

THE ASSOCIATION BETWEEN THE MARXIAN THEORY OF
ALIENATION AND THE PALESTINIAN ALIENATION

by 1050 710

ABDULSATTAR TAWFIK KASSEM

B.A., American University in Cairo, 1972

A MASTER'S THESIS

submitted in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree

MASTER OF ARTS

Department of Political Science

Kansas State University
Manhattan, Kansas

1974

Approved by:

Michael W. Suleiman
Major Professor

LD
2668
T4
1974
K38
C.2
Document

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
The Importance of the Study	2
Alienation: The Central Theme	4
Performance and Organization	7
Footnotes	10
II. MARX'S VIEW ON ALIENATION AND FREEDOM.	11
Marx's Concept of Alienation	16
Capitalism as the Prime Source of Alienation	18
Forms of Alienation	24
Alienation and Freedom	26
Conclusion	28
Footnotes	31
III. THE PALESTINIAN STATE OF ALIENATION.	33
Sources of Palestinian Alienation	35
The State of Homelessness	36
The Camps	39
The World and the United Nations	41
The Arab People and the Arab Governments	44
The Palestinian Reaction to the State of Alienation	48
The Struggle and the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine	50
Conclusion	53
Footnotes	55
IV. THE RELATION BETWEEN THE THEORY AND THE PROBLEM.	57
Alienation: The Basic Problem	58
The Nature of Conflicts	65
The World, the Arabs, and the Palestinians	69
Footnotes	73
BIBLIOGRAPHY	74

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Appreciation and gratitude go to Dr. M. W. Suleiman, of the Political Science Department at Kansas State University. Without his special assistance and encouragement this thesis would have, no doubt, been impossible.

Appreciation must also be given to Dr. Phillip Althoff of the Political Science Department of Kansas State University for his suggestions and helpful criticisms.

Finally, thanks should be given to Mrs. Bonnie Thompson for typing this manuscript.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Studying theories, until recently, has been the dominant kind of education to which the students of social sciences have been exposed. A recent shift from the theoretical preparation of the student in his field to giving him some practical training by exposing him to real concrete problems has been taking place. Political science is no exception. The student in political science, in addition to being taught the traditional and modern philosophical political theories, is getting exposed to the new methodological approach of political science to problems.

Such a shift in the curriculum of social sciences in general, and of political science in particular, is the outcome of the insufficiency of philosophical theories to solve human, social, and psychological problems. Traditional political theories, while they give some insight about human problems, generalize the cases, state them in vague terms and sometimes in ambiguous expressions; thus, these theories might appear to be useful at earlier times and lack application to existing problems which demand solutions. Studying a certain specific problem with the specific reliance on its nature and the variables determining it, seems to be an approach promising a brighter future for political science. Such a method enables the political scientist to apply conclusions reached by studying one problem to another that has similar components. Thus,

besides the integrity and the specificity of the approach, the researcher will be able to save his time and efforts.

This paper will go in line with the new trend of approaching political science. It will represent a mainly theoretical approach to studying a certain problem, study the same problem as it exists in a certain situation, and then relate the theory and the case study to each other to see how far they tie together. Specifically, the thesis of this study is to find out how far the Marxist theory of alienation relates to and ties with the Palestinian state of alienation.

The Importance of the Study

The importance of this study does not stem only from the fact that it might show how the theory may or may not help the student to understand the case and solve the question, may apply or may not apply to the existing problem, but also from the fact that both the Marxian theory and the Palestinian problem are worthwhile examples to look into and to relate to each other. Moreover, it might help the reader to understand the nature of the Palestinian problem by comparing it with the Marxian theory; and thus, guided by his conclusions, he might be able to hammer out a solution for it.

The significance of the Marxian theory is the outcome of the fact that its pioneer Karl Marx was one of the most prominent of the philosophers who, in their work, showed deep concern for the human individual and his development in history. Marx, however, dedicated himself to the cause of those who suffer from the injustices inflicted by the powerful class in

a society. As a result, he made a distinguished attempt to develop a theory that could serve as the foundation for a social order which would guarantee the individual both economic security and freedom.

Marx's philosophy is essentially humanitarian. Its humanism stems from the fact that Marx was among those Western philosophers who, from the European Renaissance up to the present, have stressed that all social arrangements must serve the growth as well as the unfolding of man's powers; that is to say that man must be an end and never a means, that each individual, in fact personifies all humanity. Marx wrote that:

Social revolution concentrates on the whole because it is a protest of man against dehumanized life, because its point of departure is the particular, real individual, because it is the protest of the individual against his isolation from the community of men, that is the essence of man.¹

Such a consideration for man and his humanity gives Marx's ideas special importance when one deals with problems that face man and challenge his humanity. The Palestinians, as a people, facing alienating forces that could undermine their humanity by forcing them out of Palestine, present a good case study for determining how far Marx's principles about the dehumanization of man link up with the practical reasons that have caused the Palestinian dehumanization.

Irrespective of its humanitarian orientation, Marxian philosophy is of special significance in our era. Of course, for social scientists and philosophers, Marx is of interest as a nineteenth century pioneer of certain contemporary social

theories. More importantly, however, in its Leninist form, Marxian socialism is probably the most important and, to many, the most disturbing ideé-force in the world today. In excess of one billion of the world's peoples are governed by regimes that claim to be based on Marx's ideas; hence, Marxism should not be only of concern to historians and political scientists studying a contemporary problem but also to policy-makers attempting to solve problems.

The Palestinian question was chosen as the issue to be studied along with the Marxian theory of alienation because it is a prime cause of one of the major conflicts in the world today. This conflict has produced four wars in the Middle East and will, in all probability, produce more; and, in addition, it possesses the potential for provoking international confrontation. It would be of value if the nature of this conflict is understood so the solution of the problem might be easier.

Furthermore, the state of alienation which Marx talked about and described as a motivating force behind conflicts exists in the Middle Eastern situation. Specifically, it is the Palestinians who have been the victims of illusion and disenchantment since the expulsion of 1948. The Palestinians have had to face the state of homelessness and humiliating living conditions. This makes the Palestinian question a relevant one for the study of Marx's theory of alienation.

Alienation: The Central Theme

This paper, as was implicitly indicated before, will not

discuss all aspects of Marxian theory; rather, it will concentrate primarily upon Marx's theory of alienation. Alienation was selected to be the central theme of the paper not only because it is the core of the Marxian theory, but also because it seems to be the basis of the major problems of mankind at the present time. Although the world has made impressive progress in science and technology, progress which has brought about changes in the quality of life, in reality little has been achieved in solving the political, economic, and social problems the individual has to face. Individuals who, in varying degrees, have access to those facilities that seem to make living easier than at any previous time in history, continue to feel depressed, mechanized, and obsessed. They are, in brief, the victims of numerous kinds of alienation. A situation involving tremendous scientific and technological advancement accompanied by devastating mental and spiritual forces acting upon individuals emphasizes that alienation is the real problem facing modern man.

The Palestinians are an example of those who have had to face one of the atrocities of modern times and modern man as well. Their state of alienation stems from the fact that they have been facing and continue to face one of history's most tragic injustices. They have had to face formidable enemies who have attempted the destruction of Palestinian history and culture as well as the annihilation of a Palestinian physical existence in Palestine. Furthermore, the Palestinians have had to face the degradation of living in what are essentially

concentration camps, under the pressure of political, economic, social and psychological difficulties.

In exile, the Palestinians have been living the lives of proletarians, in the sense that they are poor, barely existing at a level of subsistence, and, without the monthly food allocations they receive from the United Nations, they would starve to death. Thus, fundamental prosperity has not come their way. Their economic need is graphically illustrated in the following remarks by Leila Khaled:

After graduation from the garden school, I had expected a gift and a big celebration but nothing happened. I cried my eyes out, not realizing that mother was unable to buy me a dress, a doll, or even a pair of socks.²

In addition, the Palestinians, except for those who stayed in their homes in Palestine, have had to live as refugees in the neighboring Arab countries. They have had to reside in lands that they neither own nor belong to, and lands that they cannot claim to be their property. Also they have been living with people who do not share their problem and have never acquired the same feelings because they have never experienced the same conditions. The Palestinians have been governed by regimes that neither belong to nor represent them. Briefly, they are aliens in the lands in which they are camped, to the people with whom they have been residing, and to the governments by which they have been ruled.

The relation between the Palestinian problem of alienation and the Marxian understanding for alienation is plausible. Alienation, to Marx, meant that man's physical and spiritual

powers are undermined, and he is denied his human rights which are supposed to be the means for his self-fulfillment and the achievement of a perfect life; thus, man, when alienated becomes alien to himself and to others, unable to acquire a meaning for life. The Palestinians have been facing such a situation for the reasons indicated above. But the Palestinian alienation is more intense and more serious than that of the Marxian worker. The worker's alienation is due to the fact that he is deprived from the product of his work, but the alienation of the Palestinians is due to the fact that they are deprived from every source of human appreciation. The paper will look into such a situation and thus state how the Palestinian alienation relates to or differs from the worker's alienation.

Performance and Organization

To satisfy the thesis of the study, the second chapter will be devoted to a discussion of Marx's ideas about alienation and freedom. Marx's ideas about freedom will be introduced because they are an integral part of his theory of alienation and because freedom is the negative side of alienation, that is, to overcome the state of alienation, one must necessarily become free. This chapter will neither criticize nor support Marx, but it will mainly discuss his understanding for alienation and freedom, present his analysis and state his definition for the two concepts.

A third chapter will concentrate on the Palestinian problem of alienation. The problem will be described and analyzed on

the basis of how it is understood and described by Palestinians who are exposed to the problem, feel and live it. The study will utilize examples drawn from Palestinian literature. Because of the limited references I have, mainly two sources will be used, which in my opinion, are sufficient to satisfy the purpose of the research since they give a comprehensive description of the present conditions of the Palestinians. Furthermore, the authors of these two sources demonstrate the question through the experiences of the Palestinians in general, and through their personal experience in particular. While making use of additional references will contribute to the discussion by adding more quotations and stating more personal experiences from other authors, the conclusion will not essentially differ from what the two chosen authors have had to say.

The two authors whose work will be utilized are Leila Khaled and Tawaz Turki. Khaled was born in Haifa, Palestine, and was raised afterwards in a refugee camp in Lebanon. She received her education in the American University of Beirut, and joined the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine's freedom fighters after graduation. Fawaz Turki, who is also a Palestinian, had lived in a refugee camp for many years before receiving his education in Britain. He worked for an oil company in Saudi Arabia for a few days after his graduation.

