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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

State terrorism and the terrorism industry are not a figments of one's imagination. They are a reality that our world must come to terms with and address (Herman & O'Sullivan, 1989). This study will challenge the existing myths and expose the complex realities of both, contemporary terrorism and state terrorism. As a Third World political sociologist and product of colonialism, I am compelled to address the devastating effects of neo-colonialism and neo-imperialism. I chose this research project because I believe that there is an urgent need to question state legitimacy, authority, the abuse of state power and how each contributes to state sanctioned terrorism and is therefore, criminal. Furthermore, although scholarly research in the area of state terrorism has been given little attention, statesponsored terrorism has gained a prominent position in current debates among social scientists, political scientists, international relations experts, economists, and political sociologists who contend that statesponsored terrorism is a form of international deviance (Herman & O'Sullivan, 1989).

The aim of this study is to raise questions regarding
state terrorism; thus, developing a new theoretical model of contemporary state terrorism. Questions to be addressed are: Why do social scientists take on the position of "cautious rebels" when it comes to the study and investigation of state terrorism? Why the refusal to define it as criminal activity? How does state terrorism impact state legitimacy?

The study will examine the processes involved in the social construction of state terrorism. The focus will be on state terrorism as manifested in the Arab-Israeli-Palestinian uprising (Intifada) that erupted on December 9, 1987. The final aim of this study is to develop a specific theory of contemporary state terrorism as it relates to the Arab-Israeli-Palestinian conflict.

The study is guided by the Kuhnian principle of puzzle-solving activity. Thomas S. Kuhn, a philosopher and historian of science, in his work entitled, The Structure of Scientific Revolutions, first published in 1962 (revised in 1970), addressed the definition and nature of a paradigm, and its implications in the activity of collecting data and interpreting scientific knowledge. According to Kuhn, scientific investigation is an activity that is guided by a frame of reference used to interpret existing knowledge. The frame of reference influences the way data are organized and interpreted. According to Kuhn, there is a scientific paradigm which guides social scientists'
(natural/physical) activities of collecting data, analyzing data and advancing knowledge. Kuhn postulates that a paradigm has the following characteristics: (a) It provides a new way of understanding phenomena, (b) it provides new ways to guide future research activity and methods, (c) it provides new scientific dilemmas for solution, and finally, (d) it may help address new scientific dilemmas that were not previously addressed. According to Kuhn, when some of the pieces of the puzzle don't fit, then we have to attempt to address these new "anomalies." Kuhn contends that through these revolutionary challenges (science in crisis) that are raised by these "anomalies," a new paradigm replaces the old (Kuhn, 1962, 1970; Manis, 1976). The following model represents the life cycle of a paradigm (adopted from Ritzer, 1988, p. 39).

Paradigm I -------> Normal Science -------> Anomalies
Crisis ----------> Revolution ----------> Paradigm II

This study is based on the premise that the existing theories of contemporary terrorism have failed by not addressing the new anomalies that are raised by the situation of contemporary state terrorism in the Arab-Israeli-Palestinian conflict. The current theories are general in nature and could not be applied to specific forms of terrorism. This results in an urgent need to address the current anomalies raised by state terrorism in
the Arab-Israeli-Palestinian conflict.

The structure of the proposed theory of contemporary state terrorism follows Glaser and Strauss's model (1967). According to Glaser and Strauss, a theory has the following components: conceptual categories or properties and hypotheses (which I refer to as assumptions) (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). The proposed theory of contemporary state terrorism consists of an analysis of the following conceptual properties: power, legitimacy, and authority which have to be considered in order to understand the phenomena of state terrorism. The assumptions about these conceptual properties will be formulated to construct a theory of contemporary state terrorism. The task of integration will focus on the issue of whether the emergent theory, substantive or formal, fits in. Glaser and Strauss (1967) caution against creating new theories haphazardly. "The theory should never just be put together, nor should a formal theory model be applied to it until one is sure it will fit, and will not force the data" (p. 41).

The study is organized into five chapters. Chapter II will discuss the historical context of the Arab-Israeli-Palestinian conflict and most importantly, the early seeds of the conflict including the experience of colonialism, superpowers diplomacy, state sovereignty, and the military occupation of Palestine. Chapter III will examine the phenomena of the Palestinian uprising of 1987 and the
challenges it raises in relation to the issues of the legitimacy of the occupation and human rights concerns. A brief historical review of the conflict is essential because to discuss it out of its historical context would lead to a biased and distorted analysis and therefore, historically incomplete or inaccurate. Social forces contributing to the current situation include: colonialism, imperialism, neo-colonialism, sovereignty, statehood, diplomacy, and the occupations.

Chapter IV will focus on the social constructionist paradigm, or what is sometimes referred to as the definitional or the labeling tradition of deviance and social control. It will include a detailed analysis of two important theoretical traditions contained within the paradigm; the labeling and the critical school. The labeling school will provide insight into the dynamics of image management. The critical school will provide the necessary insight into the phenomena of power. The "propaganda model" of Chomsky and Herman, and the "dominant ideology" model of Perdue will attempt to provide an answer to the question, Why social scientists took on the position of "cautious rebels" when viewing acts of state terrorism as criminal. Additionally, the world system approach of Wallerstein will provide clarity to the issue of power as operating globally.

Perdue's work entitled Terrorism and the State: A
Critique of Domination Through Fear (1989), provides a critique of the literature on contemporary terrorism and can explain why the propaganda model, or what is sometimes referred to as the "patriotic model," has failed to provide an explanation or a definition of state terrorism. According to Perdue, a "dominant ideology" exists in the West that sets the tone, style, and direction for the study of contemporary terrorism, particularly state terrorism. The ideology of the West reduces the complex phenomena of contemporary terrorism to a set of behaviors that are privatized and ahistorical (Perdue, 1989).

Perdue states further that "from the dominant side, terrorism is a form of international deviance; a set of behaviors that violate a collective consensus supposedly held by civilized people or acceptable forms of violence" (Perdue, 1989, p. 7). This ideology was not created by accident, but rather, was carefully crafted and constructed by the ruling elite and its apparatus of social control, such as the mass media. According to Perdue, the ruling elite enlisted the help of the mass media to create what is referred to as "the construction of terrorism" (Perdue, 1989).

The final chapter will seek to develop an integrated theoretical model of contemporary state terrorism which will provide an adequate explanation of, and a more accurate presentation of the existing reality of state
terrorism in the Arab-Israeli-Palestinian conflict. This theory is based on the conceptual properties of power, legitimacy, and authority. The phenomena of systemic anomie and normative chaos will provide additional clarity that is needed to develop a new integrated theory of state terrorism. The constructionist principles that are implied in the propaganda model, the dominant ideology model, and the terrorism industry will be used to explain the phenomena of state terrorism and in particular the case of the Arab-Israeli-Palestinian conflict. The concept apartheid will be analyzed in order to assess its utility in constructing this specific theory on state terrorism. Finally, Dom Helder Camara's theory of spiral violence will be analyzed for relevant insights into the situation of state terrorism in the area of the Arab-Israeli-Palestinian conflict. This theory will offer insight into the vicious cycle of violence that characterizes the current situation in the occupied territories in the hope that a way out of this madness will become the new option and a reality.
CHAPTER II

HISTORICAL SEEDS OF THE CONFLICT: A HISTORICAL REVIEW OF EARLY DEVELOPMENT

The Palestinian uprising of 1987 has to be understood within the context of the Arab-Israeli-Palestinian dilemma. It is essential to give a brief historical review of the conflicts, particularly, the role vital forces played in the shaping of the current Arab-Israeli-Palestinian dilemma such as colonialism, imperialism, neo-colonialism, sovereignty, statehood, diplomacy, and the occupation.

The Palestinians (refer to Appendix A for a map of Palestine post WWII) had to adjust to colonial rulers, first the Ottoman of Turkey and then the British. The historical development of the experience of colonialism-imperialism proceeded in the following phases:

1. The age of colonialism (1500-1800). This phase set the stage for the beginning of European influence and control over most of Asia and Africa including the Middle East and Palestine. The colonial powers were arrogant and inhumane in their treatment of the colonies and they imposed the most aggressive form of colonialism which is slavery. It was during this phase that the Ottomans gained complete control over Palestine (Peretz, 1988).
2. The period of intensified colonialism is sometimes referred to as the age of imperialism (1800-1947). This phase encompasses WWI and WWII as well as the previous 100 years. This phase is characterized by the expansion and manipulation by the colonial powers of most of the third world nations' economies including Africa, Asia, and Latin America. The Western European capitalist system was developing and the colonial powers saw a great opportunity to exploit and even manipulate most of the third world nations in order to secure investment opportunities for their growing accumulation of capital, extract raw materials needed to keep the capitalist system growing and expanding, and finally, to secure and guarantee markets for their products. It was during this phase when the Ottomans of Turkey lost control of most of the Middle East region including Palestine (the aftermath of WWI). Following the disastrous defeat of the Ottomans of Turkey and Germany, the Middle East was divided among the allied forces, France and the United Kingdom. Palestine was placed under the control of the British administrative power, which is sometimes referred to as the mandate period ending May 14, 1948, when David-Ben Gurion, Israel's first prime minister, proclaimed the state of Israel (Smith, 1988).

3. The post-independence period (since 1947) is referred to as post WWII or the aftermath. The interaction between the West and the third world took a new direction.
It focused on fulfilling the needs of the international capitalist system through the use of indirect and direct control and manipulation of the economic systems of the third world nations (which includes the Middle East and thus, Palestine).

Important developments took place in the Arab-Israeli-Palestinian conflict during the above phases which set the stage, direction, orientation, and nature of the conflict such as the atrocities committed at the hands of Hitler and Nazi Germany against European Jews, the emergence of the Zionist movement, and the Balfour Declaration of 1917. A brief description of these events follows in order to assess their impact on the Arab-Israeli-Palestinian conflict.

**The Holocaust: Genocide and Emancipation**

World War II was a crucial event in the history of the Arab-Israeli-Palestinian conflict. In 1941 Adolf Hitler began his plan for exterminating the race he considered impure and inferior based on Nazi ideology and Aryan racial supremacy. Hitler's plan set out to exterminate the retarded, insane, and homosexuals but his intention was to exterminate the European Jews and European gypsies. Hitler built crematories and gas chambers in existing concentration camps that were used to hold German political prisoners. By the end of World War II, approximately 6
11 million Jews were exterminated. The allied forces liberated the camps and exposed Hitler's atrocities. The Holocaust survivors had to, and still are, attempting to come to terms with this horrible experience. The aftermath is characterized as a difficult journey to achieve inner peace and serenity. Victor E. Frankl, an internationally renowned psychiatrist, and a Holocaust survivor wrote extensively about the experience in the concentration camps. Frankl (1984) revised and updated his famous work, *Man's Search for Meaning*, which gave an intriguing account of his experience in the concentration camps (Frankl, 1984).

The Zionist Movement, Anti-Semitism in Europe and Jewish Immigration to Palestine

The Zionist movement was another important development in the history of the Arab-Israeli-Palestinian conflict. This movement is ideological in nature emerged as a response to the anti-semitic sentiment in Europe, particularly in Eastern Europe. This movement was formed in 1897 and headed by Theodore Hertzl, an assimilated Viennese Jew. Financial support poured in to support the Zionist movement in its commitment to assist Jews to immigrate and establish a homeland in Palestine; for example, wealthy Western Jews contributed funds such as Baron Edmond de Rothschild, who gave 1.6 million English pounds sterling
and Moses Montefiere (Smith, 1988). The Zionist movement created its first bank in 1899; and in 1901, the Jewish National Fund was created for the purpose of purchasing and developing lands for a Jewish settlement in Palestine (Smith, 1988). The Zionist movement facilitated Jewish immigration which set in motion an establishment of agriculturally based settlements, which later developed into military settlements organized to protect Jews from the perceived and real threats from Arabs' and Palestinians' aggression.

Moreover, Jewish immigration to Palestine was encouraged by the Balfour Declaration of 1917, a communiqué between the British cabinet of Lloyd George and Lord Rothschild that was sent on November 2, 1917 (Smith, 1988). It was the extensive lobbying effort of the Zionist movement that pushed for the acceptance of said declaration (see Appendix B for the content of the letter) (Smith, 1988).

Palestine was partitioned in 1947 by the United Nations in order to curtail terrorist incidents and clashes between the Arabs and the Jews, which established the division of Arab and Jewish state/territories (refer to Appendix A for a map of Palestine post-WWII United Nations Partition Plan of 1947). Increased hostilities between the Arabs and the Jews forced the British out of Palestine. Before the British left the territories, they had to honor
a promise to King Abdullah, the grandfather of Jordan's present day King Hussein. In return for his support of the British forces during World War II, the king was granted the right to establish the state of Jordan including territories East and West of the Jordan River (see Appendix C for a map of Israel after the 1967 war) (Day, 1986). Following Britain's withdrawal from Palestine, the state of Israel was established on May 14, 1948, and the newly created state received immediate recognition from powerful nations such as the U. S., Britain, and France. Israel fought an assortment of wars with the first being the war of independence against its neighboring Arab states of Iraq, Jordan, Egypt, and Syria. Israel fought significant wars against its Arab neighbors in 1956, 1967, and in 1973, with each war the Arabs lost more territories to Israel (see Appendix D for a map of the current status of Palestine).

