldn’t use “bottomlessly cynical” to denigrate the Haganah should be using it to denigrate Gazans.

At a crucial moment in history, it was Zionists who practiced a foundational “human shield” strategy, holding the victims of Nazism “hostage” to the Zionist “statehood” project – as none other than the publisher of the *New York Times*, Arthur Hays Sulzberger, [recognized and criticized](#):

I cannot rid myself of the feeling that the unfortunate Jews of Europe’s D. P. [Displaced Persons] camps are helpless hostages for whom statehood has been made the only ransom. ...[W]hy in God’s name should the fate of all these unhappy people be subordinated to the single cry of Statehood?

The *Exodus/Patria*/Paul Newman/Haganah willingness to blow up hundreds of Jewish refugees in order to force their way into a desired territory was an attitude endemic to the Zionist movement, and enunciated quite clearly by its leader, [David Ben-Gurion](#), as early as 1938: “If I knew it was possible to save all [Jewish] children of Germany by their transfer to England and only half of them by transferring them to Eretz-Yisrael, I would choose the latter.” *You want human sacrifice?* ...

(Sulzberger, by the way, “opposed political Zionism not solely because of the fate of Jewish refugees because he disliked the ‘coercive methods’ of Zionists in this country who use economic means to silence those with differing views.” Yes, the *NYT*! So change is possible.)

What’s Right Is Wrong

And here’s the thing: You want to call what the Gazans did—coming out unarmed by the thousands, knowing many of them would be killed by a heavily-armed adversary determined to put them down by whatever means necessary—a “politics of human sacrifice”? *You are right*.

Just as you’d be right to say that of the Zionist movement, when it was weak and faced with much stronger adversaries. And just as you’d be right to say it of the unarmed, non-violent Civil Rights Movement, when it faced the rageful determination of the immensely more powerful American South, to preserve the century-old Jim Crow apartheid that *was* its identity, by whatever means necessary.

Princeton Professor Eddie Glaude, Jr. nailed it when, to the visible discomfort of his MSNBC co-panelists, he [responded](#) to the invocation of the White House line that it’s “all Hamas’ fault and that they’re using them as tools for propaganda,” with: “That’s like saying to the children in the [Children’s March of Birmingham](#) it was their fault that Bull Connor attacked them.”

Civil-rights activists *did* put children on the front lines, and put their own and those children's lives in danger to fight and defeat Jim Crow. They knew there were a lot of people armed and willing to kill them. And children, as well as activists, were killed. And those actions *were* supported (but by no means "orchestrated") by "extremist" organizations—i.e., the Communist Party. At the time, conservatives attacked Freedom Riders with the same arguments that Zionists are now using to attack Gaza Return Marchers.

All unarmed, non-violent but disruptive, Gandhian strategies to *eliminate* entrenched systems of colonial-apartheid rule will knowingly sacrifice many lives to attain their victory. Call it a politics of human sacrifice if you want. I won't make any ingénue objections. But it's not a sign of the subjugated people's cynicism; it's a result of their predicament.

"Human sacrifice" defines the kind of choices a desperate and subjugated people are forced to make in the face of armed power they cannot yet overcome. A militarily-weak insurgent/liberation movement must use an effectively self-sacrificing strategy of moral suasion. That is now a standard and powerful weapon in political struggle. (Though moral suasion alone will not win their rights. Never has. Never will.)

For Gazans, it's the choice between living in a hell of frustration, misery, insult, confinement, and slow death, or resisting and taking the high risk of instant death. It's the choice faced by people whose "dreams are killed" by Israel's siege and forced expulsion, and who are willing to risk their lives "[for the world's attention.](#)" Young men like [Saber al-Gerim](#), for whom, "It doesn't matter to me if they shoot me or not. Death or life — it's the same thing." Or the one who [told](#) Amira Hass: "We die anyway, so let it be in front of the cameras." Or 21-year-old [Fathi Harb](#), who burned himself to death last Sunday. Or [Jihadi al-Najjar](#), who had to make the choice between continuing to care for his blind father ("He was my sight. He helped me in everything, from going to the bathroom to taking a shower to providing for me...I saw life through Jihadi's eyes.") or being killed by an Israeli sniper while, as his mother Tahani says "defending the rights of his family and his people."

Tough choices, to get the world's attention. This is the kind of choice imposed on the *untermenschen* of colonial-apartheid regimes. The only weapon they have is their willingness to die. But Gazans won't get the sympathetically-anguished Paul Newman treatment. Just "bottomlessly cynical."

Paul's choice, Sophie's choice, is now Saber's and Jihad's and Fathi's, and it's all bad. Maybe some people—comrades and allies in their struggle—have a right to say something about how to deal with that choice. But the one who doesn't, the one who has no place to say or judge anything about that choice, is the one who is forcing it. Those who are trying to fight their way out of a living hell are not to be lectured to by the devil and his minions. So, yes, in a very real sense, for the Palestinians, it *is* a politics of human sacrifice—to American liberals, the gods who control their fate.

By choosing unarmed, death-defying resistance, Palestinians are sacrificing their lives to assuage the faux-pacifist conscience of Americans and Europeans (particularly, I think, liberals), who have decreed from their Olympian moral heights that any other kind of resistance *by these people* will be struck down with devastating lightning and thunder.