In addition to Khaled's and Turki's work, the ideas of the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine (PFLP) will be considered and given special attention. The PFLP is chosen rather than any other Palestinian organization because it has

a written philosophy in which it has certain ideas about the nature of the Middle East conflict, the concept of freedom, and the solution of the problem, something the other organizations lack. This philosophy will help in the process of tying the Marxian theory of alienation with that of the Palestinians.

In the fourth chapter, the paper will analyze, contrast and compare Marx's ideas with the Palestinian feelings and beliefs about the nature of their state of alienation and the way they view freedom, so as to see how, if at all, the two views are related.

1. Karl Marx, Economy, Class and Social Revolution,
edited by Z.A. Jordan (London: Michael Joseph, 1971), p. 11.

2. Leila Khaled, My People Shall Live, edited by George
Hajjar (Aukland: Hodder and Stoughton, 1973), p. 29.

CHAPTER II

MARX'S VIEWS ON ALIENATION AND FREEDOM

Marx was not the first to write about the concept of alienation. The core of the concept, except for the sociological meaning it has in capital, is foreign to the historical, materialistic humanism of Marx. Self-alienation is a concept that has its origin in religion. Certain religions have argued that the human soul can become alienated from God, salvation being the process through which this self-alienation is overcome.

Hegel was the first prominent philosopher of modern history to write about alienation. While he used the term in several meanings, its root notion is religious, i.e., man's self-expression in the world rests on spiritual fulfillment. Feuerbach, in his theory of religious alienation, which can be interpreted on an anthropological basis, came after Hegel. According to Feuerbach, man estranges himself from himself by transposing his own greatness into an external object of worship. Marx, in his early writings in which he developed the concept, was influenced by Hegel and Feuerbach, by their methods and ideas.

Marx shared Hegel's refusal to accept an imperfect world. The term which to both Hegel and Marx described man's unfulfilled condition was alienation. Marx followed Hegel in describing man's progress towards fulfillment as the overcoming of a situation in which material things and other men appeared

in the guise of alien, hostile objects. Marx, however, criticized Hegel's formulation of the problem. He wrote that the only labor which Hegel recognized was abstract mental labor, and thus, according to Hegel, man's freedom in the world is a function of spiritual satisfaction. Man can overcome estrangement by returning to himself on a higher level, i.e., connecting himself with the Almighty. According to Marx, Hegel argued that self-estrangement and its transcendence lies in the realm of thought rather than in the realm of reality.¹ In short, he regarded the Hegelian philosophy as

...a transliteration into obscure prose of the underlying ideas of western Christianity and therefore shot through, despite itself and the dialectical method, with dualism. God and self are regarded implicitly one. The end of man is logically predetermined -- union with the absolute or God.²

Marx, however, seemed to be more influenced by Feuerbach's ideas on alienation. He adopted and completed Feuerbach's anthropological interpretation of alienation. He just reformulated Feuerbach's idea that man undermined his own greatness and placed it into God. According to Marx, religious alienation has its origin in the social and economic conditions of life. It is precisely because man no longer feels at home in this world that he takes refuge in another world which is above and outside reality. Religion, according to Feuerbach and Marx, is not the cause, but the result of man's alienation.

Later, in 1844 to be exact, Marx's ideas appeared to be characterized by a more obvious social perspective. Marx stressed that the class-oriented society and the economy based

upon the division of labor are the roots of alienation. Alienated man is divided against himself and against his fellow man. This concept takes on an increasingly social and economic complexion, while the anthropological interpretation, which is taken from Feuerbach, recedes. Generally, one can say that Marx assumed the main ideas of Hegel and Feuerbach and learned their dialectical methods. In keeping with his materialistic interpretations, he transferred these ideas to the level of man's dynamic being in the material world.

Marx's Materialistic Approach

As a philosopher, Marx was concerned with man's development throughout history -- not in an anthropological sense, but in a human sense -- as well as with the manner in which man relates to change. Marx interpreted history as a series of objective events, an interpretation based primarily on the concept of class struggle. Marxism is based specifically on the principle that the means and forces of production, including not only results of production, but also the exchange of these results are the basis of any given social order and thus that in every society past and present such things as property ownership and the classification of individuals into classes or estates are determined by how products are produced and exchanged. According to this view, the ultimate cause of social change, including of course political revolutions, is to be found not in the minds of men, that is, not in their ideas concerning, say, truth and/or justice, but in alternations in the means and forces of production.³ Therefore, the ultimate

cause of social change should not be sought in philosophy, but in the economic conditions of the epoch under study.

History, then, according to Marx, is determined by economic conditions. Specifically, it is determined by conflict between productive forces and economic forms -- that is by the conflict between the dispossessed masses who produce commodities and the prevailing economic system which is represented by the class owning and profiting from the means of production, thus having a vested interest in the existing economic forms. For example, under feudalism, history was determined by the conflict between the productive forces, i.e., primarily, the peasants, and the economic system itself which was represented by the lords. Generally, it is the conflict between an oppressed class and an oppressing one that determines the nature of the social, including the political system.

The conflict, according to Marx, is basically a function of the growth of the productive forces. The chances for the conflict to occur increase with the quantitative and qualitative growth of the productive forces. The growth of these forces is a function of changes in the means of production.⁴ For example, the introduction of the steam engine into the manufacturing process led to economic, and thus to social and political changes. The resulting stability, however, was challenged by the development of new means of production -- specifically, from the steam engine through several stages to the atomic reaction. Each of these changes conditioned to new social forms which corresponded to the new means of production.

Accompanying the conflict between productive forces and economic structures is the conflict between social classes. For example, the feudal class, based on certain forms of production, eventually came into conflict with an emergent middle class composed chiefly of capitalist manufacturers and businessmen. This middle class, once established, came into conflict with the working class as well as with the leaders of monopolistic enterprises who wished to destroy the smaller forms of capitalistic enterprise.

In sum, history, according to Marx entails change. As change occurs, a new social order emerges, but within this new social order antagonistic social forces develop. History then consists of constant change which takes the form of thesis (the existing social order), antithesis (the forces opposing this order), and synthesis (the outcome of the struggle between the thesis and antithesis, i.e., the new social order). The process upon which Marx's concept, dialectical materialism is based, has been evolving since the beginning of history. While Marx discussed the various economic systems that have existed throughout history, he concentrated his discussion on capitalism, because he believed that capitalism represented the final social order to be marked by exploitation, the class struggle, etc.

Generally, one can state that Marxism, as described by Marx, seems to be a scientific history of economic phenomena, formulating laws applicable to concrete situations. Marxism's dialectical materialism seems like a comprehensive method for

studying man's environment, while historical materialism relates the story of man, including how he affects or is effected by history itself.

The study of Marx's methods of analysis can recognize that he was moving in a humanitarian direction, i.e., toward freeing man from economic restrictions. In his analysis of historical development, Marx described conflicts as conflicts between just powers (exploited class) and unjust powers (exploiting class). The just powers have always struggled to free themselves, thus realizing their natural rights as men. Marx described the just powers as an alienated class which has been economically deprived and controlled by a wealthy class in order to serve the latter's material interests.

Marx's concern was to free the oppressed class through overcoming its state of alienation. Marx, in his social theory, provided a means for abolishing alienation and, since there is only one source of alienation, the nature of the economic system, he claimed that this means could be applied internationally to all situations where alienation exists.⁵ In the remainder of this chapter, I shall attempt to outline Marx's understanding of the concept, alienation, and of how it is related to the idea of freedom.

Marx's Concept of Alienation

The concept of alienation, which is integral to the theory of Marxism, is the bridge upon which Marx built his theory of freedom. Marx did not develop a systematic psychopathology -- that is, he did not construct a theory dealing with the social

adjustment of the individual; instead, he utilized a fundamental expression of alienation. In reoriginating the concept and using it analytically, he hoped to provide a solution that goes away with it and brings into the realm of freedom. Marx stressed that alienation must be abolished, because its existence denies the existence of freedom. In other words, a state of freedom is conditioned by a state of unalienation.

Marx refused to accept an imperfect world; he chose the concept of alienation, which symbolizes man's unfulfilled condition and his imperfect life, so as to analyze man's depressed conditions. He connected man's progress toward self-fulfillment to overcoming a condition of alienation in which not only material things, but also other men appeared in the guise of alien, hostile objects.⁶

Marx was probably the first scholar who treated the concept in material terms derived from interpretation of the realities of his time. His ideas concerning alienation are based upon a materialistic perspective and deal with man's dynamic existence in a material world. For Marx, man's self expression, i.e., man's state of freedom, lies in his method of work, in his role in the production of an available world. Man is not estranged from self-expression because his mind cannot recognize itself in this world, but because he is materially imprisoned and thus prevented from recognizing himself in and expressing himself through his work as well as dispossessed from the product which is supposed to be his self-expression.⁷ In other words, man in the material world is

enslaved by production and does not have any power to self-determination and self-realization.

Capitalism as the Prime Source of Alienation

The methods of production under capitalism, according to Marx, are the prime source of alienation. Wage-labor and capital relations which are of an exploitive nature are the main pillars upon which the capitalistic system stands. In its development and operation, capitalism tends to oppress the worker, thus depriving him of his humanity and transferring him into a tool for the service of the capitalists. The dominant characteristic of capitalism is the drive for maximizing profit, which in turn necessarily leads to the exploitation of the worker and to the degradation of human values. Capitalism divides society into two classes: the exploiters who attempt to maximize profit based upon the labor of the other class, the exploited. Such a society is eventually composed of oppressors and oppressed, of those who control the society and those who control nothing, not even themselves.⁸

Capitalism, since it is motivated by profit rather than by need, does not embrace the ideas of social cohesion and social welfare. According to Marx, the capitalists are only concerned with the accumulation of capital and do not have any commitment toward the society in general. Since capital has all power, and since the worker has none, the system reduces the laborer's working ability to the level of merchandise, something to be bought and sold in the market. Marx stated it as follows:

...[C]apital is thus the governing power over labor and its products. The capitalist possesses this power, not on account of his personal or human qualities, but inasmuch as he is an owner of capital. His power is the purchasing power of his capital, which nothing can withstand.⁹

It is essential to understand how the capitalist system operates so as to understand how the worker comes to be alienated. Marx, in Das Kapital, described how a revolutionary method of production was created with the advent of capitalism. It was revolutionary in the sense that it overthrew the existing system, i.e., feudalism, and that the capitalists revolutionized the methods of production and, as a result, all other aspects of social existence.

Since capitalism is a system motivated by profit, capitalists tend naturally to attempt to accumulate capital. This tendency leads to the centralization of capital. Eventually, this accumulation of capital results in a concentration of large scale production since such production is more economical and consequently more profitable. This is brought about by the transformation of individualized and scattered means of production into means that are socially concentrated. The law of capital accumulation, then, leads to a conflict among capitalists with a few winners and many losers, the latter being either destroyed or absorbed by the former. This upshot is a constantly diminishing number of centers of capital, the growth of capital in one enterprise being facilitated by the total failure of other enterprises.