Life in the Occupied Territories: Coping With the Occupation

Life in the occupied territories of the West Bank and Gaza Strip was difficult and the Palestinians lost control over their basic political rights and freedom. The Palestinians lost their academic freedom, freedom of speech, freedom to vote and participate in the political process, and freedom to freely travel abroad, even within Palestine.
There are striking similarities between the British form of classical colonialism and the Israeli occupation. These similarities in characteristics will be discussed at a later time. The hardships and wars forced many Palestinians to leave the territory and become refugees in neighboring Arab states, such as Lebanon, Syria, Iraq and Jordan. It was in the camps of Lebanon and Jordan, in the 60s, that the PLO movement surfaced. Israel reprisals to Palestinian resistance turned violent, as a reaction to the PLO, especially during the uprising. Some of the common reprisal practices include the following: destruction of the homes of suspected terrorists; illegal imprisonment of suspected terrorists for a long period of time, without trial or conviction; closing of educational institutions; and the daily and constant personal humiliation of the residents for no apparent reasons (i.e., indiscriminate search and seizure of personal properties, and confiscation of political materials perceived to be a threat to the state of Israel). These conditions continued despite the various efforts of the international community to bring peace and harmony to the territories (Hilterman, 1991). Refer to Appendix 0 for a complete documentation of Israeli reprisal policies in the occupied territories of the West Bank and Gaza Strip during the uprising of 1987.

The state of Israel was experiencing difficulty controlling the residents in the occupied territories, and
they had to resort to the "iron fist" policies approved by the Israeli cabinet on August 9, 1985. These policies are based on the principles of intimidation and fear through the use of the IDF (Israeli Defense Forces) in the occupied territories. Old policies were brought back such as deportation, administrative and preventive detention (house arrest), and the use of tear gas (Aronson, 1990). The Palestinians became frustrated with these conditions and could no longer live under these humiliating circumstances or the constant horrors they had to endure on a daily basis. These conditions set the stage for the Palestinian uprising of 1987.

Various theoretical traditions can be utilized to help us put the occupation in perspective: internal colonialism, inequalitarian pluralism, and the state of apartheid. A discussion of these theories are necessary before moving on to the task of describing the characteristics of the occupation. These theories are vital to our discussion because they provide critical insights into group dynamics, and most importantly, dynamics of power.

Group Dynamics in a Multiethnic Society: Assimilation and Pluralism

As a result of the various wars Israel fought against its neighboring Arab states, the war of independence in 1948, the 1956 war, the 1967 war, and the 1973 war; Israel
managed to extend its control beyond the original partitioned Israeli territories stipulated in the partition plan of 1947. Israel added new territories under its control that was seized from the neighboring Arab states of Egypt, Syria, and Jordan. In each of these wars, Israel dealt a devastating blow to its neighboring Arab states and came out victorious in every single war they engaged in. The most devastating blow to the Arabs and the Palestinians was when the West Bank territories, and most importantly, the holy city of Jerusalem fell in the hands of the Israelis.

The Israeli occupation is a unique phenomenon that can be explained through the use of important conceptual properties and assumptions borrowed from the theories of race and ethnic relations dynamics, and in particular the ideas of assimilation and pluralism. A critical assessment of these theories are necessary because these theories help explain the phenomena of the Israeli occupation. The focus will be on two important theories of race and ethnic relations dynamics, which are internal colonialism and inequalitarian pluralism.

Assimilation, Pluralism, and the Theory of Internal Colonialism: Issues of Power and Cultural Integrity

Assimilation and pluralism are two concepts used to describe group dynamics within the context of multiethnic societies. Involved in the understanding of these concepts
is the issue of power, who has the power, how is it distributed in a society, and the consequences of the dynamics of power sharing and monopoly on group dynamics in a multiethnic society.

Assimilation, as understood by Yinger (1981) is a process of boundary reduction that occurs when groups of two or more cultures meet. This process of boundary reduction occurs within all groups whether its voluntary or involuntary. The ultimate goal of assimilation is to create a homogenous society (Marger, 1994; Yinger, 1981). There are four dimensions of assimilation: cultural, structural, biological, and psychological.

Cultural assimilation is sometimes referred to as acculturation, involves the adoption of the cultural tenets of a politically dominant ethnic group. The transmission of ideas are dispersed through language, religion, diet, and the media. Structural assimilation involves the process of increasing the degree of social interaction among different ethnic groups and it occurs at two levels; primary and secondary. Primary structural assimilation (informal) is a process of interaction among members of different ethnic groups on an interpersonal level or within interpersonal networks such as entrances into clubs, neighborhoods, friendship circles, and ultimately marriage. The secondary level refers to the idea of equal access to power and privilege within society's major institutions.
such as the economy, politics, and education. Biological assimilation (amalgamation) represents the ultimate stage in the assimilation process which through intermarriage, members of distinct groups merge. Finally, psychological assimilation deals with the social psychology of ethnic relations, which cultivate the extent to which individuals of an ethnic group have been absorbed into the dominant society while developing a self-identity that falls within the context of a multiethnic society (Marger, 1994; Yinger, 1981).

Assimilation is embodied in the classical thoughts of Emile Durkheim (1858-1917), a French social theorist who was mainly concerned with the issue of stability and order. He set the classical foundation for the structural functional perspective in sociology. According to Durkheim, at the core of every social order there exists what he terms the "conscience collective" which is a set of commonly held values and orientations that guide social actions or norms. It is through the activity of "conscience collective" that separate individuals are socialized, and made fit to participate in the collective life (Hechter, 1975; Ritzer, 1988).

Robert Park (1864-1944), an American sociologist from the Chicago school, was the first to suggest a cycle of race and ethnic relations, which he calls race relations cycle. According to Park, assimilation proceed through a
sequence of stages proceeding until full assimilation is obtained, which is the ultimate goal or final stage. There are four stages in the process of assimilation: contact through migration, followed by competition, from competition emerge various forms of accommodation and finally, total assimilation (Marger, 1994; Park, 1950).

There are major flaws in Park's theory of cyclical assimilation and these flaws are obvious from its applicability and from the assumptions that underlie the stages of cyclical assimilation. First, Park's cyclical theory of assimilation is not a general theory that could be used to explain the experience of all groups but rather, his focus is on a specific group. Park's theory might be used to explain the experiences of European immigrants who voluntarily came to the United States. What is learned from this work is that the dominant groups did not resist European immigrants because they were similar to the dominant group. It is important to understand that assimilation is easiest when the dominant group accepts the other groups, compared to the times when assimilation is forced upon a group to create a homogenous society. It is very difficult to assimilate a racial group if the group is physically distinct from the dominant group. Racial and ethnic groups who have involuntarily came in contact with the dominant group have experienced a system of slavery, a system of colonialism and the occupation (Marger, 1994).
Another criticism of Park's cyclical theory of assimilation is the rational applied to his sequential process of assimilation. Park assumed that the stage of competition is followed by accommodation; and, he failed to recognize how accommodation is reached. Moreover, competition sometimes, if not always, leads to conflict and conflict does not accomplish accommodation nor total assimilation. Park ignores some important dynamics that are crucial in race and ethnic relations such as exclusion, pluralism, and ethnic stratification which seems to represent the most accurate portrayal of race and ethnic relations (ideal versus real) and certainly such dynamics do not lead to assimilation, directly or indirectly (Marger, 1994).

Another limitation deals with the fact that Park assumes that the cycle is lineal and therefore, can not explain unforeseen interruption or the termination of the process at any stage, which reverse the acquisition of assimilation. Another limitation of this theory is that Park ignores the dynamics of the power struggle between the dominant groups and the racial and ethnic groups and most importantly, the consequences of such dynamics on the status of racial and ethnic groups within the context of multiethnic societies (Barth & Noel, 1972; Berry & Tischler, 1978; Marger, 1994). Assimilation as I perceive is an important power dynamic between the dominant group and the racially and ethnically subordinate groups.
Assimilation by choice is the least restrictive and oppressive dynamic unlike forced assimilation. I will turn my attention to the concept of pluralism and particularly inequalitarian pluralism to assess the impact it has had on the theory of internal colonialism and its relevancy in explaining the Israeli occupation.

According to Abramson (1980), pluralism refers to the processes or conditions that produce and sustain ethnic stratification, thus, producing a heterogenous society (Abramson, 1980). Furnivall (1948) presented a theory of pluralism in his work entitled Colonial Policy and Practices: A Comparative Study of Burma and Netherlands India. Furnivall was concerned with the fact that the phenomena of colonialism and imperialism would create what he calls a "plural society." Plural societies are manifested from an interaction between the colonial powers (core nations) and the colonized nations. What plural societies share with colonial power is the imposition of the current political and economic system that is created to benefit the colonial powers which appears to be maintained and cultivated through coercion. Plural societies are characterized by political and economic exploitation and the policies of structural pluralism are enforced by the colonial powers. Colonial nations are characterized by inequalitarian pluralism, a condition that is exploitative and oppressive in nature and orientation (Furnivall, 1948;
Smith, in the early 1960s, offered a generalized application of Furnivall's theory of plural society. Unlike Furnivall, Smith did not exclude non-colonial societies from his analysis. Smith contends that Furnivall's theory can be applied to all societies, colonial or otherwise, that meet, at least, two conditions. According to Smith, a plural society is a society that has incompatible institutions within its context, with the exception of the unifying state system, and a dominant cultural numerical minority in power, but not necessarily a sociological minority but rather a sociological majority (Smith, 1965; Smooha, 1978). It is important to keep in mind that when sociologists apply the concepts minority and majority to groups it has to deal with the group's relationship to society's resources and that is the definition I am using in this study. A sociological minority is a group that has a subordinate status in society and is in continuous struggle to secure its share of society's resources when the resources are not distributed equitably. Generally, a sociological minority is a group that is perceived to be at a disadvantage in reference to status (powerless). On the other hand, a sociological majority is the dominant group in society which tends to monopolize society's resources and power.

Furnivall's theory and Smith's application of
Furnivall’s theory are too simplistic because these theories don’t delve in the question of power but gives a simplistic view of power and ignores the consequences of power dynamics. Furnivall’s theory and Smith’s argument are basically economic theories that look at the relationship between the colonized, and the colonial powers. Smith contradicts himself when he states that Western societies such as the U.S. are not a plural society because what exists in this society is what he calls "functional differentiation." He makes a reference to Dahl’s political pluralism theory in order to defend his argument (Marger, 1994; Smooha, 1978). Functional differentiation and equalitarian pluralism do not concern me, but what is of major concern is the conditions of inequalitarian pluralism.

Inequalitarian pluralism is a condition where racial and ethnic groups are structurally separated and they are not able to participate in society’s political and economic institutions in an equitable manner. Within the context of inequalitarian pluralism, ethnic and racial groups are separated structurally and culturally, and excluded from equal access to power and privileges of the society. The state holds the different groups together through coercion rather than mutually recognized legitimacy (Marger, 1994).

Inequalitarian pluralism tends to be the feature characteristic in an internal colonialist society. Internal
colonialism and classical colonialism share common features despite the differences in which these systems emerge. According to Blauner (1969, 1972), internal colonialism is a type of inequalititarian pluralistic society, similar to the United States, where ethnic relations follow an "assimilation" model and at the same time treat the ethnic groups in a "colonial fashion." Within the context of internal colonialism, the dominant and the subordinate groups may be indigenous with the dominant groups being the numerical majority (sociological majority), and on the other hand, the classical or traditional colonialism, practiced by the European powers in the 17th, 18th, 19th centuries, a conquering group, being a numerical minority, but not necessary a sociological minority. They establish political and economic domination over the majority indigenous group. The presumption of conquering and acquisition are the conditions that create the traditional or the classical forms of colonialism that most of the third world nations had to experience in the 17th, 18th, and 19th centuries (Blauner, 1969, 1972). Blauner refers to traditional or classical colonialism as the "colonization complex" and according to him, this complex has the following four components: (1) colonization starts with forced and involuntary entry, (2) the colonizing power alters or, destroys the existing indigenous cultures, (3) the colonized group is governed by representatives of the
dominant groups and finally, (4) systems of domination—subordinations are maintained through the use of an oppressive racist ideology (Blauner, 1969, p. 396).

To summarize, both internal and classical or traditional colonialism are oppressive systems of domination where subordinate groups are separated culturally and structurally from the dominant group and at the same time there exists a political and economic structure designed to benefit the dominant group and leave the subordinate group at a political and economic disadvantage. The next step is to apply principles borrowed from internal, and classical, or traditional perspectives of colonialism to the situation in the state of Israel. It is important to keep in mind that I am more interested in ethnic relations within the context of the Israeli occupation of the West Bank and the Gaza Strip (Jews-Palestinian dynamics).

Characteristics of the Israeli Occupation: Colonialism, Internal Colonialism, and Neo-colonialism

This section will focus on the following themes: the elements of classical/traditional colonialism and internal colonialism embodied in the Israeli occupation, and provide evidence of such elements by using old and existing Israeli policies in the occupied territories that are colonialist and oppressive in nature and orientation. In applying Blauner's "colonization complex," we find that the Israeli
occupation as a phenomenon shares similarities with Blauner's model. The components or elements of this model are: forced involuntary entry, alteration and destruction of the existing indigenous culture, colonialization occurs as an appointed representative from the dominant group, and finally, the use of an ideology to legitimize, defend, and sustain the dominant-subordinate dynamics (Blauner, 1969, 1972).