Funny, that these are the same gods the Zionists appealed to to seize their desired homeland, and the same gods the civil-rights activists appealed to to wrest their freedom from local demons of lesser strength. Because, in their need to feel “sympathy and pity,” the sacrifice of human lives seems the only offering to which these gods might respond.

The Nakba Is Now

The Israelis and their defenders are right about something else: They cannot allow a single Gazan to cross the boundary. They know it would be a fatal blow to their colonial-supremacist hubris, and the beginning of the end of Zionism—just as Southern segregationists knew that allowing a single black child into the school was going to be the beginning of the end of Jim Crow. Palestinians gaining their basic human rights means Israeli Jews losing their special colonial privileges.

As Ali Abunimah points out, Arnon Soffer was right, when he said: “If we don't kill, we will cease to exist,” and Rosner, when he said the Gazans threatened the “elimination of Israel.” To continue to exist as the colonial-apartheid polity it is, Israel must maintain strict exclusionist, “*no*right of return,” policies. Per Abunimah: “the price of a ‘Jewish state’ is the permanent and irrevocable violation of Palestinians’ rights...If you support Israel’s “right to exist as a Jewish state” in a country whose indigenous Palestinian people today form half the population, then you... must come to terms with the inevitability of massacres.”

What's happening in Gaza is not only, as Abunimah says, a “reminder... of the original sin of the ethnic cleansing of Palestine and the creation of a so-called Jewish state,” it is a *continuation* of that *unfinished* work of the devil. The *Nakba* is now.

I'm all for everybody on both sides of the issue to be aware of the stakes and risks in this struggle, without any disingenuous denials.

Whether you sympathize with, or denigrate, the choices of people who put their own, their comrades', and even their children's, lives at risk is not determined by whether some tactical choices can be characterized as "human shields, human sacrifice"; it's determined by *what they're fighting for*, and what and whom they are fighting against, and where your solidarity lies.

Stage Left

Here's the core of the disagreement about Gaza (and Palestine in general): There are those—they call themselves Zionists—who think the Palestinians deserve to have been put in that concentration camp, and who stand in solidarity with the soldiers who, by whatever means necessary, are forcing them to stay there. And there are those—the growing numbers who reject Zionism—who stand in solidarity with every human being trying to get out of that camp by whatever means necessary.

There's a fight—between those breaking out of the prison and those keeping them in; between those seeking equality and those enforcing ethno-religious supremacism; between the colonized and the colonizer. Pick a side. Bret Stephens, Shmuel Rosner, and Tom Friedman have. The New York Times, The Washington Post, and Breitbart have. ABC, CBS, (MS)NBC, and Fox have. The Democrats and Republicans and the Congress and the White House have. And they are not shy about it.

It's past time for American progressives to clearly and unequivocally decide and declare which side they are on. It's time for professedly humanitarian, egalitarian, pro-human rights, anti-racist, and free-speech progressives to express their support of the Palestinian struggle—on social media, in real-life conversation, and on the street.

It's time to firmly reject the hypocritical discourse of those who would have been belittling any expression of sorrow and outrage over Emmet Till, [Chaney, Schwerner and Goodman](#), and the [four black schoolgirls](#) killed in Birmingham, while "ingénue mourning" the terrible moral quandary in which those disrupters had put Bull Connor's boys. Don't shrink from it, talk back to it—*every time*. Make them ashamed to be defending colonialism and apartheid with such patently phony arguments.

Politically? At a minimum, *demand* of any politician who seeks your vote: *End the blockade of Gaza, immediately and unconditionally. Support BDS. Refuse any attempt to criminalize BDS and anti-Zionism. Stop blocking UN and ICC actions against Israeli crimes. Restrict arms sales to Israel. Reject the hypocritical Zionist apologetics. Refuse*

any attempt to censor or restrict the internet. (This last is very important. Nothing has threatened Zionist impunity more than the information available on the internet, and nothing is driving the demand to censor the internet more than the Zionists' need to shut that off.)

This is a real, concrete, important resistance. What'll it cost? Some social discomfort? It's not sniper fire. Not human sacrifice. Not Saber's choice.

Are we at a turning point? Some people think this year's massacre in Gaza will finally attract a sympathetic gaze from the gods and goddesses of the Imperial City. Deliberately and methodically killing, maiming, and wounding thousands of unarmed people over weeks—well, the cruelty, the injustice, the *colonialism* is just too obvious to ignore any longer. And I hope that turns out to be so. And I know, Natalie Portman and Roger Waters and Shakira, and—the most serious and hopeful—the young American Jews in groups like Students for Justice in Palestine and IfNotNow. There *are* harbingers of change, and we must try.

I also know there is nothing new here. *Thirty years ago*, a doctor in Gaza said: “We will sacrifice one or two kids to the struggle — every family. What can we do? This is a generation of struggle.” It was obvious thirty years ago, and forty years before that. The *Nakbawas* then. The *Nakbais* now. Was it ever not too obvious to ignore?

My mother was an actress on Broadway, who once came to Princeton University to share the stage, and her professional skills, with Jimmy Stewart and other amateur thespians. She played the ingénue. Me, I'm not so good at that.

By all means, regarding Palestine-Israel and the sacrifices and solidarity demanded: No more ingénue politics.