The accumulation and thus concentration of capital and

the concomitant rise in the organic composition of capital -- that is, in the relation between constant (raw materials and machines) and variable wages capital -- results in a battle of capitalists using price competition as a major weapon. Each capitalist tries to lower the price of his commodities while keeping his profits rising. His success depends on the mass means of production per worker, that is on the scale of production.¹⁰

As the industry becomes capital intensified and the concentration on large scale production grows greater, supply will increase, and consequently prices will fall resulting in a declining rate of profit. Marx noted that if the rate of profit declines, an increasing intensity of exploiting the worker may counteract this tendency. Specifically, to keep the rate of profit from falling, the capitalist must squeeze the worker.¹¹ The labor-power purchased for variable capital must be exploited so intensely that it produces a rate of surplus value that more than compensates for the declining rate of profit. Indeed, the rate of profit might even rise under such circumstances.

The exploitation of the worker leads to the conclusion that the primary purpose of capitalist production is the realization of surplus value, i.e., maximized profit. In the actual process of production, capital absorbs a certain quantity of the surplus value or unpaid labor. In order to convert this quantity into profit, Marx notes that,

The entire mass of commodities, i.e., the total product, including the portion which

replaces the constant and variable capital, and that representing surplus-value, must be sold. If this is not done, or done only in part, or only at prices below the prices of production, the laborer has been indeed exploited, but this exploitation is not realized as such for the capitalist, and this can be bound up with a total or partial failure to realize the surplus-value pressed out of him, indeed even with the partial or total loss of the capital. The conditions of direct exploitation, and those of realizing it, are not identical.¹²

As we have seen, in the process of development, capitalism creates a unique social relationship. It divides society into two classes: those who have and are motivated to have more, and those who do not have, but still attempt to survive. The dynamic between these classes can be identified by property relations, which create a condition of antagonism between the classes. Those who are motivated by greed, the capitalists, attempt to increase their property holdings and to make use of others in order to extract profit from these property holdings, a process which eventually leads to the alienation of the workers. Therefore, private property, according to Marx, is not the source of alienation, but the consequence of the original source, i.e., the motivation to make profit by exploiting things and beings. Marx stated:

True, it is a result of the movement of private property that we have obtained the concept of alienated labor from political economy. But on analysis of this concept it becomes clear that though private property appears to be the source, the cause of alienated labor, it is really its consequence, just as the gods in the beginning are not the cause but the effect of man's intellectual confusion. Later this relationship becomes reciprocal.¹³

Since it will be of little use without applying labor to it, private property makes labor the essence of all property, but leaves the laborers without property. Since the essence of labor is man, in an economic system based on private property concentrated in few hands, man will be turned to a mere tool serving this property. This process of making man a tool of tools is the alienation of man. In a capitalist society labor becomes an object of private property and, consequently, man becomes entirely estranged from his self-creation.

In addition to being an object from which private property attempts to extract the maximum amount of work for the smallest possible investment, the worker is subjected to the laws of the free market just like any other commodity. The greater the supply of a commodity, the cheaper its price. In order to keep the cost of labor down, supply must always exceed demand. Marx wrote that,

The worker has the misfortune to be a living capital, and therefore a capital with needs--one which loses its interest, and hence livelihood, every moment it is not working. The value of the workers as capital rises according to demand and supply, and even physically his existence, his life, was and is looked upon as a supply of a commodity like any other.¹⁴

Since surplus value, as was noted above, tends to fall because of competition among capitalists, a phenomenon which causes prices to go down, the capitalists attempt to improve the efficiency of their methods of production. This leads to a more intensified application of technology, including machinery, which means that more specialization and division of

labor will be required. Thus, man, instead of being the master of the machine, becomes its slave and dominated by it under a system of technologically advanced, large scale production dominated by specialization and division of labor.

The rationalization of labor increasingly reduces work to unvarying manipulations; this tends to depress the laborer physically and spiritually.¹⁵ Thus, as the worker goes to work, and as he produces more and more, the more his personal value decreases, for his value consists entirely in his contribution to the production of external goods, and these goods devaluate as their number increases.

Generally, capitalism, according to Marx, has one overriding characteristic -- that is, it is a system of exploitation by its very nature. The worker is exploited, and he cannot help being such as long as he works under a system based upon private property.

In summary, man is self-estranged under capitalism because he is alienated from his act of self-expression and from the product of this self-expression. The fact that his product becomes the private property of someone else in the capitalistic system reveals man's self-estrangement. Private property makes it impossible for man to find his work meaningful as a human activity.

The worker, according to Marx, is self-alienated because he cannot be himself in his work, and his "objectification", the product of his work, is taken away from him when he has to work for wages. The worker cannot see his product as an

embodiment of his human activity because the product is taken away by the private owner of the means of production. The crucial point is that someone else's private economic power forces the worker to sell his power to work and thus takes away the worker's self-expression; the worker is alienated because an "alien being" robs him of his expressed self.¹⁶ Thus, man makes his life activity, his essential being, a mere means of existence. For this reason wage labor is beyond redemption, and evil in itself.

Forms of Alienation

Alienation, according to Marx, assumes a threefold form: 1) man is alienated from the product of his work; 2) man is alienated from the act of producing; and 3) man is alienated from his own social nature.

Man is alienated from the product of his work in the sense that he is robbed of his self-expression, i.e., his work is something alien to himself. The more the worker pays an effort, the more dehumanized and the poorer he is. The harder he works, the less he is himself. He is a physically and spiritually dehumanized being. According to Marx:

Estranged labor thus turns man's species being, both nature and his spiritual species property, into a being alien to him, into a means to his individual existence. It estranges man's own body from him, as it does external nature and his spiritual essence, his human being.¹⁷

Man is alienated from the act of producing in the sense that he, in his work, does not affirm himself because he is not free to develop his physical and mental powers. The

worker's activity is not determined according to his benefit, but according to his physical and/or mental disposition for the objective product. Labor instead of being the worker's self-realization becomes his self-negation. As a result, he only feels at home in the mere animal functions, e.g., eating, drinking, and sleeping. The very labor which was to liberate his humanity has reduced him to an animal. Marx described that as follows:

...[T]herefore, he does not affirm himself but denies himself, does not feel content, but unhappy, does not develop freely his physical and mental energy but mortifies his body and ruins his mind..., and in his human functions he no longer feels himself to be anything but an animal. What is animal becomes human and what is human becomes animal.¹⁸

Concerning social relations, alienation in a capitalist society causes the estrangement of the worker from his fellow man. His fellow man becomes a stranger, another individual competing with him for the satisfaction of needs that might not be satisfied. They are both strangers to each other because they are alienated from their universal human activity. Therefore, social relations will become less and less a matter of cooperation for the advancement of the common good, and social bonds will be reduced to bonds concerning capitalistic affairs. The entire society finally is composed of separate individuals, everyone dealing with his own affairs regardless of what adverse effects his actions might have upon others. According to Marx:

An immediate consequence of the fact that man is estranged from the product of his labor, from his life activity, from his species being is the estrangement of man from man. If man is confronted by himself, he is confronted by the other man. What applies to a man's relation to his work, to the product of his labor and to himself, also holds to a man's relation to the other man, and to the other man's labor and object of labor.¹⁹

In conclusion, the worker, according to Marx, is a mere instrument in the production process in any society based on private property and particularly under industrialized capitalism. What he produces is a thing, alien to himself. His labor becomes part of an external object, entirely independent of himself and to be consumed by a stranger.

Alienation and Freedom

It should be clear that the essence of the concept of alienation, according to Marx, is that the world has become alien to man. Man does not experience himself as the subject of his own acts, i.e., as a thinking, feeling, loving being, but only in the things he has created, i.e., as the subject of the externalized manifestations of his labor power. Briefly, he is in touch with himself only by surrounding himself with the products of his creation.

The process for overcoming man's alienation is based upon the manner in which Marx viewed work. Work, according to Marx, is man's self expression, and true work, i.e., the work in which the worker expresses himself, exists when man can recognize himself in the outcome of his efforts. Work is the thing in which the physical and spiritual variety of individual

activity manifests itself. The outcome of man's work objectifies him -- that is, it is the embodiment of his human activity. Thus, work should not be done for a wage, but for the objectification of man.²⁰

The abolition of man's self alienation depends upon all means of production being turned over to the ownership of society. As a result, the worker would be conscious of himself as one who, in fellowship with other members of society, would give according to his ability for the common self-realization of all.

Private property does not have a place in this system. It must be completely abolished. By the transcendence of private property, and the liquidation of the capitalists and, thus, the absence of capitalistic exploitation, man begins to make the object of his activity a human object, but not the other way by making himself the object of his activity. Man can then begin to appropriate the world in a human way; his relation to it is no longer one of having, but of being. His work no longer exists solely as a means for satisfying desires outside himself; rather it begins to be his self-expression and self-realization, and he begins to objectify himself instead of losing himself. Nature becomes human, and man becomes natural. In Marx's words:

The transcendence of private property is therefore the complete emancipation of all human senses and attributes; but it is the emancipation precisely because these senses and attributes have become subjectively and objectively, human. The eye has become the human eye, just as its object has become a social, a human object -- an object emanating

from man for man. The senses have therefore become directly in their practices theoreticians. They relate themselves to the thing for the sake of the thing, but the thing itself is an objective human relation to itself and to man, and vice-versa. Need and enjoyment have consequently lost their egoistical nature, and nature has lost its mere utility by becoming human use.²¹

Thus, man is expected to overcome all forms of alienation by humanizing his relation to the material world. With the disappearance of alienation, all the attributes which accompany it, e.g., religion and the state, will disappear. Marx wrote that,

The emancipation of society from private property, from servitude, takes the political form of the emancipation of the workers; not in the sense only that the latter's emancipation includes the emancipation of humanity as a whole. For all human servitude is involved in the relation of the worker to production, and all types of servitude are only modifications or consequences of this alienation.²²

Under these conditions, according to Marx, the unalienated man will emerge. The free man, who is the creative one, will be engaged in significant and meaningful work. Freedom, for Marx then, is a condition allowing man to go voluntarily to work with a belief that work is a means for self-fulfillment rather than for subsistence only.

Conclusion

Man as a race slowly emancipates himself from mother nature through the process of work, and through his process of emancipation, he develops his intellectual and emotional powers and grows up, becomes independent. When he brings nature under

his full and rational control, and when society loses its egotistic class character, pre-history will have ended, and truly human history in which free men plan and organize their exchange with nature, and in which the aim and end of all social life is not only work and production, but also the freedom of man's powers and an end in itself, begins.