Smooha (1978), in his work entitled *Israel: Pluralism and conflict*, applied the principles of the colonization complex to the case of the Israeli occupation. Smooha (1978) contends that the state of Israel possess characteristics of the colonization complex, with neocolonialist ideals and practices which are embodied in its system of internal colonialism that is characterized by inequitarian pluralism. The colonial view of Israel contains the following themes: Zionism is a colonial movement, Israel is a neocolonial state, and Israeli society is an oppressive system (Smooha, 1978).

The theme of Zionism being a colonial movement is centered on the belief that Zionism is basically an ideology of a "white settler's" movement that is aimed at displacing the natives, who happen to be of non-European origin, and colonizing the territory. Following the European chauvanism ideal, Zionism perceived all territory as "empty" and available if the indigenous population had
not yet achieved national independence as a recognized statehood, which at times was valid, since Palestine was still under the control of the old colonial power of the United Kingdom. Zionism carried on the ideals and practices of the old European settlers which were considered racist, ethnocentric and supremacist in nature and orientation. The Zionist movement operated on the belief that they were bringing modernization to backward and uncivilized natives. A final theme embodied in the colonial nature of Zionism was to deal with the status of Jews as a group, and their presence and status in Europe. Jews were considered a religious ethnic group who never had a country of their own. They were frequent visitors and settlers in eastern and western Europe and the world. For the Jews, Europe served as a mother continent and they were dispersed throughout Europe. Therefore, their efforts to colonize overseas was mainly supported by the majority of European governments, thanks to the zealous efforts of the Zionist movement and its supporters (Smooha, 1978).

This was the beginning of the colonialist nation and the occupation followed. I will now focus on the neo-colonial features of the state of Israel and the occupation. Neo-colonialism literally means a new form of colonialism. I will review the historical development of the experience of colonialism before embarking on the discussion of the neo-colonialistic nature of the state of
Israel, and the occupation.

Colonialism is a concept that describes the experience of most of the third World nations prior to gaining sovereignty and independence. This experience deals with the form of interaction between Western and non-Western societies, and it can be traced back to about 1500 A.D. when Western European nations, i.e., France, Great Britain, Spain, and Portugal first established colonies in Africa and Asian nations. This experience is divided into three stages: (1) (1500-1800) age of colonialism where the colonial power imposed systems of slavery on the non-Western world, (2) (1800-1947) age of imperialism, and finally, (3) the post independence era (1947 to present) which is sometimes referred to as the neocolonialism or neo-imperialism age (Wallerstein, 1974, 1979).

Historians of colonialism emphasized in their writings a perception that the political, social, and economic systems of the non-western world was stagnant and underdeveloped, while the western world was advancing in their economic, political, and social structures. The contributions of the agricultural revolution of the 12th century and the scientific and industrial revolution brought about rapid advancement in the level of technology. This perception was emphasized by early modernization theorists of the 1950s and early 1960s (Wallerstein, 1974, 1979).

During the age of exploration, western European
nations sought out colonies in the non-western world in order to secure raw materials, cheap labor, and markets for their products. It was during this stage that the western European capitalistic system was advancing and needed new investment opportunities abroad. Most non-western nations had gained independence and sovereignty from the old colonial rulers. These nations had to contend with the new form of colonialism or imperialism which is a form of socioeconomic domination which does not rely on direct political control. After WWII, the old colonialist system of domination had finally collapsed and a new source of imperial systems of influence emerged: the multinational corporations, which represents the increasing concentration of capital and the integration of production on a world scale. Furthermore, corporations did increase their economic grip on the raw materials and the labor power market in the non-western world (Wallerstein, 1974, 1979). Now, let us move our attention to the issue of the neocolonialist nature of the state of Israel and the occupation.

The Zionist movement in its quest to construct an exclusively Jewish community managed to politically dominate the natives, usurp the territories, and displace them. The newly created state excluded the Palestinians on the grounds of ethnicity, and it was determined to follow the model of its predecessors, the British colonial regime. The state of Israel is tied by an "umbilical cord" to the
capitalist world, just like any other ex-colonial developing countries, which is obvious from its dependency on military, political, and economic assistance in order for the state to survive. The capitalist world is constantly rewarding the state of Israel for its supportive foreign policy of the capitalist world's interest through the use of massive economic assistance. The dependency relationship is reflected in the interaction between the state of Israel and the United States which is considered to be its biggest supporter. Internally, the state of Israel must maintain a capitalist economy and a facade of democracy in order to keep its supporters happy and to keep the economic and military support pouring in (Chomsky, 1983; Mansour, 1994; Smooha, 1978).

It is important to differentiate between Israeli practices within the context of the state of Israel and the occupied territories (East Jerusalem, the West Bank, and Gaza Strip). Internal colonialism is practiced in the state of Israel which reflects policies of prejudice and discrimination that target non-European Jews, i.e., African and Oriental Jews, Israeli Arabs, and the Arabs who live in cities like Haifa, Tel Aviv, and West Jerusalem. These Jews of non-European background and Israeli Arabs make up a small percentage of the population which makes them both a numerical minority and a sociological minority. International colonialism as depicted by Hechter (1975) is a
condition in which a dominant ethnic group in the industrialized core of a nation subjugates an industrially backward ethnic group in the nation's periphery. Zureik and others contend that the Arab minority that reside in the state of Israel have been rejecting the label of Israeli Arabs since 1967, because they perceive themselves as Palestinians, and they sympathize and support their brothers and sisters in the occupied territories (Khalid, 1992; Smooha, 1979, 1984; Zureik, 1978, 1988, 1990).

The Palestinians living in the occupied territories contend with a classical form of colonialism that is reflected in the Israeli policies. These policies include political domination, cultural and economic subordination, exploitation, and the complete usurpation of Palestinian land for the sole purpose of forming and constructing Jewish communities and settlements in the occupied territories. These actions are perceived by the state of Israel as a form of security since the state is surrounded by hostile Arabs and Palestinians (refer to Appendixes H to N for a listing of these settlements). According to Khalidi (1992), the following development occurred in the occupied territories between the period of 1948-1992 which reflects the Israeli colonialist ideals and practices:

1. East Jerusalem has been formally annexed to Israel with expanded municipal boundaries at the expense of the West Bank;
2. 140,000 Israelis now live in East Jerusalem;
3. 150 Israeli settlements have been established in the West Bank and Gaza Strip, with a total population of 100,000 Jews outside East Jerusalem;
4. 55 percent of the land of the West Bank and 42 percent of those of the Gaza Strip have been alienated from Palestinian ownership;
5. Palestinian buildings are barred on 68 percent of the West Bank; and
6. All the water resources of the occupied territories are under Israeli control - the bulk being diverted to meet the needs of Israel or of Israeli settlers in the occupied territories. (Khalidi, 1992, p. 7)

(Refer to Appendix E for a detailed analysis of land distribution, Appendices F and G for population makeup of the territories, and Appendices H to N for settlements in the West Bank).

The next chapter will document the terroristic nature and orientation of the Israeli colonialist policies and practices in the occupied territories. These issues and concerns were brought about by the Palestinian uprising of 1987 and this is why such mass movement is important to the study.
CHAPTER III


"Situations that are defined as real are real in their consequences." W. I. Thomas (1863-1947)

An accident occurred in Gaza strip on November 8, 1987 involving an Israeli truck driver who allegedly swung his vehicle directly into the path of a van loaded with Palestinians returning home from work in Israel. Four people were killed. This was the precipitating event. The following day, demonstrations erupted in the refugee camps of the Gaza strip and quickly spread throughout all the territories (Hiltermann, 1991). The uprising involved the popular masses including the old, the young, the children, and women. Samih K. Farsoun and Jean M. Lands characterize the uprising (Intifada) as follows:

the Intifada represents their sustained mass-based popular revolt. The duration, scope, innovative tactics, and the accomplishments of the Intifada make it a historic movement organizing in Palestinian political unity around a clear and simple objective: ending the occupation and paving the way for self-determination (cited in Nassar & Hencoci, 1990, p. 9).

The Palestinian uprising involved non-violent activities of resistance such as peaceful demonstrations, refusal to pay taxes, boycott of Israeli products and...
goods, and the creation of various political, economic, and social organizations for the sole purpose of helping the Palestinians come to terms with their total dependency on the state of Israel. The uprising created the needed forum for Palestinians to be heard and recognized as independent citizens. Israel reacted violently to the tactics by using measures which included indiscriminate shooting into the crowds with plastic and real bullets, seige, house demolition, and mass arrest and punishment. These tactics prompted various human rights agencies like Amnesty International, and Al-Haq, Law in the Service of Man, a West Bank affiliate of the International Commission of Jurists, to interfere on behalf of the Palestinians and investigate the Israeli's actions in the occupied territories. Both agencies published periodic reports in the hope that exposing Israeli atrocities would force the government, under international pressure, to curtail its activities (Al-Haq/Law, 1988). (Refer to Appendices X, O for a compiled database report on human rights violations in the occupied territories of the West Bank and Gaza Strip).

The Palestinian uprising brought to the world "stage" the question of political occupation, and Palestinian human rights, particularly, the basic rights of self determination. The Israeli's use of oppressive measures and tactics constitutes a form of state terrorism, particularly, the
Israeli measures of reprisal and the "iron fist" policies. These forms of state terrorism are highly organized and public despite efforts of the Israeli government to censor the media (i.e., the closing of newspaper offices in the West Bank and Gaza Strip, and the periodic confiscation of films and videos from television network personnel working in Jerusalem such as ABC, NBC, and CNN). The Israeli policies of settlement and replacement in the occupied territories constituted a form of state terrorism because it is in direct opposition to, and is a violation of established international laws regarding citizenship and sovereignty. Since the nature of Israeli colonialist policies has been asserted, the next step is to discuss the conceptual problems associated with the concept of state terrorism and criminality. Then, I will provide a workable definition of the concept of state terrorism and criminality, then build the case for the Israeli colonialist practices and policies in the occupied territories as being a distinct form of state terrorism and criminality.

State Terrorism-Criminality: Definitions and Conceptual Problems

State terrorism as criminal activity is an undesirable topic to discuss. When the subject is approached, the position of a "cautious rebel" is taken by scholars who wish not to rock the boat and many refuse to discuss the
issues in academic circles (Findley, 1984; Herman & Chomsky, 1988; Herman & O'Sullivan, 1989). International relations experts and experts on terrorism focus on international terrorism as the despicable activities of deranged individuals and groups, and state-sponsored terrorism as an activity of undemocratic states such as the former Soviet Union, Libya, Iran, and Iraq, to name a few. When the experts discuss or investigate the phenomenon of state terrorism, they tend to focus on regimes and states that are distinctly different from the West, both economically and politically. Their studies focused on Hitler's activity in Germany, Stalin's in Russia, and Mussolini's in Italy. These experts were eager to analyze the phenomena, but shied away from the study of state terrorism in their home country (Liazos, 1972). For example, Brian Jenkins (1975, 1987), the Rand Corporation's top authority on terrorism, writes extensively on the issue of terrorism, but at the same time refuses to examine the issue of state terrorism. As a result, he has been criticized by other scholars for dancing around the issue of state terrorism, and for being selective and exclusionary in his analysis of the existing data on state terrorism (Herman & Chomsky, 1988; Herman & O'Sullivan, 1989).

Barak (1991) criticized criminologists for being obsessed with what he calls "traditional crimes," crimes that target property and person. Mainstream criminologists
and sociologists of deviance and social control focus on the process of victimology and the consequences of such processes on society and individuals (Barak, 1990, 1991). American sociologists of deviance and social control were courageous enough to investigate elite deviance and had found themselves overwhelmed with the extent of such deviance in the United States, particularly, white collar crime or crimes of the capitalist class (Eitzen & Bacazinn, 1994). American sociologists have not spent much time or effort on the task of investigating state terrorism, nor have they attempted to present an operationalized definition of state terrorism. The American sociologists who perceived themselves to be "watch dogs" made it their duty and moral obligation to expose the crimes of the capitalist class, and to expose the financial burden that these crimes caused to the average American citizen. This viewpoint is perceived in academic circles to be radical-critical sociology and criminology, but it did not go far enough (Quinney, 1977; Simon & Eitzer, 1993; Turk, 1982).

According to Duvall and Stohl (1988) the problem in the conceptualization of state terrorism is linked to an understanding of the state and the institutional-legal foundation of the government which gives the state the legitimacy for its terroristic actions, directly and indirectly. They base their arguments on Weber's conception of the state, particularly the legitimate use of
violence and force which are considered traditional rights of the state. Weber defines state as follows: a human community, which, within a given territory, territory is one of its characteristics, claims for itself successfully the legitimate monopoly of physical violence (Weber, 1904-1905/1958).

Another problem concerning the conceptualization of the concept state terrorism deals with the emotional nature of the concept of terrorism. It invokes highly charged responses from the masses, whether they are directly or indirectly effected by terrorism. A known fact about terrorism is that acts of terrorism are only carried out against the state by means of revolutionary groups as a component of political violence. These acts of terrorism make it difficult to accept the fact that a legitimate state, such as, the United States or illegitimate colonialist states such as the State of Israel, can engage in terrorism because states engage only in terrorism activities in defense of its citizens (Duvall & Stahl, 1988).