Marx concluded that the independence of the individual and thus his freedom are based on the act of self-realization. A being does not regard himself as independent unless he is his own master, and he is his own master only when he owes his existence to himself. A man who lives by the favor or under the mercy of another, according to Marx, is a dependent being.

If one lives completely in another person's favor then one owes him not only the continuance of his life, but also its creation, since he shapes and controls that life, and one does not have any authority over oneself. As Marx stated, man is independent only:

...[I]f he affirms his individuality as a total man in each of his relations to the world, seeing, hearing, smelling, tasting, feeling, loving, willing -- in short, if he affirms and expresses all organs of individuality, if he is not only free from but also free to.²³

Freedom for Marx is integral. It cannot be divided into various freedoms; it exists as a whole and thus, if absent, is absent as a whole. Marx wrote:

Each form of freedom is the condition for all of them, as one member of the body is for the others. Whenever a specific freedom is brought into question, then freedom is brought into question.²⁴

Marx also concluded that freedom stimulates creativity and builds the road of progress and development. A man in captivity or in the cell of oppression cannot be expected to make a constructive contribution to society. Progress in science and art depends on freedom. And freedom, through progress, gives man the chance to perfect himself in the process of history.

1. I Meszaros, Marx's Theory of Alienation (New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1970), pp. 87-90.
2. S. Hook, From Hegel to Marx (Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1950), p. 5.
3. H.B. Acton, What Marx Really Said (London: Macdonald, 1967), pp. 40-4.
4. R.E. Dewey, Freedom (London: The Macmillan Company, 1970), p. 282.
5. P.J. Wiles, The Political Economy of Communism (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1962), pp. 333-4.
6. E. Fromm, The Fear of Freedom (London: K. Paul, Trench, Trubner and Co., Ltd., 1960), p. 48.
7. Karl Marx, Economy, Class and Social Revolution, ed. by Z.A. Jordon (London: Michael Joseph, 1971), p. 18.
8. Marx, op. cit., p. 168.
9. Karl Marx, Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts (Moscow: Foreign Languages Publishing House), p. 37.
10. Irving M. Zeitlin, Capitalism and Imperialism (Chicago: Markham Publishing Company, 1972), p. 2.
11. Zeitlin, op. cit., p. 4.
12. Karl Marx, Capital (Moscow: Foreign Language Publishing House, 1961), pp. 238-9.
13. Marx, Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts, op. cit., p. 77.
14. Marx, Ibid., p. 84.
15. Meszaros, op. cit., p. 88.
16. H. Marcuse, Reason and Revolution (London: Oxford University Press, 1941), p. 286.
17. Marx, Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts, op. cit., p. 76.
18. Ibid., pp. 72-3.
19. Ibid., p. 77.
20. H. Marcuse, Soviet Marxism (New York: Columbia University Press, 1958), p. 22.
21. Marx, Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts, op. cit., p. 106-7.

22. Ibid., p. 107.
23. Ibid., p. 109.
24. Ibid., p. 110.

CHAPTER III

THE PALESTINIAN STATE OF ALIENATION

While alienation is a worldwide phenomenon, and the peoples of the world are facing it in one form or another with the uncomfortability it is introducing to life, the Palestinians are the most to feel it and suffer from it. The Palestinians seem to be facing all kinds of alienation which make their life not only uneasy, but leaves it completely demolished. Peoples of the world are either suffering from economic exploitation or from political oppression, or from social and psychological frustration. The Palestinians, however, in addition to their low economic status, lack of political freedom, and social and psychological problems, are denied the right to exist on their land, either as a nation or even as individuals.

The present state of alienation has been dominating the quality of Palestinian life since 1948 when the state of Israel was created and the Palestinians were expelled or fled from Palestine to the neighboring Arab countries. The events of 1948 had their roots in 1897 when the Zionists held a conference in Bazle, Switzerland, and in which they decided to work toward the return of the Jews to the Promised Jewish homeland. The Zionists achieved their first significant success in 1917 when Lord Arthur Balfour, the British Foreign Secretary at that time, declared that Britain was favoring a Jewish homeland in Palestine and it would help the Jews

achieve that goal. Britain, through the use of the League of Nations, fulfilled its promise. Later, the United Nations plan of 1947 helped set the stage for the creation of the state of Israel.

As a result, the Palestinians were driven out of Palestine, aimlessly moved toward the Arab countries and without a source of life. And since then, the majority of them have been living in camps in Gaza Strip and in the neighboring countries, Jordan, Lebanon, and Syria. During the time that has elapsed since 1948, the Palestinians have been trying to call the attention of the world to their cause, but the world, it seems, has little attention to pay. The world, in fact, did not start to take the Palestinians seriously before they started their active counter-attack against Israel in particular, and against the world in general. The Palestinians are not willing to accept the realities that exist in the Middle East, and they do not seem to be ready for a compromise.

Palestinian and Arab writers and poets have written about Palestinian alienation and disenchantment. They have described how the Palestinians live in miserable economic conditions, and how they face the hardships of looking for jobs. Housing problems have been described in detail. Political, social, and psychological difficulties have been exposed and analyzed. But these writers and poets have failed to put Palestinian alienation in a concrete form -- that is, they have not delineated the sources of alienation in a systematic form. Also, little has been written about how the Palestinians view their state of alienation.

This chapter will deal with the sources of alienation as they are perceived and understood by Palestinians. As was mentioned in the introduction to the paper, mainly two resources will be utilized in addition to the publications of the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine. These two sources are My People Shall Live by Leila Khaled, and The Disinherited by Fawaz Turki. The two books reflect the general feeling of the Palestinians toward their problem, and summarize the way they understand it.

Sources of Palestinian Alienation

It is evident from the writings of both Leila Khaled and Fawaz Turki that there are four primary sources of the state of alienation in which the Palestinians exist. These are: the homeless existence which the Palestinians assumed as a result of expulsion or flight from Palestine; the refugee camps in which the Palestinians dwell and which can be described as humiliatingly depressing as well as despicable; the world, including the United Nations; and the Arab people and their governments.

Turki succinctly summarized the four sources as:

[A] whole nation found itself suddenly in exile and its two million people afflicted by defeat, hunger, and humiliation, repudiated by men, despised by host countries and forgotten by the world, left to in pariah refugees, their disinherited souls empty of hope and devoid of meaning.¹

The four sources have been acting together to constitute the formidable force which has been acting against the Pales-

tinians as individuals and as a people. The engineers of these sources have been trying to kill every rising Palestinian spirit of resistance, and to extinguish every sign of revival. But these sources are the ones that motivate the Palestinians to reject the situation and accelerate the revolution. How these sources have come to be the alienating forces that revolutionized the Palestinians is explained by Khaled and Turki in the remainder of the chapter.

The State of Homelessness

The year 1948 was a turning point in the history of Palestine and the Palestinians. From a state of nationhood, the Palestinians were forced into conditions of statelessness and of loss of identity. They became refugees, deprived of the sources of material and spiritual strength. This development in Palestinian history has been essentially the prime reason for the sufferings of the Palestinians since 1948. Khaled, through her experience, dramatically described this turning point.

I vividly remember my mother saying to me, shortly after our arrival in Lebanon, that I must not pick oranges from the garden nearby. I was puzzled and insisted on knowing why. My poor mother with tears streaming from her eyes explained: 'Darling, the fruit is not ours; you are no longer in Haifa, you are in another country.' After wiping her tears, the mother said 'Henceforth you are forbidden to eat oranges that are not ours.'²

To the Palestinians, this state of homelessness has been the chief source of alienation. In addition, they came to be

a people without leadership, without home or shelter, and without food and clothing. Consequently, they turned into a socially disintegrated people without purpose, aimlessly devouring time, and having no reason for living. In her writings, Khaled described how she and her family were thrown into a depressed mood, without hope for relief or remedy: "my family and I sank into a mood of quiet despair and settled into a routine of sordid life."³

It is not only that the Palestinians were driven out of their homes and placed into camps overlooking the land in which they had toiled for years, but also that they have not been allowed to step onto their own property, an act that might carry disastrous consequences if carried out. A Palestinian living outside Palestine is not allowed to visit his home or to cultivate the fruits of his garden; he is not allowed to visit his relatives or to wander in the streets of his town. Khaled, in My People Shall Live, expressed these feelings, saying: "Yes, I as a citizen of Haifa, am not allowed to bask in its sun, breathe its clear air, live there with my people."⁴

This state of affairs affected the thinking of the Palestinians in general, but specifically the way they view themselves as a people deeply rooted in history. The actions of the Zionist movement are not only viewed as aggressive actions that uprooted the present, but also an aggression that disconnected the past and the present. Not only did individuals come to be deprived of the tangible and intangible aspects of

their being, but also a nation with a long history and a prominent civilization suffered humiliation. Therefore, the Palestinian does not simply feel that his physical existence in Palestine was ended, but also that his historic and cultural ties with the earth were severed. This of course only intensifies any of his feelings of sordidness. As Khaled stated:

As I grew older and began to read and think for myself, I discovered that I have historic roots, that my people have a history, that my nation is equal to other nations....⁵

The loss of the land, it seems, must be viewed as the fundamental cause of the alienation of the Palestinians and thus the most important factor leading to their dehumanization. Land, as viewed by the Palestinians is the fountain of being, and if a man loses his land, he loses his position in life and thus his humanness. Furthermore, the Palestinian culture places a high regard on the relationship between the dignity of man and his land. Man's worth and esteem will be leveled to the ground if his land is raped. Therefore, it was the loss of the land that created the general feeling of destitution -- that is, the general feeling of loss of honor, esteem, dignity, and humanity.

In poetry, Khaled stated the fundamental cause of Palestinian alienation:

Yes we have lost everything:
We have lost life and its meaning;
We have lost the humanity of man;
We are a people that lost its land;
And he who loses his land
loses his life -- for land is
the source of life.⁶

Looking deeply into this source of alienation, one can accurately predict the consequences of such a situation and easily figure out the aims of the groups that have acted against the Palestinian existence. In fact, the expulsion of the Palestinians and their loss of identity are regarded by the Palestinians as the core of their problem, while the consequences and the forces that intensify their feeling of alienation are the surrounding wall. And, as we shall see later, to cure the Palestinian state of alienation, the heart of the problem must be treated first.

The Camps

Erecting camps for the Palestinians became the logic of the sequence of events of 1948, since there was no other way of containing a people who had been totally dispossessed of everything except their bodies. The Palestinians have had to subsist in these camps since they have been unable in general to afford to live elsewhere.

The camps are cheerless places, discouraging and with a low-spirited atmosphere. They are not designed for purposes of providing a full life conducive of a creative atmosphere. The facilities provided do not even meet the requirements of a minimum standard of living. A visitor to the camps can realize easily how dirty they are, how muddy the roads and streets are, how insufficient the housing is, and how the tents are crammed together. The toughness of life and its wretchedness dwell in the camps.

The Palestinian camp inhabitant has to face the

difficulties of the severe winter. The tents must resist the blowing wind and stand against the running water. The Palestinian must manage to keep his children warm with the few blankets he has, and more importantly he must manage to keep the water from reaching the floor of the tent. If he lives in a room with a zinc ceiling, he must know how to sleep without being annoyed by the pounding noise of the rainfall.

The camps are not business districts; rather, they are quiet places and sad. Except for very few shops and some street salesmen, life in the camps could hardly be noticed. Jobs are not available and, consequently, recreation areas are completely absent. The head of the family, if unable to find a job in a nearby area, which is mostly the case, must efficiently allocate the food allowances he gets from the United Nations so his family can continue surviving. Medical clinics hardly exist in these camps. Parents usually depend on an ancient tradition old medical methods to cure their children in case of sickness, because they cannot afford to go to the physician. As a result, infant mortality is high and the life span is low. Khaled described part of the situation in the following:

The pleasant summer of 1952 turned into a violent winter in early December. A storm struck and blew over our school tent which held over seventy children. A few were injured; the rest of us had the daylights scared out of us. In the midst of pouring icy rain, tears and mud, I stood silently crying as the children screamed and ran for cover. It was a symbol of our ruined Arab homeland. Local protests and heartrendering stories followed, but to no avail. Western Christian charity has its limits. The tent was reerected; there was no alternative.⁷

In addition, the possibility of moving out of the camps is slim. The Palestinian can seldom locate employment that pays a decent amount of money, and as long as he is unable to do so, he does not have any alternative but to stay in his camp. It is true that some Palestinians have moved out of the camps, but the majority have not yet been able to.

The Palestinians view the camps as an additional source of degradation and thus alienation. Turki, in The Disinherited, stated his feelings concerning the camps as follows:

...[I] am also aware that this knowledge has mutilated my reality and impoverished my consciousness; that I lived as a million of my fellow Palestinians lived, silently walking hither and thither along the muddy paths of DP camps, in a void, in a state of non-being....⁸

It seems to me that one cannot consider the camps as the prime source of alienation for the Palestinians because they are merely a consequence of the original source. The camps are a source that intensifies the feeling of alienation, and their disappearance does not mean a partial disappearance of alienation, but might mean a decrease in the intensity. This is obvious in the case of the Palestinians who have left the camps to more comfortable places. These people, while they could and have achieved some prosperity in their economic life, still have the same depressed status of those who live in the camps.

The World and the United Nations

The Palestinians firmly hold Zionism responsible for the

sufferings they have experienced. Zionism has existed in the Western world and has penetrated to the centers of power in Western capitals, thus having the opportunity to conspire against the future of the Palestinians. Zionism has been the political pressure that force Western governments to support the Zionists and to either neglect or undermine the cause of the Palestinians.

The Zionists did not plan to colonize Palestine and turn its citizens into a toiling proletariat under their rule; rather, their plan opposed the physical existence of the Palestinians in Palestine and entailed their departure from the scene. The Zionist plan was to establish a pure Jewish state, in which only Jews have the right to citizenship. Thus, the presence of the Palestinians, most of whom were Moslem, contradicted the very aims of Zionism. As Khaled stated, "the Zionists wanted us out of Haifa and Palestine."⁹

The Palestinians, according to their view of the situation, were expelled from their homeland and replaced by individuals who are racially, ethnically, and culturally different, and who do not have any right to Palestine. The world did not oppose such action; on the contrary, it supported it by encouraging the Zionists, equipping them militarily, and supplying them financially so as to enable them to break the opposition of the citizens of Palestine. Khaled expressed these feelings as follows:

Zionists and their followers are living in Palestine by right of arms and they have expelled us from our homeland. They live where we should live while we float about, exiled.¹⁰

The world as a whole, utilizing the United Nations as its tool, alienated the Palestinians by neglecting their right to self-determination and by dividing their country into two parts as well as by its lack of concern for their problems, and by its continuous support of Israel. It is the world, cooperating with the Zionist movement, that has inflicted the physical and spiritual damage to the Palestinians and has brought them to a humiliated state. Khaled accused the world:

I, as a dreamer, living on the bare subsistence provided by UN blue card, in a crowded room, on a side street in Sour, stand as a witness to Zionist inhumanity. I charge the world for its acquiescence in my destruction.¹¹

The Palestinians no longer seem to have faith in anyone and hold everyone responsible for the loss of identity and for throwing them into an existence, marked by purposelessness. The feeling was expressed by Turki, "I had been cheated by the world, by the gods, and by history."¹²

In the face of this atrocity, the world could only donate tents and allocate finances for the purpose of shipping the bare necessities of life to the Palestinians. Ironically, the United Nations, which was used for the destruction of the Palestinians, was authorized to serve them. And without the monthly food shipments from the United Nations, the Palestinian camp dweller might starve to death.

These shipments, as viewed by the Palestinians, intensify their feelings of alienation. The shipments are not seen as an aid for the purpose of establishing the humanity of the Palestinians or to assist them in building a meaningful life;

rather, they are seen as a device for keeping them alive. Many Palestinians go further and insist that the shipments are the price paid for Palestine and are designed for the purpose of maintaining the camp status of the Palestinians, thus preventing them from becoming freedom fighters. Turki commented on this as follows:

I have been stateless for nearly all of my twenty-nine years; that I have lived and grown up in a refugee camp on the edge of a desert; that except for those freckle-nosed bureaucrats in the West who from time to time endorsed a shipment of food and warm blankets to me, I did not exist on the face of this globe; that I was robbed of my sense of purpose and sense of worth as a human-being and forced to line up obsequiously outside UN food depots each month.¹³

The Arab People and the Arab Governments

Although the Palestinians have lived in the Arab countries for more than twenty-five years, they do not feel that they are a part of those countries. Two reasons seem to explain this feeling. The first reason is that the Palestinians are emotionally and mentally still in union with "mother Palestine." This is primarily due to the process of socialization to which the Palestinians are exposed. The Palestinian child, as he starts to explore the world around him, learns that he does not belong to the place in which he was born; rather, he learns that he is a Palestinian who belongs to Palestine which is under foreign occupation. Thus, the child grows up with a knowledge that he is alien to the Arab countries and with a determination to liberate his own land. Khaled stated how her mother transmitted this feeling

to her: "You Leila, and your brothers and sisters, must never forget Palestine and must do your utmost to recover her."¹⁴ Or, as stated in another place, "You are an alien here in Lebanon, and your homeland is under foreign occupation."¹⁵

As ideas such as these become rooted in the minds of Palestinians in exile, one finds a new generation firmly believing in their people and strongly stressing their identity as Palestinians. An example of this is the following from Turki:

Living in Beirut as a stateless person for most of my growing-up years, many of them in a refugee camp, I did not feel I was an Arab, a Lebanese, or, as some wretchedly pious writers claimed, a 'Southern Syrian.' I am a Palestinian.¹⁶

The second reason is that the Palestinians are accepted neither by the host people nor by their governments. The Palestinians, in general, are treated as second class citizens in the Arab countries, and, in most cases, they are not considered citizens. They are usually down at the bottom of the employment list priorities. Jobs are scarce, and, if available, inferior jobs are assigned to them. A Palestinian can stay in his job as long as there is nobody from the host country to fill his place. Such a policy has been in effect in countries like Kuwait and Saudi Arabia. Furthermore, the Arab people do not think that the Palestinians have the right to jobs because they assume that those who leave their country should not demand employment in other countries. Such a treatment was dramatically described in Kanafani's novel, Rijāl

Fi al-Shams (Men under the Sun). Kanafani dealt with the difficulties the Palestinians meet in their search for jobs. Marwan, one of the personalities of the novel, met one of these difficulties in which a fat Iraqi man specializing in smuggling people to Kuwait slapped him many times and said that "you Palestinians come here and start crying like widows."¹⁷

Discrimination against the Palestinians exists not only in the economic sphere, but also in the political sphere. Political freedom, which is high on the priority list of Palestinians, is absent. The Arab governments deny Palestinians the right to express themselves freely or to deal with problems that have a direct impact on their situation. The police forces are the tools used by the Arab governments to suppress turmoil or the occasional uprising generated by the Palestinians. More fundamentally, perhaps, the Arab governments prevent the Palestinians from striking at Israel, and this encourages the Palestinians to believe that there exists natural cooperation between Israel and these governments.

Turki, in The Disinherited, recalls a time when he and fellow Palestinians were assembling to discuss a political incident. The assembly was disrupted by the police; then, "the police responsible for political affairs lectured us on the evils of meddling in the internal life of Lebanon, and reminded us that we were aliens living in the country under duress."¹⁸

The Arab governments have not done anything special to relieve the Palestinians unless one considers a continuous bombardment of speeches by heads of states promising that the situation will be corrected and the wounds healed as relief. Practically, the Palestinians and the Palestine question, as far as the Arab governments are concerned, did not exist outside these hot air speeches. As Turki stated:

We existed not in the present tense, the tense of reality, but in the future imperfect, when next year, next time, next speech, the wrongs will be righted, the grievances removed, and our cause justified.¹⁹

Historically, the Arab people did not welcome the Palestinians, and there have been few indications that the Palestinians will ever be welcomed. Instead of aiding the newcomers, the Arabs have looked down upon them, have despised them, and have accused them of being traitors for handing their country over to the Zionists and for accepting refugee status in Arab lands. The Palestinians are aware of Arab feelings and this awareness is expressed not only in Palestinian literature, but also in daily discussion. Turki, drawing from his personal experiences, described how the Palestinians are treated by the Arabs:

A kid at work had called me a two-bit Palestinian and a fist fight ensued. The supervisor, an obese man with three chins and a stubble that covered most of his face and reached under his eyes, came over to stop the fight. He decided I had started it all, slapped me hard twice, deducted three liras from my wages for causing trouble, paid me the rest, called me a two-bit Palestinian, and pointing to my blond hair, suggested I had a whore mother and shoved me out of the door.²⁰

In view of treatment such as this, the Palestinians do not feel that they are guests in the Arab countries, but aliens who have control neither over themselves, nor over their destinies. It is, of course, impossible for the Palestinians to feel at home in Arab lands as long as everything seems to go against them and everyone seems to reject their presence. As a result, the Palestinian does not feel that he is a human being with a right to be a full citizen in his Arab "homeland", but "an outsider, an alien, a refugee and a burden."²¹

The Palestinian Reaction to the State of Alienation

The state into which the Palestinians have been hurled could not but arouse certain emotional reactions. New beliefs and attitudes as well as psychological responses have developed as the Palestinians have investigated the world around them, have looked into their inner psyches, and have compared the present with the past. Turki's newly developed attitude toward the "new order" might well reflect the general attitude of the Palestinians. He stated:

I hated. I hated the world and the order of reality around me. I hated being dispossessed of a nation and an identity. I hated being the victim of political Darwinism. I hated not being part of a culture. I hated being a hybrid, an outcast and a zero. A problem.²²

The general unfolding of this new mental position as regards environment was accompanied by the rejection of experience. The refusal to accept the new reality was led by the

youth who fully understood how their problem evolved, and who realized the nature of the brutal attack against their humanity. The new generation "...growing up alienated, excluded, and forgotten, rejected this legacy...."²³

The Palestinians, especially the youthful Palestinians, determined not to accept the new reality, but remained inactive for a time, hoping that the world truly might devote attention to their problem or that the Arab countries might act against Israel, thus changing that reality. But neither occurred. The Palestinians "...patiently endured so long as it seemed beyond redress, a grievance comes to appear intolerable once the possibility of removing it crosses men's minds."²⁴ Thus, as they realized that the hope of relief was not to appear on the horizon, began to think in another direction. They started to realize that they should not depend on the world or the Arab countries, but to depend on themselves.