To summarize, Duvall and Stohl recognize and acknowledge the problems associated with the process of creating an operationalized definition of state terrorism. This task can be accomplished if scholars move beyond the myths and misconceptions regarding contemporary terrorism in general, and state terrorism, in particular.

This study will utilize the following operationalized
definitions to state terrorism. State terrorism refers to the activities of the state and its social control apparatus that are designed to induce fear in order to achieve a means to an end. The state's goal is not intending to inflict physical harm to a specific group but rather its aim is to alter the target's behavior or characteristics by inducing fear. State Terrorism has the following characteristics: the activities are intended, purposive, and covert in nature and orientation. The targeted population shares specific characteristics that make them more susceptible to the activities of the state, for example, they are socially, politically, and economically marginal groups who are more likely to be selected as a target population because of their status of powerlessness (Duvall & Stahl, 1988; Thornton, 1964).

Furthermore, state terrorism deals with the activities of oppression and repression that are aimed at controlling the behavior of the targeted population. Policies of oppression and repression tend to be in direct violation of basic human rights (Barak, 1990, 1991).

Barak (1990) offers a definition of state criminality that he applies to the conduct of the United States government and its various apparatus of social control including the media. According to Barak (1990), democratic and undemocratic regimes have engaged in state criminality. The issue is not whether the regime is democratic or not,
but it is an issue of power, and most importantly, power dynamics and the consequences of the dynamics. Barak's analysis focus on the issue of what constitutes a crime? and why? In answering these questions, he focuses on a definition of crime as understood within the context of western laws, in particular the United States' system of law, which does not apply to this study because Barak uses specific body of laws that is not part of the Israeli legislative body of laws. The definition of state criminality and the violation of human rights are relevant for this study. "To confront state criminality as a legitimate enemy of civil society is to join the struggle for universal human rights and social justice" (Barak, 1990, p. 25).

To summarize, state terrorism includes activities of the state that targets certain segments of the population and are aimed at altering and controlling their behavior. These activities may be covert, and include campaigns of disinformation, and they tend to be oppressive in nature and orientation. Forms of oppression, repression, domination and exploitation carried out by the state and its social control apparatus are forms of state terrorism. These forms of state terrorism have one common theme and that is that these activities lead directly and indirectly, to the violation of basic human rights of the targeted population. Another theme these activities share has to do
with the issue of state power, the limits of legitimate state power and the illegitimate use and abuse of state power. Since the definition of state terrorism has been established, I will apply the definitions to the case of the Arab-Israeli-Palestinian conflict, and in particular, the Israeli occupation of the West Bank and Gaza Strip. The question of legitimacy of the occupation which sparked the Palestinian uprising in 1987 will be raised. This section will discuss the colonialist policies of the Israeli government in the occupied territories. The policies include political domination, economic exploitation, subjugation, and repressive and reprisal techniques. These techniques were aimed at silencing, controlling and intimidating the Palestinians to submit. Silencing, controlling, and intimidating the Palestinians was perceived by the state as a necessary mean to establishing peace and maintaining the Palestinian resistance activities which were perceived by the Israeli government a threat to the security of the state, as well as a threat to the legitimacy of the occupation. It is important to question the legitimacy of the occupation because it is linked with the controversial existence of the state of Israel. Establishing a state through the use of colonialist policies and practices of conquering and involuntary entry raises inherent questions regarding its legitimacy. To continue to violate the basic human rights of the indigenous
population—the Palestinians—is criminal. This is a critical dilemma that haunts most, if not all, Israelis for which one day they will have to resolve and come to terms with (Ruether & Ellis, 1990).

The Palestinian Uprising: The Legitimacy of the Occupation

It is important to know that the Palestinians in the occupied territories had been questioning the legitimacy of and resisting the occupation since 1967, and challenged the right of the state of Israel to create its state in mandate Palestine (West Bank, Gaza Strip, and East Bank-Jordan). The uprising itself brought the issues to the public and forced the world to question what Israel was and is doing in the occupied territories. The Israeli's also had to address the Palestinian question of self-determination which has been ignored for a long time (Hunter, 1991; Lockman & Beinin, 1989; Rigby, 1991).

The uprising was a struggle between Palestinians and Israeli soldiers. The Israeli government wanted to quell the uprising by enforcing old policies and developing new policies of repression (Lockman & Beinin, 1989). The policies were designed to curtail the uprising as well as humiliate and remind the Palestinians that they were doomed to less than human status. Various human rights agencies monitor the Israeli's repressive and oppressive policies in
the occupied territories. These agencies were considered
alternative sources of information, since the Western media
were influenced, directly and indirectly, by the Jewish
lobbyist groups who were protecting the image of the state
of Israel by using methods of censorship and a campaign of
misinformation (Findley, 1989). The alternative sources of
information included the following: al-Haq Law, in the
service of Man, a group of Palestinian lawyers; the West
Bank Data project, founded by the Ford Foundation and
directed by Meron Benvenisti; the Alternative Information
Center for Jerusalem; and the Raymond Twil's Palestinian
press service (Lockman & Beinin, 1989). These agencies
published annual reports highlighting Israeli violation of
human rights in the occupied territories. For instance,
the Data Base Project on Palestinian Human Rights published
a special report in 1988 entitled, The Cost of Freedom:
Palestinian Human Rights Under Israeli Occupation and in
1989 another report that was edited by Bassiouni and
Cainkar entitled, The Palestinian Intifada - December 9,
These and other reports exposed the state of Israel co-
lonialist policies of oppression and repression in the
occupied territories. The next step is to provide a
critical assessment of the policies, emphasizing how such
a blatant violation of human rights is terrorist in nature
and orientation.
It was stated earlier that the Israeli colonialist policies were aimed at usurping Palestinian land and completely dominate and control every aspect of Palestinian life (economic, political, and cultural). In order to survive, the Palestinians had to become economically dependent on the state of Israel. It was during the uprising that the Palestinians took it upon themselves to break away from the oppressive dynamics of dependency and created grassroots economic organization that fostered Palestinian independence. To accomplish this goal, the Palestinians boycotted Israeli products, refused to pay taxes to the government (tax revolt in the West Bank town of Beit Sahour and others), and created grassroots organizations that addressed the economic and social needs of the Palestinians. These organizations were mostly created and run by Palestinian women (Aronson, 1990; Freedman, 1991; Rigby, 1991).

The Palestinian Land and Israeli Settlements: Whose Land Is It Anyway?

In a collection of work edited by Ellis and Ruether (1990) entitled, *Beyond Occupation: American Jewish, Christian and Palestinian Voices for Peace*. Jewish scholars such as Ellis and Ruether contend that Zionist colonialist movements envisioned the possibility of creating a homeland in other regions of the world. For
instance, Africa was considered as an option, especially during the time that the European colonists were dividing the region among themselves (first and second stage of colonialism). Zionist groups, basically Eastern Europeans, were guided by the vision of building a Jewish homeland and nation state. Jewish settlers came to Palestine as early as the 1880s (Ellis & Ruether, 1990). This was the position taken by a small minority of European Jews after WWII. It was the shock of the Holocaust during WWII that the Zionism movement turned its attention to establishing a homeland in Palestine. However, not all of them immigrated to Palestine. According to Ellis and Ruether, four-fifths of the world Jewry continued to live in North America, and the Soviet Jews preferred to migrate to the United States (Ellis & Ruether, 1990).

The Zionist movement with the help of the Jewish fund and other organizations directly supported the operation of purchasing and disposing of Palestinian land in order to expand its presence in the territory, thus, becoming a dominant majority, both numerical and sociological. Additionally, this was accomplished through the armed conflict the state engaged in against the neighboring Arab state which resulted in the accumulation of territories seized from the Arab states under its control. These armed conflicts created a Palestinian refugee problem in the Arab states of Jordan, Lebanon, Syria, and Egypt. The state of
Israel was then able to destroy and depopulate 418 Palestinian villages during the 1948 war (Khalidi, 1992). In 1967, with the occupation of most of the territory being complete, the Israeli policy of land usurpation took on a new form including the following techniques: Palestinian expulsion, Jewish settlement, and the exportation of land and water resources of the region (Khalidi, 1992). As of 1990, the Palestinian population in the occupied territories are about a million and a half, excluding the Palestinian refugees and their descendants who were expelled during the Arab-Israeli wars of 1948, 1956, 1967, and 1973 (Ellis & Ruether, 1990).

Uri Davis (1992) in his work entitled, *Israel an Apartheid State*, summarizes Israeli colonialism policies in the occupied territories, the laws, and the regulations that allowed Israel to create settlements in the territories. These laws were enacted, in addition to the existing laws that were passed during the late 1940s. This gave the Zionist movement the complete power to proceed in its goal of colonizing Palestine. The regulations of colonialism included the following: emergency defence regulations, security zones emergency regulations, the law of requisitioning of property in times of emergency, and the cultivation of wasteland ordinance, all passed in 1949 (Davis, 1987, p. 57). In addition to the above regulations, the state of Israel passed the following laws in
order to help the state of Israel in its goal of acquiring more territories from the Palestinians, and settling more Jews in the territories.

1. 1950 - Law of Return; Absentee property law; Development authority law.
2. 1952 - World Zionist Organization - Jewish Agency Status law,
3. 1953 - Keren Kayemath Leisrael (Jewish National Fund) Law; Land Acquisition (validation of Acts and compensation) law,
4. 1954 - Covenant between the government of Israel and the Zionist Executive, also known as the Executive of the Jewish Agency for the Land of Israel,
5. 1958 - Prescription Law,
7. 1961 - Covenant Between the government of Israel and the Jewish National Fund.
9. Lands (allocation of rights to foreigners) Law. (Davis, 1987, p. 57)

The Israeli government colonist policies created a complete hegemonic domination over the territories as reflected in its progress in the area of land usurpation, depopulation and Israeli settlement. In assessing Israeli colonist policies in Palestine, Khalidi (1992) contends that Israel has complete control over 55% of the land in the West Bank and 42% of the land in the Gaza Strip. He also contends that the colonialist policies of the state of Israel is centered on an important ideal that is to push the Palestinians out from the territories, and send them to other neighboring Arab states because they were Arab, and let the Jews own the land and live in the territory
The next step is to address the Israeli colonialist policies in the territories, and the administrative policies of social control. I contend that the administration policies are terroristic in nature and orientation because they are in violation of basic human rights.

**Israeli Administrative Policies in the Territories: State of Apartheid**

The state of Israel enacted emergency regulation laws that gave the power to control the natives in the territories. Some of these laws were already in existence and they established new ones. The state kept old rules and regulations used by its colonialist predecessor--United Kingdom. The Israeli colonialist policies are characterized by a strong Zionist zeal and an ideology of ethnic apartheid that divides the population in terms of Jews versus non-Jews. The term apartheid is used to refer to the official policy of racial segregation of the government of the Republic of South Africa which used blatant and open discriminatory practices favoring the white European minority over the non-white majority (Plano and Olton, 1982). Apartheid is a sophisticated system of racial segregation that encompasses the social, economic, political, military, and cultural structures of a society. When a minority race dominates a majority race, then such a society exhibits a
structure of apartheid (Kohler, 1978). This concept of apartheid can be expanded to include ethnic apartheid which is the case in the Arab-Israeli-Palestinian conflict, particularly, dynamics of ethnic struggle between Jews and non-Jews.

The state of Israel has a dual system of laws: civilian and military, and both sets of laws are based on old colonialist regulations that were in operation during the Ottoman rule over Palestine, and the British mandate systems, which ended in 1948. Civilian and military courts operate independently. Therefore, depending on the offense, a person could be tried in either the civilian or the military court once it took over the West Bank and Gaza Strip. The Israeli government established a system of military administrative agencies and gave the agencies complete control over Palestinian living in the territories, including land use, distribution of water, construction of new buildings, investment and employment, freedom of movement, organization, expression, and assembly, once it took over the West Bank and Gaza Strip. The area commander took charge of the military government and staffed it with army personnel. In 1981, the Israeli government established the civilian administrative system in the West Bank and gave it secondary legislative and administrative functions. The area commander, and the Israeli Defense Force had the final say in legislating power and decision.
making, which allowed the agency to have complete control over the legal and administrative affairs of the territories (Samara, Shelley, & Cashdon, 1989).

A dangerous aspect of this centralized legal and administrative power of the military government and the Israeli Defense Force is reflected in the use of the power when applying the label criminal, and the type of punishment used to protect the interest and security of the state of Israel. The military forces were interested in maintaining the existing oppressive system--the occupation--and any perceived or real threats were dealt with appropriately (Samara, Shelley, & Cashdon, 1989).

The Emergency Defense Regulation of 1945 introduced to the territories by the British mandate authorities best exemplify Israeli colonialist policies in the territories. These policies were aimed at building a strong system of internal repression which makes the regulations terroristic in nature and orientation. These regulations are carried out by the military government and its supportive apparatus of social control. Articles of the Emergency Defense Regulation of 1945 address the following issues: detention, deportation, taking possession of land, forfeiture and demolition of property, closed areas, etc. The Palestinians endured a great deal of hardship under these emergency regulations and their suffering intensified during the Palestinian uprising of 1987 (Intifada) that is
reflected in the human cost paid by the Palestinians which increased dramatically during the period. The Israeli government, through the indiscriminate use of such regulation, was focused on one goal, to silence the Palestinian resistance movement in the territories at any cost. The government was convinced that by silencing the resistance movement, they could regain complete control over the territories that they felt they were about to lose (Iron Fist policies) (Davis, 1987). (Refer to Appendix 0 for a detailed report of the consequences and effects of Israeli policies in the occupied territories).

The indiscriminate use and abuse of power by the military government and the Israeli Defense Force prompted human rights agencies to speak out against Israeli colonialist policies and practices in the territories that were perceived as repressive, oppressive, and therefore, terrorist in nature and orientation. The Peace Now movement, a non-profit organization aimed at bridging the gap between the Palestinian and the Jews, took it upon themselves to challenge the occupation, and question the "democratic" image of the state of Israel. Their purpose was to assess the "benign" nature of the occupation and challenge the Israeli government to consider turning over the territories to the Palestinians as a peace option. The Peace Now movement perceived this option as a possible solution to the Palestinian dilemma, aimed at restoring peace to the
state of Israel. The Peace Now movement and other Jewish leaders, have compared such policies to the Nazi measures of occupation and colonization that they had endured during the regime of Hitler's Nazi Germany. Furthermore, there is a sharp similarity between policies of Hitler's Nazi Germany and the Israeli Palestinian occupied territories. To them, these policies were inconceivable and reprehensible which lead them to question their Jewish identity (Davis, 1987). A report compiled and published by Al-Haq, Law in the Service of Man, the West Bank Affiliate of the International Commission of Jurists, entitled Punishing a Nation: Human Rights Violations During the Palestinian Uprising (December 1987-1988), is one of the many reports that provided a detailed documentation of Israeli colonialist policies in the occupied territories.

The Israeli colonialist policies and ethnic apartheid reflects the worst examples of power abuse and policy misuse. The Palestinians are victims of the terroristic policies of the state of Israel who have created a myth of a "democratic" society which is a facade. The cycle of violence (spiral of violence) has elements of the following dynamics: injustice-oppression, revolt-resistance, and repression (Brown, 1982) (refer to Appendix R for a complete analysis of the spiral of violence). These dynamics of social control are abnormal and terroristic techniques that blurs the perception of what is legitimate. The state
of Israel gave themselves the complete power to create colonialist policies in an effort to defend their security and legitimate their right to exist in Palestine, regardless of the human cost. In the eyes of human rights advocates, the Israeli colonialist policies are terroristic in nature. The state took the biblical promise and the Zionist ideals and created a Jewish state in Palestine and sacrificed the Palestinians.

The next chapter will set the sociological framework for the study. The labeling tradition and the critical school of deviance and social control will shed light on the complex dynamics involved in the creation of appropriate definitions and images of deviance. Finally, the world system approach of Wallerstein will provide additional clarity to the process of power as it operates both in the national and global arena.
CHAPTER IV

THE CONSTRUCTIONIST PARADIGM: STATE TERRORISM, SOCIAL CONSTRUCTIONISM AND THE QUESTION OF POWER

Sociological theories of deviance and social control contributed important perspectives that help explain the complex reality of deviance and social control. These theoretical traditions are unique in terms of focus, relevancy, unit of analysis and their problem-solution orientation. The social constructionist paradigm sets the theoretical foundation for this study, particularly the labeling and the critical school. I will give a brief description of the constructionist paradigm, focus on the questions it asks, and the theoretical images and traditions of deviance and social control it portrays.

Conrad and Schneider (1980) called the constructionist paradigm the "Interactionist orientation." They give the following assumptions of the "interactionist orientation."

1. Deviance is universal, but there are no universal forms of deviance. It is therefore implied that no behavior is inherently deviant and deviance is relative. That is, different societies define different activities as deviant.

2. Deviance is a social definition, intentionally defined by "significant actors" in the society or social
groups. Kai Erickson (1966) perceived deviance not to be a property "inherent" in any particular behavior, but rather a property "conferred upon" a behavior by the people who come into direct or indirect contact with it (Erickson, 1966).

3. Social groups are the actors, creators, and reactors to deviance which is brought on by the process of judgments and sanctions. The rules are created and enforced by the dominant groups (Becker, 1963).

4. Deviance is contextual. Whatever is perceived as deviant varies by social context (i.e., subculture, time, and place).

5. Deviance is political, and the process of defining and sanctioning deviance is centered on the question of power (Conrad & Schneider, 1980).

To summarize this orientation, no behavior is inherently deviant. Deviance is a subjective definition and deviance is political. This paradigm asks the following questions: Where do the labels of deviance come from? How/why are labels or definitions applied to specific individuals, and applied by whom? and, What are the consequences of the labeling process on the individual and society?
Becker's Labeling Theory

The labeling tradition is centered on the issue of historical development and the discovery of deviant categories. Pfohl summarizes Becker's (1964, 1973) labeling premises:

Becker's concerns with the labeling process are pitched at two levels: (1) the concrete interaction between the labelers and potential targets for labeling, and (2) the historical construction of labels themselves (Pfohl, 1985, 1994, p. 289).

Becker (1963) published a study that critically analyzed the political, historical, economic, and social origins of the Marijuana Stamp Act of 1937 that made smoking pot illegal. J. L. Simmons (1969) used Becker's concept of career deviance in order to develop his sequential model of deviance. The model perceives deviance as developing from the sequential stages of recruitment, role imprisonment, and deviant subcultures. Despite the existence of a wide range of choices in each and every stage, Simmons contends that the potential deviant is not a free choice, but rather, decisions that are influenced by outside structural and personal factors (Simmons, 1969).

The Critical Tradition: The Question of Power

Pfohl (1985) summarizes the theoretical concerns of the critical perspective as follows:
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The critical perspective combines theoretical concern with deviance and social control as interrelated aspects of the human struggle for power and history with a particular concern for the realization for social justice. It examines the relationship between power, social control, and actions which resist control. It is concerned with the way in which social control affects the human rights, dignity, and material well-being of all people. Does it do so justly and with respect for the interests of each person, or does it favor the interest of some over the others? (p. 333).

The theoretical image of deviance, is centered on the concept of power. Critical theorists are concerned with deviance and social control systems with an emphasis on social justice. The critical perspective theorists disagree with the labeling theorists who tend to emphasize micro dynamics and the concept of the label without recognizing the depoliticization effect (Pfohl, 1984, 1985).

C. Wright Mills (1956), in his work entitled The Power Elite set the foundation for an elite model of power which established the conceptual basis for the critical perspective. Mills argues that the United States is dominated by a small, informal, and highly powerful group of people who hold prominent positions in the government, large corporations, and the military (Mills, 1956). Mills addresses the question of power, and he details where the power is concentrated and the consequences of the arrangements on the direction and tone of the decision-making processes and social dynamics. Figure 1 is a diagram that describes and explains Mills' power perspective, which according to
Eitzen and Bacaizinn (1988), is referred to as the "military-industrial complex."

![Diagram of the Military-Industrial Complex](image)

**Figure 1. Military-Industrial Complex.**


G. William Domhoff, in his work entitled *Who Rules America Now: A View for the 80s* (1983), presented another variation of the power elite which he calls the "governing class" theory. The governing class is made up of a small percentage of the population (who own a disproportionate amount of the country's wealth). The members of the governing class do influence institutions and key decision making groups of the country (i.e., the executive branch, Congress, mass media, major corporations, and important councils for domestic and foreign affairs). An example of the governing elites would be wealthy families such as the Rockefellers, Carnegies, and the Duponts.

Pluralism conflict theorists developed a different model of power that puts the power in the hands of a different segment of the society. The pluralistic conflict
theorists perceive deviance as an ongoing struggle and competition between the various social, religious, political, ethnic, and economic sectors and the assumption is that conflicts are "natural" since society is in flux.

The Marxist tradition is another important theoretical tradition in the critical perspective. A Dutch criminologist, Willem Bonger (1916) adopted Marxist principles and applied it to his understanding of crime. Bonger was critical of the capitalist political economy and its influences on crime. His theory of crime is based on the following premises:

1. Crime is linked to the principle of "egoism" which is an attitude promoted and reinforced by the capitalist political/economic system.

2. Crime is caused by conditions imposed on the lower classes following the emergence of the capitalist industrial system which is exploitative in nature (Bonger, 1916). Bonger's theory of crime addresses a behavioral question and he relates the causes to the development of a capitalist system.

It was the work of three British sociologists--Taylor, Walton, and Young--entitled The New Criminology (1973) that set the foundation for the "new criminology" movement which is the dominant approach of the critical perspective. The new criminology movement is a critical theory that borrows heavily from existing theoretical traditions. These
theorists criticized the existing work of criminology for its ideological and political biases and implications. Theorists of the new criminology movement have two purposes: (1) To expose systems of oppression in the criminal justice system, and (2) to provide plan to fix these systems of oppression. Mainstream critical criminologists/sociologists focus on the grim realities of oppression and how people, in general, attempt to come to terms with reality. Criminologists/sociologists tend to get lost in the grand scheme of their theoretical analyses and they need a "wake-up" call from the theorists of the new criminology movement (Taylor, Walton, & Jock, 1973).

The new criminology movement switched the focus from deviant individual to deviant powerful elites. Robert F. Meier (1973) outlined the major principles of the movement which is guided by the following assumptions:

(a) Society is dominated by a ruling elite; (b) the interests of the ruling class are formulated into criminal laws; (c) the police power of the state protects the vested interests of the elite; (d) criminal sanctions are disproportionately applied against lower-class persons; (f) crime is fundamentally the result of class conflict between those who wield power and the powerless (Traub & Little, 1985, pp. 396-397).

The new criminology movement guided by the Marxist principles embraced important issues neglected by the old and mainstream criminologists such as white collar crime, state crime, and the political economy of gender. The new criminology has the following focal points:
(a) It seeks to demystify the criminal justice system, particularly in the area of creating and applying criminal laws; (b) it seeks to scrutinize actions of people and groups in power such as social control agencies, government bureaucracy, and the media; (c) it seeks to create new definitions of crime that will address the political and ideological motives of the powerful elite; (d) it calls for creating new criminological theories that have a praxis aspect of it (Traub & Little, 1985, p. 445).

The social constructionist theorist contributed significantly to the methods of deviance research, especially the reflexive tone of the research process and the ability to objectively criticize the limitations of official statistics. The social constructionist perceives the data to be suspect and they use the following questions to criticize the study: (a) Who gets classified as deviant? and why?, (b) Why are the classifications done the way they are?, and (c) Who is missing from official classification? and why? These questions address the process of data collection and analysis (Pfohl, 1985, 1994).

The social constructionists perspective did not escape anomalies despite its substantive and methodological strength. The anomalies deal with issues relating to the labeling theory, such as, the causal orientation in the development of deviant categories. Jack Gibbs (1981) offers another criticism of the social constructionist perspective particularly the labeling tradition that focuses on the concept label. Gibbs wanted the focus be on norms and not labels (Gibbs, 1981).
Alvin Gouldner (1968) provides an important criticism of the social constructionist perspective. Gouldner contends that the social constructionist perspective overemphasizes micro processes and ignores macro dynamics involved in the labeling process, particularly the ones that are political, economic, and ideological in nature and orientation. Gouldner addresses the issue of power and power hierarchy which are crucial structural dynamics that must be addressed in order to understand the complex reality of labeling (Gouldner, 1968).

Critical theorists use diverse methods to collect data. For example, some might use the historical method, others might use participant observation while others might resort to the old method of positivism. Pfohl (1985, 1994) perceives the critical perspective to be ideological in nature and is therefore, unable to provide a "truthful" picture of the world. As a critical sociologist, Pfohl offered a solution to the dilemma by admitting that biases are a part of the sociologist's personal, professional, and political background. The biases influence the type of questions the sociologist seeks to address, and the research method and process of data analysis. Pfohl (1985, 1994) contends that true value-free or objectivity is a myth and that positivism is ideological in nature. It is important for the sociologist, positivist and nonpositivist alike, to admit that ideological boundaries/biases exist.
Pfohl's work reflects professional honesty and ethical commitments, particularly his view of the critical perspective (Pfohl, 1985, 1994).

The Constructionist Approach to Contemporary Terrorism: The Case for State Terrorism

The constructionist theorist focuses on the process of constructing definitions. This includes the political nature and overtone in applying the labels and the implications of the labeling process that effect the parties involved. The labeling tradition perceives terrorism as a socially constructed praxis and the process of interpreting this praxis is political in nature. Constructionist sociologists assert that there is no universal forms of terrorism because they believe that deviance is relative and contextual. Social constructionist theorists such as Perdue, Chomsky, Herman, Chambliss, Simon, Eitzen, Quinney, and Barak, are interested in analyzing the definitions of deviance and particular how definitions become laws. These theorists perceive the social control apparatus (i.e., the military, the criminal justice system, and the media) as engaging in defending the vested interests of the ruling elite or class.

The constructionist explanation of terrorism is based on the following premises:

1. State terrorism is not exclusively a third world
phenomena, state terrorism exists in highly industrialized nations such as the United Kingdom, France, Israel, and the United States.