Under existing conditions, and with the ability to free themselves depending primarily on their own strength, the Palestinians, seemingly dictated by the logic of events, did not have any choice but to revolt and to initiate a struggle. As Turki stated,

...[Y]et when we looked around us we could see either the desert to shed our tears in or the whole world to hit back at. Having nothing with nothing to lose, we proceeded to do the latter.²⁵

The Palestinians initiated struggle in order to earn once again their freedom and thus recover their humanity. An

existential struggle was initiated which is concerned with the fundamental being of the Palestinians and is designed to regain their identity as a people, a nation, and a culture. As stated by Turki, the purpose of the struggle is "...for our place in history, our right to glimpse a vision, to search for hope, to return to Palestine. We struggled for the phoenix, not the phantom, that is, our homeland."²⁶

In summary, freedom entails humanity and, as viewed by the Palestinians, is an abstract that can be gained and felt only when they return to their land -- that is, when they return to Palestine. In only two lines of poetry, Khaled grasps this abstract:

I shall embrace my beloved and sleep
I am in union with my humanity--with Palestine.²⁷

The Struggle and the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine

The Palestinians, thinking of armed resistance, began to form military organizations to wage the struggle. One of these organizations is the Marxist-oriented Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine (PFLP). The PFLP is not only a prominent Palestinian organization, but more importantly perhaps, an organization that is especially interested in philosophy, including revolutionary theory, and its leaders feel strongly that there must be a revolutionary theory for the initiation and guidance of the struggle.

The PFLP was formed shortly after the Mideast June war of 1967. Its formation was one of the positive responses to the situation by the Palestinians since that war. The PFLP's

leaders envisioned that "...the revolutionary theory which represents all questions relating to humanity and the age in a scientific and revolutionary manner is Marxism...It is the revolutionary theoretical weapon which enables us to view things in their state of continuous motion...."²⁸ The leaders were heading to the conclusion that "...the value of our commitment to Marxism-Leninism lies eventually in the application of this approach to the conditions of our struggle for the purpose of formulating revolutionary strategy and tactics."²⁹ Thus, the PFLP tries to make of Marxism a device for understanding the nature of conflict and for guiding the struggle for liberation.

The PFLP, while it does not discuss directly the problem of alienation, does discuss the question of freedom, thus stating the reasons behind as well as the purposes of the resistance movement. It states how the struggle should be conducted, defines who will carry it out, and specifies against whom it should be waged. In its delineation of the enemies of Palestinian freedom, the PFLP's thought goes along with that of the Palestinian individual. As its basic position, it states that "...in our battle for liberation we first face Israel as a political, military, and economic entity which is trying...to defend its aggressive expansionist racial structure and prevent us from regaining our land, our freedom and our rights."³⁰ This is indeed a view that reflects the general belief of Palestinians concerning Israel.

Thus, "the political motive behind the Palestinian

national movement is the liberation of Palestine,"³¹ a goal that is expected to remove the source of injustice and bring the Palestinians into the realm of freedom. This is an objective that, when achieved, will bring the Palestinians into unity with their humanity. The purpose of this political motive then, as stated in the philosophy of the PFLP, is

...to destroy the state of Israel as a military, political and economic establishment which rests on aggression, expansion and organic connection with imperialist interests in our homeland... The aim of the Palestinian liberation movement is to establish a democratic national state of Palestine in which both Arabs and Jews will live as citizens with equal rights and obligations....³²

The PFLP does not think that all the Palestinians should carry out the struggle; rather, "...it is essential to define the forces of revolution on the Palestinian level from a class angle."³³ The PFLP believes that those who could achieve a prosperous life and luxuriously live in Arab cities will not ever think of struggling against Israel because they are not ready to give up their economic gains. So, the revolution must depend on those who still live in the camps or in the slums of Arab cities because they are the ones who are ready to fight and make the cadres of the revolution. As stated by the PFLP:

The material of the Palestinian revolution, its mainstay and its basic forces are the workers and peasants. These classes form the majority of the Palestinian people and physically fill all camps, villages and poor urban districts. Here lie the forces of revolution...the forces of change.³⁴

Without going into further detail, one can conclude that the PFLP's sole interest is the liberation of Palestine and the achievement of freedom. It considers the Marxist-Leninist theory as the guiding lamp for the revolution. This theory, according to the PFLP, explains the nature of the enemy, the nature of the conflict, and defines the carriers of the struggle. To reach this objective, the Palestinians must wage a guerrilla warfare against Israel.

Conclusion

The Palestinians have been suffering from alienation for a long time, a situation that makes frustration an everyday experience, and social integration a distant goal. The Palestinians look at their state of homelessness as the most tragic source of alienation, a thing that differentiates their situation from the conditions of the other alienated peoples of the world. Furthermore, while homelessness is the most important, it is the most difficult to overcome because of the multi-opposing forces the Palestinians face which have been trying to destroy their physical and spiritual power.

As a Palestinian, I would say that the difficulties and the hardships the Palestinians face are beyond the imagination of a by-stander. I have had chances to talk to people from different countries who visited the Middle East and stayed with Palestinians, but I admit that none of them seemed to me to be realistic in his suggested solutions for the problem, because of lack of understanding. According to my understanding for myself and for my people, the problem and its

solution do not exist only in the human mind. If they did, I am sure the solution would be easy to achieve. The problem exists in the Palestinians' emotions, feelings and in every part of their bodies. To grasp the intricacies of the situation, the observer must put himself into the body of a Palestinian; otherwise he should not claim that he comprehends the case. They have been trying to tell the world that the only solution for the Middle East dilemma is for the Palestinians to return home, but nobody seems to listen to or to believe them. Whatever the thinking of the world might be, I agree with the PFLP that return is the objective and the only way to free the Palestinians.

1. Fawaz Turki, The Disinherited (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1972), p. 16.
2. Leila Khaled, My People Shall Live, ed. by George Hajjar. (Aukland: Hodder and Stoughton, 1973), p. 28.
3. Khaled, op. cit., p. 28.
4. Ibid., p. 22.
5. Ibid., p. 22.
6. Ibid., p. 150.
7. Ibid., p. 33.
8. Turki, op. cit.
9. Khaled, op. cit., p. 27.
10. Ibid., p. 22.
11. Ibid., p. 28.
12. Turki, op. cit., p. 74.
13. Ibid., p. 15.
14. Khaled, op. cit., p. 29.
15. Ibid., p. 29.
16. Turki, op. cit., p. 16.
17. Ghassān Kanafānī, Rijāl Fi-al-Shams (Men Under the Sun) (Beirut: Dar al-Ṭali'a, 1963), pp. 44-5.
18. Turki, op. cit., p. 64.
19. Ibid., p. 16.
20. Ibid., p. 47.
21. Ibid., p. 16.
22. Ibid., p. 77.
23. Ibid., p. 16.
24. Ibid., p. 16.
25. Ibid., p. 16.
26. Ibid., p. 16.

27. Khaled, op. cit., p. 156.
28. A Strategy For the Liberation of Palestine (no author). (Amman: Information Department, 1969), pp. 91-4.
29. Ibid., p. 96.
30. Ibid., p. 8.
31. 'Ala Treek Thawra Al-Filastīniyya (On the Road to the Liberation of Palestine) (no author). (Amman: Information Department, 1969), p. 117.
32. A Strategy for the Liberation of Palestine, op. cit., pp. 79-80.
33. Ibid., p. 20.
34. Ibid., p. 25.

CHAPTER IV

THE RELATION BETWEEN THE THEORY
AND THE PROBLEM

At first glance, Marx's theory of alienation and freedom does not seem to correspond with the Palestinian understanding of alienation and freedom. Even though the theme of both of the previous chapters is alienation, they seem to discuss two different issues, each having little relation to the other. The forces of alienation mentioned by Marx, especially the ones relating to capitalism, which tend to limit man's powers and to deprive him of his humanity, do not seem to resemble the forces to which the Palestinians have been exposed. This gives the impression that Marx might have been overwhelmed by his times and as a result, might have made generalizations which he imagined to be universally true and thus applicable to different concrete situations.

Also, such little likeness between Marx's theory of alienation and the Palestinian state of alienation, if true, might deny the principles of the PFLP, which claims to be Marxist-Leninist in orientation. It is probable that the Palestinian problem might not be relevant to Marxism, and it is possible that the PFLP might be copying the experience of other organizations which identify themselves as Marxist such as the Viet Cong.

This chapter will examine the extent to which the Marxian theory of alienation and the Palestinian problem are related. The approach to this problem will not only compare the previous

chapters together, and will not necessarily stay within their limits, rather, the study of the question will consider matters that have direct relation with the substance of these chapters such as the nature of conflicts. In other words, the study will consider the basic components of the Marxian theory as a whole as well as the essential elements that dominate the Palestinian question.

Alienation: The Basic Problem

Marx's definition of alienation as a man's unfulfilled condition, that is, man's imperfect life, applies to Palestinian conditions. Marx connected man's progress and his self-fulfillment, that is, for man to make substantial progress in his life, he must overcome alienation. Such a connection reflects the situation of the Palestinians who cannot seemingly make progress on the national level as an integrated people, except perhaps through fighting, as long as they are living the present conditions. It is impossible for the Palestinians to develop as long as everything around them, including other individuals and objects, is alien and specially as long as they do not have a land upon which they might evolve.