2. State terrorism is defined as follows: A violent and oppressive activity carried out by the state through the use of its social control apparatus such as the police, the military, the criminal justice system, and the media. Thus, other forms of state terrorism can vary and can be implemented in a covert or overt fashion. Examples of state terrorism are racism, sexism, classism, apartheid, and military occupation.

The constructionist explanation has two purposes: (1) to explain the political, economic, social, and ideological aspects of state terrorism, both on the national and international levels; and (2) the explanation should include practical policy implications. The constructionist model explains that state terrorism, in its various manifestations, is a politically and ideologically driven activity. The state actively pursues these policies in support of the status quo. Additionally, this theoretical explanation recognizes the fact that only direct forms of state terrorism will be discussed by academia because the academians are interested in state's activities that pursue goals that are in support of the status quo (Herman & O'Sullivan, 1989).

The political rationalization and implementation
processes of state terrorism are politically motivated which manifest itself in the application of the label of terror-ist to a particular state. The application depends upon the state's status in the global arena. It is easy to condemn a state for being terroristic if it is not a major player in global politics or if it is perceived to be somewhat powerful, it may be condemned for its "radical" ideology. An example is the media portrayal of the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait. The United States and most of its allies strongly condemned the action of the Iraqi government, and called Iraq a terroristic nation, an outlaw state, a dictatorship. These labels continued to influence world opinion and policies long after Iraq left Kuwait. The successful application of such labels is dependent on the political and economic status of the state to which the label is applies.

The media are an active participant in the process of creating a definition of state terrorism. The media directly and indirectly support the government's propaganda by creating particular images of terrorism which support the ideological norms of the society. The public is constantly bombarded with images of political normalcy. All of these elements are embodied in the "propaganda model," the "dominant ideology" model, and the "terrorism industry" model. Presented next is a synopsis of these models.
In the book entitled *Manufacturing Consent: The Political Economy of the Mass Media* (1988), Herman and Chomsky outlined their theoretical model and identified it as the "propaganda model." The authors give a social constructionist explanation to the phenomenon of state terrorism focusing on the creation process of a definition that implicates the media. The media are the primary agent or culprit behind political propaganda. In 1983, he published another book titled *The Fateful Triangle: The United States, Israel, and the Palestinians* in which he looks at the explosive relationship between these parties (Chomsky, 1983). According to Herman and Chomsky, the state, with the help of the media, is successful at the task of constructing acceptable definitions of deviance and making those definitions the norms in society. This view is also expressed in other works of Chomsky (1989), Herman (1992), Perdue (1989), and O'Sullivan (1989). Chomsky (1989) published *Necessary Illusions: Thought Control in Democratic Societies* in which he applies the propaganda model to an analysis of U.S. foreign policy in the third world, including the Middle East and Latin America. Additionally, Herman and O'Sullivan published a study on the terrorism industry in which they focused on the nature and the actors involved in the phenomena of terrorism (Herman
The propaganda model is based on the following premises: (a) The state, through the use of media and print, is successful at the task of constructing suitable definitions of deviance and making these definitions the norm in a society; and (b) the propaganda model is partly to blame for the state's ineffectiveness in addressing the political, economic, and ideological implications of state terrorism. This model can be used to explain the dynamics of state terrorism in the Arab-Israeli-Palestinian conflict, particularly the phenomenon of military occupation, and the denial of basic human rights for the Palestinians. The application of the propaganda model will argue that military occupation in Palestine is illegitimate, violent, and barbaric in nature and must not be tolerated in a civilized world.

The Dominant Ideology Model

Perdue's (1989) idea of the "dominant ideology" is closely related to the propaganda model developed by Chomsky and Herman (1988). Perdue describes in detail the characteristics of the dominant ideology and the processes involved in its application vis-a-vis policies. A workable definition of the concept ideology is necessary in order to understand what Perdue is attempting to explain.

The term ideology was first used in 1801 by a French
philosopher, Destutt de Tracy, who perceived ideology to be a label for broad scientific ideas and human ideals (Lichtheim, 1967). It was the work of early German philosophers such as Engels and Marx (1848) who gave the concept its sociological orientation. According to Engels and Marx, ideology is a collection of philosophies, ideals, laws, and social knowledge that is linked intimately to the material conditions of those who produce such knowledge. Ideology reflects class interests and is characterized by its function of helping to maintain an existing class structure (Marx & Angels, 1848/1977).

Karl Mannheim (1893-1947), in his work entitled *Ideology and Utopia* (1929/1960), offers a systematically refined and expanded definition of Marx and Engel's notion of ideology. Mannheim perceives ideology to be a set of ideas that functions to maintain the existing social order. However, ideological thinking is not an exclusive phenomenon of the ruling class. Rather, all classes have a particular ideology of existence, a social perspective, and a set of interests that are valued and protected (Lichtheim, 1967; Mannheim, 1929/1960).

Perdue's understanding of the notion of ideology is a combination of Engels', Marx's, and Mannheim's ideas. Perdue defines ideology as a set of beliefs, ideas, values, and philosophies that function to maintain the existing social order. A dominant ideology is one that belongs to
the ruling elite. The sociological questions are, How is an ideology created, maintained, and enforced? (Perdue, 1989).

According to Perdue, the ruling elite enlists the help of the mass media to carry on its propagandistic work. As a matter of fact, the media plays an integral role in the propaganda process, particularly the activities of censorship, selective reporting, distortion, and stereotypical imaging. Perdue developed a political/economic perspective of terrorism that criticizes the role the media play in creating and enforcing an inappropriate definition of a situation in order to maintain and protect the existing status quo:

Argued thus, a critique of the media must address the definition or ideological problems associated with terrorism; (2) inadequate coverage of the sources of political violence, with bias favoring coverage of the high drama that gives twisted expression to those grievances; and (3) the role of the media in creating the political climate in which state terrorism is legitimated as "counter terrorism" (Perdue, 1989, p. 48).

This explains the state’s position regarding terrorism as part of a dominant ideology. This ideology defines terrorism by exposing who the terrorists are, how terrorists behave, and which targets terrorists mark for violence. Also contained in the dominant ideology policies and procedures the state has at its disposal to use in dealing with terrorism domestically and abroad (Perdue, 1989).
The Terrorism Industry

Various labels have been used to describe the literature on terrorism. Herman and O'Sullivan's work, *The Terrorism Industry* (1990) perceived terrorism to be dominated by the western model or what is referred to as the "patriotic model" (Herman & O'Sullivan, 1990). The "western model" or "patriotic model," addresses the causes of terrorism, the forms of terrorism, who are the terrorists, and how to deter future acts of terrorism. This approach is held by some western leaders and other scholars who are interested in the "terrorism industry," and contains the following elements:

1. The west is an innocent target and victim of terrorism.
2. The west only responds to other people's use of force.
3. Terrorists, whatever their motives, tend to impose their will through the use of force and in the end are designed to create fear.
4. Insurgents that are supported by the west are done so on behalf of democracy against fascist regimes and civilians are not killed.
5. Democracy is vulnerable to terrorist acts, and finally,
6. Terrorist activities that undermine democracy are
supported by the Soviet Union (the Cold War mentality) (Herman & O'Sullivan, 1990).

To illustrate this model, Paul Wilkinson's work is a good example.

Paul Wilkinson is a leading authority on the phenomena of terrorism. He focuses on international terrorism and ways of combating terrorism. He has written extensively on terrorism and in his famous work, Terrorism and the Liberal State (1986), he contends that terrorism is on the rise. Wilkinson's work is both qualitative and quantitative in nature. He traces the historical phenomena of terrorism and he provides a definition of terrorism which is an activity that groups and individuals use to accomplish political goals. Wilkinson focuses on the effects of terrorist's activities on the political process. Since his academic background and preparation is in the field of international relations, he focuses on the global effects of terrorism and its impact on innocent bystanders, heads of states, and the individuals who are either directly or indirectly involved in the political process (Wilkinson, 1986).

Wilkinson's expertise is in combating terrorism. He consults and evaluates strategies used by the state and its various apparatuses to determine the effectiveness of the strategy and/or presents new ones. Wilkinson operates on two assumptions when combating terrorism. The first
assumption is that the state is obligated to use any available measure in order to protect its citizens at home and abroad. As a matter of fact, he perceives such obligation to be an important function of the state. The second assumption is that terrorist groups, organized or unorganized, and individuals need to find new means to accomplish their political goals, perhaps through diplomatic means. Through diplomatic means, terrorist groups and individuals are encouraged to accept the existing political process, with its ills, and to realize that sometimes it doesn't work. As citizens of a democratic and civilized state, citizens must accept the existing political process and take the good with the bad and make the best of it.

Based on those assumptions, one can see that Wilkinson exemplifies the western or patriotic model described by Herman and O'Sullivan. His approach is similar to the structural functionalist perspective with regard to the role of the state in modern society and the political process. Wilkinson is often quoted extensively by other scholars who share his view on terrorism, such as Yonah Alexander, legal scholar on international terrorism, Jonathan Power, Amnesty International expert, Michael Stohl, defense expert, Bruce Hoffman, an expert on Palestinian terrorism and Phyllip Schlesinger, an expert on terrorism and the west (Herman & O'Sullivan, 1989).
Wilkinson borrowed concepts and principles from classical political philosophers and sociological thinkers such as Durkheim, Locke, Aristotle, Hobbes, and Aquinas to develop a liberal democratic view on terrorism. Wilkinson identified three major principles for a liberal state to exist and function. These principles set the basic "foundation" and the stage for his perspective on terrorism and are outlined as follows:

1. Citizens of the liberal state have a political obligation toward the state which include loyalty, support, and obedience.

2. The legislative function of the state is vital and necessary in order to create an organized "rule of law" or "government by law" which is necessary to regulate the behaviors and the interests of the people.

3. The role of force principle gives the state the legitimate right to use it to protect the status quo and to protect its citizens from internal/external, or perceived/real threats of terrorism (Wilkinson, 1986).

Chomsky, on the other hand, describes two approaches to the study of terrorism: the literal approach and the propagandistic approach. The propagandistic approach closely resembles Herman and O'Sullivan's "patriotic" or "western model" and the literal approach is favored by Chomsky. According to Chomsky, the literal approach to the study of terrorism looks at what constitutes terrorism as
a phenomenon while providing causes and remedies that are not ideologically bound. It is this approach that evaluates the process of constructing a definition of terrorism and the consequences of the processes for all parties involved, including the state and its various apparatus (Chomsky, 1989). The next issue to address is the dilemma of legitimizing terrorism or can terrorism ever be justified and why?

In terms of the legitimacy question, theorist must examine international terrorism and state terrorism and focus on a theoretical approach to define terrorism. Wilkinson's work, Terrorism and the Liberal State (1986), presented an argument that questions the legitimacy of terrorism. Wilkinson states that terrorism is a form of politically motivated violence and it has no place within the context of the liberal democratic state. Furthermore, Wilkinson states that "revisionists" who attempt to justify violence misunderstand the principles on which the liberal democratic state operates, particularly the "rule of law" principle. It is important to expound on "the rule of law" principle in order to understand Wilkinson's argument (Wilkinson, 1966).

Wilkinson draws from Lock's (1966) idea of civil government to develop and argument for the "rule of law." Lock envisioned a society that is run by a set of laws created by the legislative branch and not a group of men.
In other words, government by men should be replaced with "government by law." Also, these laws have to be general, and apply to everybody. These laws should be designed to fulfill one purpose to serving the good of the people (classical deviance-rational justice). Finally, the legislative branch is in charge of creating the laws. The legislative branch cannot raise taxes without the consent of the citizen. Wilkinson concludes that the "rule of law" principle are becoming complex due to the fact there are various systems and institutions that perceive themselves to be law creators. This has to deal with the complex nature of judiciary and legislative functions of the government (Wilkinson, 1985).

Wilkinson believes in the importance of the "rule of law" principle, despite its complex nature. The "rule of law" should be the guiding force that regulates everyone's behavior. Moreover, every society has its own minority groups and these groups have to abide by the "rule of law" and use diplomacy to address and relieve their suffering. Honderich (Miller, 1984) was criticized by Wilkinson because he set up conditions where terrorism can be used by the minority and they are justified in its use. Honderich perceives two requirements for which "democratic violence" is justified: (1) if it alleviates more suffering than it causes; and (2) if there is no alternative ways of alleviating suffering within the context of the liberal

Wilkinson's argument is too theoretically ethnocentric and it can only be applied to cases of terrorism within the context of the western world. His argument cannot address cases of terrorism in the third world societies because these societies do not share the same political culture framed by Wilkinson's vision. The Third World societies have several forms of governments that are neither democratic nor liberal. Thus, Wilkinson's arguments do not address state terrorism or political violence used by the state to achieve certain political objectives. Wilkinson gives the state the legitimacy to use force as part of the foundation of a liberal state. Wilkinson believes that the state has legitimate authority to use force in order to preserve order and protect society from internal and external enemies (including combatting terrorism). Another limitation to Wilkinson's argument is that it is dogmatic, rigid, and ideological. His argument reflects the ideology of a cold war sentiment, which is aimed at legitimizing bipolarity. One important limitation of Wilkinson's argument is that it doesn't offer an explanation to the phenomena of military occupation and violence. An example is the military rule in the occupied territories of Palestine and the military occupation of Northern Ireland by the British. In summary, Wilkinson's arguments are culturally biased, simplistic, dogmatic, rigid, and ideological.
Wilkinson's theory is a classical example of theoretical ethnocentrism, culturally chauvinistic, and elitist in nature and orientation. Since Wilkinson's argument failed to address the complex issue pertaining to the legitimacy of terrorism in general and state terrorism in particular, a new argument is needed.