Marx argued that man's self-fulfillment is conditioned by his dynamic existence in a material world -- that is, by his being at work. Man's method of work, i.e., his role in production, determines whether or not he is self-fulfilled. Man's, and especially the worker's, unfulfilled condition rests in his inability to recognize himself through his work. The

worker, exploited and enslaved by unjust powers, is alienated because he is deprived from the product of his work which is his self-expression.

It seems clear that the Palestinians relate the loss of fulfillment to the loss of identity which is related in turn to the loss of a material object which is their homeland, Palestine. These relationships tie in well with Marx's concept of alienation as it is developed by him in material terms. However, the Palestinians consider the loss of their homeland as more than something possessing an economic value. The homeland might possess other things that cause the Palestinian alienation and give rise to their motivation to fight.

What is of more importance, however, insofar as the Palestinians are concerned, is that their dynamic existence, i.e., being at work in the material life does not seem to be critical in their lives. Even during and after expulsion, they could not locate jobs and, thus, could not get involved in a method of work or mode of production. Even now, a high rate of unemployment exists among Palestinians. This lack of employment is due primarily to the fact that jobs are simply not available, because of the state of underdevelopment characterizing the economics of the host countries and the Arab countries prefer to employ their own citizens rather than Palestinians. Therefore, it is the nature of the host countries' economies and the stateless character of the Palestinians that condition their economic misery.

The social structure of Arab society seems to be a reason

for the economic difficulties the Palestinians are facing. A "tribal spirit" still exists in the Arab countries, and this belief places higher consideration upon a person belonging to a known family than upon one belonging to an unknown family.¹ Since favoritism and nepotism characterize the society and jobs are scarce, those who "belong" have priority, and those who do not "belong", like the Palestinians, remain unemployed. While these facts could be given a class interpretation, it cannot be considered a problem for the Palestinians only; rather it is a problem for a majority of the Arab people.

I think that it is a reasonable argument to suggest that a class structure exists in the Arab states. The exploiting class, the feudalists, merchants, rulers, etc., exists and exploits those who did not have a chance to increase their wealth. While the Palestinians list the Arab people among their sources of alienation, it seems that there is an economic cause that might bring the majority of the Arab people together with the Palestinians. In fact, the PFLP lists the Arab poor class among the cadres of the revolution, who along with the Palestinians, as suggested by the PFLP, will bring the Arab regimes down thus removing the protectors of the exploiting class.

However, the Palestinians do not consider their cause an economic problem. Economic suffering is not the prime source of Palestinian alienation, but the consequence of the prime source, that is, the loss of their country. The Palestinians do not consider the loss of their homeland as a material loss signifying an economic value causing their alienation and

motivating them to hit back at the world, but it is a loss signifying the loss of their identity and humanity. This interpretation, in a broad sense, agrees with Marx's ideas concerning material things. According to Marx, as was indicated before, the product of a man's work contains the self-expression and thus the humanity of that man; and if this product is taken away from a man, his humanity is taken away. As it is in the case of the worker, the Palestinians must regain a material loss so as to overcome this unfulfilled condition.

According to Marx, however, the worker has another concern that the Palestinians do not seem to possess -- namely, he wants to realize an economic gain in the process of humanizing himself. The worker hopes to raise his standard of living beyond the level of subsistence, a level which is a sign of his alienation as well as a result of it. On the other hand, the Palestinians do not seem to have this interest when they concentrate on their land. Khaled, while not living at a level of subsistence at the present, gave an idea about the unimportance the Palestinians place on economic gains in the following dialogue with an American lady:

'Do you expect to live in Palestine more luxuriously than you are living here, if and when you get there?' the American lady asked. 'Perhaps not, but that is not important,' I answered.²

The argument that the Palestinians do not wish to make economic gains by initiating liberation movements is strengthened by the fact that some of those Palestinians who can achieve a

comfortable economic existence have chosen to act along with the Palestinian freedom fighters. They have started or joined liberation movement with previous knowledge that they may live in caves or military encampments for the remainder of their lives. George Habash, the leader of the PFLP and who used to be a dentist, and Yesser Arafat, the leader of Al-Fatah, and who was an engineer, are examples.

Further, the Palestinians are able to raise their low standards of living and to rid themselves of the dehumanizing camps if they agree upon compensation. The world powers as well as Israel are prepared to compensate the Palestinians by locating them permanently and by providing employment. Much has been said about the Jordanian Valley and the Syrian Horan plains as suitable agricultural areas in which to settle the Palestinians as well as about the oil industry as a possible area of employment. The Palestinians, however, have not endorsed such ideas simply because such suggested solutions are not considered the ones that will go away with alienation. Turki stated the case against settlement as follows:

Mine is not a vexatious issue, nor has it much to do with the conflict now raging between the Arabs and the Zionists. Nor is its solution dependent upon, nor I will allow it to be, the whims of the big powers...If there are people around who call us 'Arab refugees' or 'Southern Syrians' or terrorists, who want to subdue us, who want to resettle us, who want to ignore us and who want to play games with our destiny, then they are not tuned into the vibrations and the tempo of the Third World, of which the Palestinians are a part.³

These arguments lead to the conclusion that the Palestinians,

who are willing to maintain the same living standards and to fight for generations, do not relate their problems to economic losses. Simply, they are not prepared to accept any solution other than to return to the land from where they originated. In addition, it is evident that some of the forces (specifically Israel and the Western capitalist countries) that have oppressed the Palestinians are willing to aid them economically which leads to the conclusion that these countries realize that economic difficulties do not constitute the basic elements of the Palestinian problem, and that they are willing to aid the Palestinians hoping that such aid might divert their attention from the cause.

The above conclusion sets the difference between the forces that have been acting against the Palestinians and those that have been acting against the worker as well as between the Marxian worker and the Palestinians. While the former tries to compensate the Palestinians, the latter tries to press the worker economically. The worker, as drawn by Marx, is concerned with the methods of work and with changing them so that he can humanize himself, but realizing the Palestinian goal of humanity is determined by where the Palestinians live regardless of the manner in which they live.

Turki stated that:

Mine is an existential problem having to do with the yearning for my homeland, with being part of a culture, with winning the battle to remain myself as a Palestinian belonging to a people with⁴ a distinctly Palestinian consciousness.

This difference in goals between the Marxian worker and

the Palestinians is a difference, in essence, between the Palestinian and the Marxian ideologies. Marx attached material meaning to the humanization of the workers, but the Palestinians attach an emotional-spiritual meaning. The worker, according to Marx, in addition to humanizing his life, aims to gain control of the mode of production and to raise his living standards. According to this as well as to Marx's basic principles about the conditions under which the worker becomes fully humanized which were mentioned earlier, the worker does not need to identify himself with a certain culture or a certain nation, which is the prime concern of the Palestinians. Briefly, the worker needs to be international in approach, giving according to his abilities and taking according to his needs, but the Palestinians are identifying themselves with a particular approach that concerns them only, aiming to liberate their homeland which is their source of spiritual inspiration and emotional motivation.

In summary, one can state that insofar as the sources of alienation, the definition of humanity, and the requirements for its fulfillment are concerned, there is a fundamental difference between Marx's ideas and those of the Palestinians. It is a difference between one who views the world from a material perspective and one who views the world from a spiritual and emotional angle. The worker, in order to become humanized, must conquer economic exploitation; however, the Palestinian, in order to overcome alienation, must reconquer his history, culture, and land.

The Nature of Conflicts

Although the Marxian concept of alienation as it is analyzed by Marx in material terms differs from the understanding of the Palestinians for the concept, still there is a possibility of tying the two approaches together. In order to determine whether or not the two different kinds of alienation are related, one must examine the nature of those conflicts which produce different kinds of alienation because it is possible for essentially identical conflicts to produce different effects.

Marx suggested that, throughout history, there has been conflict, that is, class struggle. This conflict has been involving the exploited and the alienated classes on one side, and the exploiting class on the other. As the majority (the exploited) defeats the minority (the exploiting), a new economic structure, and consequently a new social structure, comes into being. In this fashion, the conflict has been of an economic nature, i.e., the struggle between the classes within societies has been caused by economic factors. This approach to the nature of conflicts will be explained in terms of the Palestinian problem in order to determine its applicability.

In the Middle East there are many forces involved in the conflict. For the purpose of this paper, only one part of this conflict will be considered. In this part there are the Palestinians, who in their battle for liberation face the opposing parties: "Israel, Zionism, world imperialism and Arab reaction."⁵

The PFLP, in its description of the opposition said that "these enemies possess technological superiority and... military superiority and great fighting power." Moreover, the enemies "have long experience in facing the masses' movements toward economic and political liberation...."⁶ Also, the PFLP realizes that "it is the nature of the enemy which determines the nature of the confrontation."⁷

In its explanation of the nature of the enemy, the PFLP stated:

We [the Palestinians] first face Israel as a political, military and economic entity which is trying to effect maximum mobilization of its two and a half million nationals to defend its aggressive expansionist racial structure and prevent us from regaining our land, our freedom and our rights.⁸

The PFLP does not consider Israel an independent and a unique entity, but "it is in reality an integral part of the world Zionist movement; indeed, it is an offshot of this movement."⁹ Thus, the nature of this movement also is a factor in the nature of the conflict. This movement, according to the PFLP, "as a racial religious movement is trying to organize and recruit 14 million Jews in all parts of this world to support Israel."¹⁰

Evidently, the PFLP does not consider Israel and Zionism as forces motivated by economic greed, but as forces using the tool of religion to serve racial purposes. Israel and its supporters, Zionism, are the results of a religion that has been used for racial identification and which has become a requirement for acquiring the Israeli citizenship.

Zionism, in realizing its goal of asserting the racial nature of the followers of the Jewish faith, had long sought a land to contain them. In order to accomplish this goal, the movement used aggression as a policy since no land was offered to the Jews as a gift. Israel, a product of aggression, has had to follow an aggressive policy in order to survive and to gain additional land for the settlement of more Jews.

Thus, Zionism and Israel have not sought to enslave and to exploit the Palestinians. They simply wanted the Palestinians out of Palestine because their presence was, and continues to be, contrary to their principles and goals. The Zionist plan and its success do not make the conflict a class struggle, but a national conflict. The majority of Palestinians do not live in Palestine as an exploited class, but outside of Palestine as refugees. It is true that some Palestinians remain in their homes under Israeli rule and they are exploited by the Israelis. However, while these Palestinians are an integral part of the Palestinian question, they are not central to the theme. The central issue, as indicated earlier, is that a nation suddenly went out of existence and has since been denied the right to exist.