Perdue, in his work *Terrorism and the State* (1989), presents an explanation for the question of terrorism and legitimacy. Perdue uses the classical work of Max Weber (Beetham, 1974; Glassman & Murvan, 1984) on power and authority to build his argument. Weber focuses on the concept of power and authority, particularly legitimate and illegitimate power. According to Weber, there are three existing forms of authority: traditional, rational-legal, and charismatic authority. According to Weber, traditional authority is legitimized through the use of long established cultural patterns and traditions. In charismatic authority, power is legitimized through extraordinary personal abilities that the person has which evokes devotion and obedience by the public. Legal-rational authority is legitimized (bureaucracy) by legally enacted rules and regulations (Beetham, 1974; Glassman & Murvan, 1984; Perdue, 1989).

According to Perdue, it is within the domain of legal-rational authority where selective legitimization is done, especially by the state. Furthermore, the dominant
ideology that is present within the context of western society determines who has the legal right or power to use violence, condone terrorism, and even legitimize it. A vital dimension in an ideological construction of terrorism involves the use and abuse of power. Terrorism from the view of the dominant ideology is perceived to be a set of deviant behaviors that violates the existing political norms. It is the state that creates labels to describe terrorist activities and labels the individuals or groups as terrorists, barbarians, "crazies," and demons (Perdue, 1989).

Perdue favors a utopian ideology model of terrorism because it offers an explanation of legitimacy and a definition of state terrorism. The utopian ideology or model focuses on the process of constructing a definition of terrorism that describes the political and ideological implications of the process. Perdue (1989) contends that from the dominant ideology side terrorism is perceived as a systematic and purposeful activity used by revolutionary groups to seize political power from the existing legitimate government. It involves violence and the abduction of symbolic victims to instill fear in the local, national, and global community.

The utopian ideology focuses on institutional forms of oppression and persecution including colonialism, global apartheid, racial apartheid, ethnic apartheid, military
occupations, and environmental terrorism. The utopian and the dominant ideologies both believe that fear is an end result, and that it is present in all forms of terrorism such as imperialism, colonialism, and militarism. The utopian ideology is similar to Perdue's idea of the social construction of terrorism, and Herman and O'Sullivan's concept of the "terrorism industry."

The propaganda model presents a simplified view of terrorism. This view allows for the construction of an acceptable general definition of terrorism while ignoring the state acts of terrorism which leads to oppression. The propaganda model would not give legitimacy to revolutionary terrorism but would justify terrorist activities carried out by the state and its various apparatus to defend the order and stability in a modern state. It is the propaganda model that presents praxis problems for Marxian theorists and socialist leaders who would find themselves supporting a national liberation struggle. The most important praxis problems for those leaders is the fear of being labelled undemocratic, or even worse, in support of the idea of state sponsored terrorism. These labels reflect how the political world reacts to terrorist activities.

The propaganda model failed to give an explanation to state terrorism, nor did it present a definition of state terrorism. Activities of the state that are oppressive and repressive in nature and orientation were completely
ignored by the propaganda model. The propaganda model gave
the state the legitimacy to carry on its terrorist activi­
ties and at the same time, gave the state absolute power in
constructing definition of what constitutes terrorism. The
next chapter will focus on the task of constructing the
proposed theory on state terrorism. The goal here is to
provide a sociological analysis and interpretation of the
important conceptual categories that are the component of
said theory, such as power and the legitimacy of authority.
Once this task is accomplished, then a theory on state
terrorism will be constructed that will provide an explana­
tion to the Israeli colonialist occupation of the West Bank
and Gaza Strip, and most importantly, the legitimacy of the
occupation and the state of Israel.
CHAPTER V

TOWARD A THEORY OF CONTEMPORARY STATE TERRORISM

The purpose of this chapter is to take the first step in constructing the proposed theory on state terrorism in the Arab-Israeli-Palestinian conflict. The proposed theory will account for the dynamics of power and legitimacy of authority which are crucial to our analysis to the case for state terrorism in the Arab-Israeli-Palestinian conflict. This analysis will start with the world system approach of Wallerstein (1974) which will add clarity to the complex phenomena of colonialism as manifested in the example of the Israeli colonialist occupation of the West Bank and Gaza Strip. The world system approach will account for how power operates in the global arena. Lastly, other perspectives will be introduced that will account for how power and legitimacy of authority operate in the national arena.

The World-System Approach: Western Imperialism and Western Hegenomy

The origins of the World-System approach can be traced back to the dependency model of development (Hettne, 1990; Spybey, 1992). The World-System approach to development attempted to address anomalies raised by the earliest model of development; the modernization model (Frank, 1967;
Munoz, 1981; Wallerstein, 1974, 1979). One has to appreciate the many contributions of the modernization and the dependency theorists, despite the critical limitations, in order to fully understand the World-System approach to development. Therefore, a brief discussion of these models is a must.

The Modernization Model

The modernization model was developed in the 1950s and early 1960s by American social scientists, to offer an account of the common features of the process of development drawing on the analysis of the classical work of Weber and Durkheim (Rostow, 1960; Smelser, 1976). Furthermore, this model was advanced through the influential work of Talcott Parsons' structural-functional reconstruction of the classic 19th century tradition (Larrain, 1989; Parsons, 1960). Watnick (1952) contends that it was the emergence of the United States as a world power and the discovery of the appeal of communism by the "underdeveloped" third world which motivated sociologists to investigate the phenomenon of industrialization and the sociopolitical change accompanying it. Hence, the sociology of development developed as a subfield in sociology. The modernization model is based on the premise that the road to third world development can be achieved if these nations are willing to follow the first world industrialization model, both normatively
and theoretically. The principal concern to modernization theorists is how this model might be extended to other nations that have different histories, social structures, and cultural traditions (Evans & Stephens, cited in Smelser, 1988).

Modernization theorists were concerned with the distinction between traditional and modern society in terms of its attitudes and values regarding development and modernization. Modernization theorists pictured the traditional society as being run by traditional minded leaders who tend to focus inward and are not able/prepared to adopt or accept change and are influenced by magic and religion (charismatic and traditional leaders). On the other hand, modern societies are run by flexible, open-minded, outward looking leaders who are willing to try new ideas, and are influenced by rational thoughts and practical experiences (instrumental leaders) (Martin & Kandel, 1989; Sklair, 1991). The modernization model has sociological, psychological, political, and economic features. However, the emphasis is on the role played by values, norms, and beliefs of people. Modernization is the process of change toward those types of social, economical, and political systems that were designed in the western world between the 17th and 19th centuries. This evolutionary process occurs as societies with traditional behavioral patterns give way under the pressures of modernization which occurred
gradually in western societies, is thought to be able to take place by diffusion in the developing world because of their exposure to the developed world. Accordingly, modernization by diffusion should encourage development in many sectors such as urbanization based on nuclear families, education, mass media to disseminate information, political awareness and participation in democratic systems, increased business opportunities through capital investment, and law. Modernization theorists contend that the scale of development varies from one society to another based on the degree of success, more or less, of that society in its process of incorporating the ideas of western modernity highlighted by the modernization model (Hamson, 1988; Larrain, 1989; Munoz, 1981; Webester, 1984).

Modernization theorists contend that the lack of development is the fault of third world socioeconomic systems which tend to create obstacles to modernization and therefore, encourage little ambition or incentives among individuals. Development is understood by the modernization model as a straight-forward process of efficient social adaptation to periods of strains (Kay, 1989; Munoz, 1981; Webester, 1984).

The modernization model, despite its limitations, has contributed insights to our understanding of the role values and attitudes play in the way people respond to social change. Also, an important body of literature was
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generated by the modernization model which is considered a valued contribution to the sociology of development field. However, the modernization model is clearly an oversimplified model of development which lacks an adequate historical base and structural scheme on how to integrate forces of economic growth with existing social relationships (Frank, 1969).

The Dependency Model

The dependency model became prominent in the 1960s and was developed by a group of Latin American social scientists who based their writings on the classical work of Karl Marx (1818-1883). The dependency theorists include both Marxist and non-Marxist economists and sociologists among them are: Dos Santos, Cardoso, Faletto, Sunkel, and Furtado. Neo-Marxist authors include Baran, Sweezy, and Frank who are considered influential in developing this theoretical model (Cardoso & Faletto, 1979; Frank, 1967; Kay, 1989; Larrain, 1989; Munoz, 1981). Karl Marx had developed a materialistic and dialectical theory of society in which society progressed from low to high stages due to changes in its material base. Marx believed that change is natural, directed, imminent, continuous, and derived from uniform courses. The major aim of Marx's method is to guide the explanation of the many folds and historical connections between the economy and all other facets of
society. Marx believed that history was made as a result of practical human activity, especially as a result of the need to exercise technical cognition control over a viable natural environment (Marx, 1906, [1867]; Mark & Engels, 1955 [1848]; Zeitlin, 1990, 1994).

While the modernization theorists focused on the theme that third world development can occur if these nations are willing to adapt to the westernization model of the first world nations, the dependency theorists focused on the relationship of dependency which occurred as a result of third world nations attempt to emulate the first world model of development. According to Sklair (1991) the dependency model, or what he refers to "metatheory," consist of three major theoretical traditions that tend to describe the dynamics associated with dependency and development and these are: dependency-underdevelopment dynamics, dependency-development dynamics, and dependency-reversal dynamics.

The underdevelopment-dependency theoretical tradition tends to focus on the status of underdevelopment in the third world. These theorists, such as Wallerstein, argue that the global capitalist system, largely but not excessively through transnational corporations, caused the underdeveloped status of the third world. The transnational corporations of the first world dominated the global capitalist system and these corporations work to
block and even stop any genuine effort of development in the third world. The ideological domination and hegemony of the TNLs is to blame for the underdevelopment status of the third world (Sklair, 1991; Wallerstein, 1974, 1979). Wallerstein's underdevelopment-dependency model of development set the foundation for his revolutionary model of global development and social change and that is the world-systems approach which dominated the field of sociology of development in the 1970s.

Immanuel Wallerstein, a sociologist by training, presented an interpretative historical overview of the origins of the evolution of the world capitalist system. Wallerstein's historical interpretative method was heavily influence by the methodology of the famous French historian Fernand Braudel. Wallerstein incorporated Marxist scholars with international reputations such as Perry Anderson and Giovanni Arrighi (Chilcote, 1984; Wallerstein, 1974, 1979; Wallerstein, Maurice, & Hopkins, 1982).

Wallerstein believed that the world system is a unit with a single division of labor with multiple cultural systems. According to Wallerstein, two types of world systems are evident in history: world empires or the great civilization of premodern times such as those of China, Egypt, and Rome; and world economies dominated by nation-states and their colonial networks, exemplified by Great Britain and France. Wallerstein was especially concerned
with the shift from feudalism to capitalism (Wallerstein, 1974).

Furthermore, Wallerstein identified three paths to national development in the 16th century Europe. First, was the "core" area of northwestern Europe dominated by highly skilled labor in agricultural production. Second, a "periphery" in eastern Europe and western hemisphere, dominated by exports of grains, cotton, sugar, and slavery on coerced cash-crop labor. Third, a "semi-periphery" in Mediterranean Europe dominated by agricultural share cropping. Wallerstein contends that some areas of the world became dependent on others as the core states emerged relatively strong with an absolute monarchy and a patrimonial state bureaucracy, whereas in the periphery there was no strong state (Wallerstein, 1974).

Wallerstein in his work on modern world systems focused on capitalist agriculture and the origins of the European economy in the 16th century and then turned to mercantilism and the consolidation of Europe in the 17th and early 18th centuries. Wallerstein examined the breakage of feudalism, the rise of the centralized state bureaucracies, and the social organization of agriculture. He argued that the crisis with feudalism led to the formation of the capitalist world economy which is considered a new form of surplus appropriation. Wallerstein's model of the modern world system tends to be geopolitical in nature and
Wallerstein contends that essential to the development of the capitalist world economy are: an expansion of the geographical frontiers of Europe, the control over different products from different regions, and the formation of strong state apparatuses. According to Wallerstein, as of 1450, the stage was set for such development in Europe. This system was based on two key institutions: a world-wide division of labor, and bureaucratic state machines in certain regions of the world. Although the boundaries of the world-economy remained largely the same after 1600, there was a difference regarding the allocation of resources, economic roles, and wealth and poverty and location of wage employment and industrial enterprise (Wallerstein, 1974, 1979, 1982).

Wallerstein's work did provide insight into the experiences of colonialism and later on neo-colonialism. It was his work that put these developments within a historical and theoretical framework which later was used to explain the process of development, underdevelopment, and dependency. The geopolitical orientation of his work provided us with important insight into power dynamics on the global level. Although the concept of imperialism was not coined by Wallerstein, his ideas of domination and exploitation by the world capitalist system tend to correspond with Lenin's version of the theory of imperialism (Lenin, 1975 [1917]; Smelser, 1988).
Western imperialism did play a pivotal role in the creation of the state of Israel and the creation of the current existing boundaries of the modern Middle East. These key players include ex-colonial powers, the United Kingdom and France, and non-colonial powers such as the United States (Anderson, Seibert, & Wagner, 1990; Smith, 1988). The next step is to provide other sociological interpretations of the categorical properties of the proposed theory of state terrorism in the Arab-Israeli-Palestinian conflict. These theoretical perspectives will provide answers to the complex reality of the Israeli colonialist occupation of the West Bank and Gaza Strip and the legitimacy of the state of Israel.