The struggle between the Palestinians on the one hand and Israel and Zionism on the other suggests that the conflict is national in nature. Israel attempts to recruit "...its two and a half million nationals to defend its aggressive racial structure"¹¹ and Zionism attempts to recruit the world to support Israel, while the Palestinians attempt to liberate Palestine. Israel and Zionism, according to the Palestinians,

are racially oriented, while the Palestinians maintain a national approach. This difference between the two is stated in the PFLP's declaration of objectives:

The Palestinian liberation movement is not a racial movement with aggressive intentions against the Jews. It is not directed against the Jews. Its object is to destroy the state of Israel as a military, political, and economic establishment which rests on aggression, expansion, and organic connection with imperialist interests in our homeland ...The aim of the Palestinian liberation movement is to establish a democratic national state in Palestine in which both Arabs and Jews will live as citizens with equal rights and obligations.¹²

The thoughts of the PFLP concerning the national nature of the conflict do not generally contradict those of the individuals. For example, Khaled stated,

What astonished us about this group [a group of visitors from Western Europe] was that they were opposed to nationalism, a doctrine we hold dearly....¹³

The national complexion of the conflict existing in the Middle East contradicts Marx's concepts about conflict and, thus, does not satisfy the assumption of the universal applicability of his interpretation of history as a class struggle. This suggests that there are different types of conflicts producing different types of alienation, a conclusion leading one to question the validity of Marx's ideas concerning alienation.

This conclusion concerning the conflict between the two sides in the Middle East constitutes the essence of the conflict. The presence of Israel with the support of Zionism

symbolizes the loss of Palestinian nationhood which is the main source of Palestinian alienation. Regardless of what might happen between Israel and the Arabs, between them both and the world, or between the Arabs and the Palestinians, the major question of how to approach the problem remains strongly imposing itself. Evidently, the approach to the problem must begin from a national perspective and end with results that give the Palestinians the right to nationhood in their homeland. Otherwise, prospects for ending the conflict will remain slim.

The World, the Arabs, and the Palestinians

Seemingly, Israel, as a result of cooperation between Zionism and certain world powers, is a reproduction of Western capitalism. Israel is the daughter of British imperialism, and the adopted daughter of the world's leading capitalist nation, the United States of America, which, needless to say, has major economic interests in the Middle East. Imperialism has been supporting Israel militarily, politically, economically, and without even considering a treaty of alliance. Thus, it seems that they are natural allies. The PFLP comes to a very similar conclusion about the nature of imperialism and its relations with Israel.

Imperialism finds itself in the best position in this part of the world [the Middle East] because, through Israel, it is able to fight the Arab revolutionary movement which aims at eliminating it from our homeland, with Israel becoming the force and the base used by imperialism to protect its presence and defend its interests in our land. Such a

situation creates an organic unity between Israel and the Zionist movement on the one hand and world imperialism on the other, because they are both interested in fighting the Palestinian and Arab liberation movement. Thus the protection, reinforcement, and support of Israel and the maintenance of its existence, are fundamental matters for the interest of world imperialism.¹⁴

Imperialism is an integral part of capitalism, and is of an economically exploitive and oppressive nature. It uses its potential to secure its economic interests in as many parts of the world as possible, including the Middle East. In order to protect its immense investments in the oil industry and to keep the oil pipe-line open, thus guaranteeing the continued operation of its industrial machine, imperialism must subdue the Arab national movement. Through Israel, and by allying itself with Arab reaction, imperialism has been able to crush Arab national movements and to exploit the wealth of the Arab states. Both Israel and Arab reaction are interested in killing these liberation movements because they constitute a threat to their interests which are connected with the interests of imperialism. And since Israel, according to the PFLP, is the most powerful of all the countries in the area, and since the Palestinian liberation movement is the strongest movement, Arab reaction and imperialism are interested in reinforcing Israel so as to kill the Palestinian resistance. According to the PFLP, it is a rule that if Israel's existence is in danger, it is the Arab puppets' thrones that will be in danger, and consequently the imperialists interests will be in danger.

Imperialism and its ally Israel, have been using two approaches to destroy the Palestinian liberation movement. The first approach, which has been successful in reducing the strength of the movement, has followed a positive response to armed resistance -- that is, fight resistance with resistance. Israel, supported by imperialism, has been attacking the Palestinian military establishments continuously. Arab reaction, also supported by imperialism, has been attacking the Palestinians in order to destroy their power. The other approach, as indicated before, has been an attempt to compensate the Palestinians by resettling them. This approach, if it can achieve any success, will reduce the power of the Palestinian movement and might completely kill it. But, so far, it has been failing.

Such an imperialist interest in the Middle East is a capitalist greed. Capitalism, as described by Marx, has an interest which is to exploit people and make profit out of them. The Marxian theory explains the motives of the capitalist nations behind their interference in the Middle East. The Arab people are facing the Western nations as exploiting powers. From this perspective, the national confrontation between the Arabs and the West could be interpreted as a class struggle. Thus, Marx's interpretation of conflict as class conflict applies to the situation where the Arabs, in general, are involved against the West.

As far as the Palestinians are concerned, it could be said that the war between them and capitalism does not have a direct economic nature; rather, indirectly, by subduing them,

capitalism hopes to make a more peaceful atmosphere in the area which, in turn, provides security for its interests. Capitalism is not interested in exploiting the Palestinians, but in terminating their danger to its interests.

In conclusion, one can state that imperialism is not hoping to make profit out of the Palestinians; on the contrary, it might be interested in financing those Palestinians who are willing to divert their attention from resisting Israel to something else. It is true that the dynamics of economics are related to the conflict in the Middle East, but this does not contradict the predominantly national nature of the conflict.

From the previous discussion, I think it is evident that the Palestinian definition for freedom and Marx's definition are not identical. Freedom, for the worker, means to liberate himself from exploitation and to go voluntarily to work without being coerced by necessity; but, for the Palestinians, it means a return to the homeland. This difference in understanding for freedom is due primarily to the different kinds of alienation which the worker and the Palestinians are facing.

1. A. A. Al-Marayati, The Middle East: Its Governments and Politics (Belmont: Duxbury Press, 1972), p. 55.
2. Khaled, op. cit., p. 109.
3. Turki, op. cit., pp. 8-9.
4. Ibid., p. 8.
5. Al-Jabha Ash-Sha'biyya Wal'Amaliyyat Al-Kharijiyya (The Popular Front and the Operations Abroad) (no author). Edited by Al-Hadaf. (Beirut: Al-Hadaf), p. 7.
6. A Strategy for the Liberation of Palestine, op. cit., p. 8.
7. Ibid., p. 9.
8. Ibid., p. 8.
9. Ibid., p. 8.
10. Ibid., p. 9.
11. Ibid., p. 8.
12. Ibid., pp. 79-80.
13. Khaled, op. cit., p. 122.
14. A Strategy for the Liberation of Palestine, op. cit., p. 12.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Acton, H. B. What Marx Really Said. (London: MacDonald, 1967).
- Al-Jabha Ash-Sha'biyya Wa-'Amaliyyat Al-Kharijiyya (The Popular Front and the Operations Abroad), ed. by Al-Hadaf (Beirut: Al-Hadaf).
- Al-Marayati, A. A. The Middle East: Its Governments and Politics. (Belmont: Duxbury Press, 1972).
- 'Ala Tareek Ath-Thawra Al-Filastiniyya (On the Road to the Liberation of Palestine). (Amman: Information Department, 1969).
- Dewey, R. E. Freedom. (London: The Macmillan Company, 1970).
- Fromm, E. The Fear of Freedom. (London: K. Paul, Trench, Trubner and Co., Ltd., 1960).
- Hook, S. From Hegel to Marx. (Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1950).
- Kanafāni, G. Rijāl Fi-al-Shams (Men Under the Sun). (Beirut: Dar al-Ṭalī'a, 1963).
- Khaled, L. My People Shall Live, ed. by George Hajjar. (Auckland: Hodder and Stoughton, 1973).
- Marx, Karl. Capital. (Moscow: Foreign Languages Publishing House).
- . Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts. (Moscow: Foreign Languages Publishing House).
- . Economy, Class and Social Revolution, ed. by Z. A. Jordan. (London: Michael Joseph, 1971).
- Marcuse, H. Reason and Revolution. (London: Oxford University Press, 1941).
- . Soviet Marxism. (New York: Columbia University Press, 1958).
- Meszaros, T. Marx's Theory of Alienation. (New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1970).
- A Strategy for the Liberation of Palestine. (Amman: Information Department, 1969).

Turki, F. The Disinherited. (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1972).

Wiles, P. J. The Political Economy of Communism. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1962).

Zeitlin, I. M. Capitalism and Imperialism. (Chicago: Markham Publishing Company, 1972).

THE ASSOCIATION BETWEEN THE MARXIAN THEORY OF
ALIENATION AND THE PALESTINIAN ALIENATION

by

ABDULSATTAR TAWFIK KASSEM

B.A., American University in Cairo, 1972

AN ABSTRACT OF A MASTER'S THESIS

submitted in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree

MASTER OF ARTS

Department of Political Science

Kansas State University
Manhattan, Kansas

1974

The association between Marx's theory of alienation and the Palestinian alienation is a thesis that tries to determine how far Marx's theoretical approach to the problem of human alienation ties with the problem of Palestinian alienation. The significance of this research rests on the fact that Marx's philosophy is one of the most prominent and important philosophies in history, and on the fact that the Palestinian problem is one of the most critical issues facing the world of the twentieth century.

The thesis describes, first, Marx's understanding and analysis of the concept of alienation and its sources; second, it analyzes the Palestinian state of alienation and its sources as it is understood by Palestinians living it and suffering from it; and finally measures how far the problem associates with the theory. In addition to the publication of the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine, mainly two other sources which deal with the Palestinian alienation are employed.

Economics, according to Marx, is the dominating functional cultural factor that determines other cultural aspects and, thus, any social or cultural disintegration caused by any conflict within a society is essentially based upon economic reasons. Consequently, alienation is a problem that rests upon economic maladjustments, and its cure must stem from modifications or changes in the economic system.

According to the Palestinians, alienation takes the form of an existential problem causally interrelated to external

forces operating outside the Palestinian disintegrated society. The Palestinians regard these forces as alien powers aiming at the annihilation of their physical existence in Palestine and at the destruction of the Palestinian spirit. These forces stand against the legitimate right of the Palestinians to exist as a nation..

The Marxian functional economic approach to the problem of alienation does not go along with the Palestinian causal and philosophical definition for alienation. It is true that there are aspects of Marxian alienation and Palestinian alienation that tie together, but still there is a major difference. Marx thought that alienation must be understood through the economics of the era, while the Palestinians think that it must be understood through the national aspirations of the people and that it does not rest on economic exploitation but on emotional and spiritual frustration.