The Pluralistic Model and the Elitist: Model of Power Structure

The pluralistic model is an analysis of politics in which power is dispersed among many competing interest groups. This model is closely linked to the structural functionalist paradigm in sociology. The pluralists claim that politics is an arena of negotiations among various interest groups with various goals. The political process, therefore, relies heavily on negotiations, alliances and compromises that attempt to bridge differences among various interest groups to produce policies that have broad support. Power in the pluralistic model is not
concentrated in the center, but rather, is dispersed among various centers representing various interest groups, each having its own political, social, and economic agenda (Dahl, 1961).

The pluralist model is one view of how political power operates in the United States. Mills (1956) and Domohof (1967) presented other views of power which is the elitist model. Mills suggested that the U.S. is dominated by a small, informal, highly powerful, and influential group of people who hold prominent positions in government, large corporations, and the military (Mills, 1956). Mills addresses the question of power, particularly where it is concentrated, and he discusses the consequences of the arrangements on the direction and style of the decision-making processes as it effects the social dynamics in the U.S.

The pluralist model and the elitist model present different views of the types of governments that can exist based on the existing power structure. The pluralist model perceives representative democracy as the dominant form of government, while the elitist model accepts the existence of an oligarchy form of government. It was Robert Michels who used the concept of oligarchy in relation to bureaucracy. He defines oligarchy to be the rule of the many by the few (Michels, 1911/1949). The pluralist model represents a conception of how power is dispersed in the U.S.
In practice, power shifts from one group to another while remaining concentrated from one center. The pluralist model assumes that all interest groups share the same amount of power which allows for a neutralized form of government. This is an ideal and an oversimplified assumption. Another criticism of this model is that the leaders of the interest groups are disproportionately from the upper class and the majority of the population is left out of the important decision making processes that can effect them directly and indirectly.

According to Mills (1956) and Domhof (1967), the pluralist model failed to give an explanation to the political reality that exists in the U.S. Mill's elitist model presents an analysis of how the American government and its political system functions today both on the national and global level. The men at the top of this model wield enormous power. Over the last several decades we have seen many shifts in the power structure, especially with the decline of the role of government and the rise in military clout. Mill's argument perceives an existing harmonious relationship between the elements of the military-industrial complex. In reality the American political system reflects an existing conflict among sectors which seek to dominate the political arena and they compete to influence the decision making processes in the areas of declaration of war, economic embargo, and intervention. I
will move my discussion to the concepts of authority and legitimacy (Pfohl, 1985, 1994; Waters, 1994).

Authoritative Theory Versus the Classical Elitism: Conspiracies of Power and Legitimacy

Max Weber and Authority Theory

Weber focused on the issues of alienation and fragmentation. He set the foundation for the protestant ethics and the modern form of bureaucracy. He favored a form of democracy that is based on a legal-rational authority in which he believed that instrumental rationalism is the basic principle behind bureaucracy. Weber admired individualism which fosters the emergence of a liberal capitalist-democratic state. Weber spent much of his intellectual career arguing with the ghost of Karl Marx, especially on the issues of socioeconomic status, class stratification, conflict, and power (Zeitlin, 1990, 1994). Weber perceived power to be a consequence of integrated human action. He perceives power to be the probability that an actor will be able to carry out his own will despite resistance, regardless of the basis on which this probability rests (Waters, 1994).

Weber describes two types of power; domination and coercion. Figure 2 is a diagram that best explains his idea of power subtypes.
The above figure explains two types of domination, monopolistic domination and legitimate domination. Legitimate domination has three additional subtypes of power which are traditional, charismatic, and rational-legal, with each having unique characteristics. Traditional domination occurs in status-stratified societies where individuals in authority inherit a position of power at birth which allows them the right to make political decisions. The authority of power are customary rights that are ascribed by the country's tradition. Any deviation from the customary rules threatens the legitimacy of this relationship. Traditional domination perceives legitimacy to be granted through a contractual agreement between the government and
Charismatic domination perceives legitimacy to be based on the personal powers of the leader. Rational-legal domination draws its legitimacy from two components. First is the "legal" component, which implies rules or laws that are accepted by the subscribers and they expect the superior to operate within the context of the established laws and rules. Second is the "rational" component which implies that rules are effective and efficient in accomplishing specific and immediate objectives (Beetham, 1974; Walter, 1994; Zeitlin, 1990, 1994). Weber contends that rational-legal domination gave rise to a bureaucratic administration staff that has the following characteristics:

1. Its activities are governed by rules.
2. It has a specific sphere of competence.
3. It is organized hierarchically.
4. Its members are specifically trained for the occupation.
5. Its officers do not own the means of production.
6. They do not own their jobs, but can be dismissed from them.

Weber's position reflects an immersion and commitment to a liberal democratic political system. Classical elitists on the other hand, perceive legitimacy to be a conspiracy of
powers. The earliest elite theorists include Pareto, Mosca, and Michels with each focusing on different forms of power conspiracy (Waters, 1994).

Vilfred Pareto's (1966) main objective was to identify the real forces that determine a state of equilibrium in the social system, namely, the elements that act upon the system and in turn are reacted upon by it. Within this tradition two main strata are identified. The elite and the non-elite or masses with the elite not being the social group that has disproportionate power to command. Meisel (1962) delineated the basic elements of an elite which he calls the "three Cs" and these are: group consciousness, coherence, and conspiracy (Meisel, 1962; Waters, 1994).

Pareto based his elite theory on human social behavior which perceives human behavior to be an outcome of derivation and residues. Derivations are ideas that attempt to rationalize and legitimize conduct which makes social life possible. Residues are basic instincts or motives of the actor which determine their conduct (logical and non- logical behaviors). There are two types of residue in relation to power formations, "instinct of combination" and the "instinct of the persistence of aggregates." Instinct of combination deals with an inclination to create new objects and new social grouping. Instinct of the persistence of aggregates is aimed at preserving the existing status of predominance. Based on these two forms of
residues, we have two different groups of people: the "lions" and the "foxes," descriptive terms used earlier by Machiavelli (1979). The foxes are described as insightful and cunning individuals who have the ability to persuade others to follow, while the lions are imaginative in nature and conservative in their orientation. Furthermore, the non-elite is composed only of lions while the elite is composed of both foxes and lions, which is a necessary condition. The character of governing practices are determined by the dominant group's struggle between the innovating, demagogic, persuasive foxes, and the conservative, repressive and violent lions (Pareto, 1966; Parry, 1969; Zeitlin, 1990, 1994).

G. Mosca (1939), another classical elite theorist argues that all societies are inevitably controlled by a small group of people who can easily organize themselves to control the masses. Mosca describes the "autocratic-aristocratic" and the "liberal-democratic" types of elite structure. The autocratic-aristocratic authority flows downward, and membership is based on the principle of self-recruiting elites. The liberal-democratic type of authority is granted by the non-elite (Mosca, 1939; Waters, 1994; Zeitlin, 1990, 1994).

Michels (1958), a student of Weber, introduced the U. S. to the concept of "iron law of oligarchy." Michels shared Weber's concerns with the negative consequences of
bureaucratic rules and he devoted much of his scholarly activity expounding on Weber's idea of bureaucracy. The "iron law of oligarchy" simply is the rule of the many by the few (Michels, 1958). Moreover, elite membership is based on the ability of its members to control the various organizations which make up the society, such as trade unions, corporations, and political parties (Michels, 1958). I will introduce a new model from my assessment of the literature.

A Palestinian View on State Terrorism: Abuses and Misuses of State Power

It has been said that personal history and experiences shape one's ideas, and therefore influence their perception of reality. My personal experiences are two-fold: a citizen of an occupied Palestine and a citizen of an unstable global world that is completely controlled by a "dangerous" form of neo-colonialist, neo-imperialist and U.S. hegemony and domination. I have lived and experienced the devastation of two of the most vicious wars in the Arab-Israeli-Palestinian conflict; the 1967 and the 1973 war. I have seen devastation and destruction brought on by the political climate of an oppressive political system. My academic career in American universities and college setting has exposed me to many "mainstream western" thoughts, both in political science and sociology. Therefore, these
experiences will definitely influence my perception of state terrorism in the Arab-Israeli-Palestinian conflict.

The proposed theory on state terrorism is heavily influenced by a critical sociological perspective. The proposed theory includes certain Marxian tenets, especially the role power plays in the political dynamics. Power is involved in every aspect of human interaction and behavior and the individual who owns a disproportionate amount of a society's wealth has the political power to enjoy a prestigious status that allows him to act with few societal constraints. Accordingly, an oversimplified definition of terrorism was created. Reducing the definition of international terrorism to forms of international deviance that violates "acceptable" political and social rules of conduct is an oversimplified definition for a complex phenomena. Power dynamics allowed for the creation of an ideological bias which is an incomplete analysis of state terrorism. This allows a state to influence its social control apparatus such as the criminal justice systems, the mass media and the government owned think-tank to label certain acts as "terrorist" when it is beneficial to the state. The systems of social control give the state legitimacy to carry on its terrorist activities at home and abroad by labeling such activities as counter-terrorist, limited insurgency, and activities carried out on behalf and in defense of "democratic" rules and principles. Accordingly,
the activities of the United States and the "allied forces" in the Gulf crisis, to be terrorist in nature. These western nations are attempting to impose and force "democratic" forms of government on the people of Iraq while ignoring the existing cultural and political patterns and rules of conduct that have been in existence for a long period of time. Also, U.S. foreign policy in relation to the Middle East, and the Israel-Palestinian conflict in particular, to be terrorist in nature because it exemplifies the abuses of power; western imperialism and hegemonic domination. The foreign policy has allowed for the existence of blatant, and covert activities that violate the basic human rights of the people in the Middle East.

The proposed theory of state terrorism will utilize the concept of anomie as developed by Durkheim, and Merton's structural strain theory of deviance and social control. The two theories are contained within the structural functional paradigm of sociology and they ask behavioral questions in regards to deviance and social control. The focus will be on the ideological implications of systemic anomie and normative chaos.

The structural functional paradigm tends to focus on how deviance makes important contributions to social systems. Emile Durkheim (1964) was the first to point out the positive functions of deviance which includes the following: (a) deviance affirms cultural values and norms, (b)
responding to deviance clarifies moral boundaries, and (c) deviance encourages social change (Durkheim, 1964).

**The Anomie Theory: Classical and Modern Foundation**

The anomie perspective draws its concept from a structural functionalist tradition which holds the prominent ideological thought in the field of sociology. It is important to give an overview of the major assumptions underlying the structural functionalist tradition.

The structural functionalist traditions focus on macro levels of analysis that scrutinize the relationship between the person and society. Emile Durkheim (1964) set the classical foundation for the tradition, and Robert Merton (1957) provided the modern foundation of analysis for the tradition. The basic assumptions of the structural functionalist theorist is that society is made up of interdependent components such as the family, the economy, the schools, and the state, with each component contributing a vital function to the balance of society. Each component is unique and contributes to the social stability in society fulfilling certain manifest functions. If something happens to disrupt the existing social order, then its parts will readjust in a way that produces a new form of stability (Durkheim, 1964; Merton, 1957).

Emile Durkheim (1964) set the foundation for the anomie perspective of deviance. Durkheim seemed to be
obsessed with the idea of order and social stability. He studied the consequences of the division of labor as a contributing source of stability and order within a society. Durkheim's analysis of primitive societies became the focus because of the obvious presence of value consensus appears to be lost in complex societies. Durkheim differentiated between mechanical and organic solidarity. Mechanical solidarity is a concept that describes the characteristics of a form of solidarity that exists in preindustrial societies. Durkheim perceives preindustrial societies to be united through common bonds and shared moral sentiments. Organic solidarity on the other hand is considered to be a superficial form of solidarity that exists in modern societies. This form of solidarity is achieved through use of a more sophisticated process and that is the division of labor and specialization (Durkheim, 1952 [1897]; Zeitlin, 1990, 1994).

Durkheim is generally credited as the first social theorist to conduct a study on suicide, published in Paris in 1897. The suicide study's results were instrumental in the development of the anomie perspective on deviance. Durkheim analyzed the forces that lead to completing suicide. In other words, what are the social, political, and economic triggers behind the phenomena of suicide? Durkheim believed that in a modern society, people are more likely to ponder the idea of suicide and/or attempt suicide.
due to the pressures of organic solidarity. In primitive societies it was observed that people are less likely to ponder suicidal ideas because their societies hold a true sense of solidarity (Durkheim, 1952 [1897]).

The anomie theory examines the existing norms in a society. Anomie is a concept that describes a state of confusion that is created when the norms of the society are not clear or they no longer are applicable to current conditions. Durkheim equates social deviance with normative chaos (Pfohl, 1985, 1994).

Durkheim's analysis of deviance focuses on the values of stability, order and social cohesiveness. Durkheim's stand on social control emphasizes the moral reconstruction of the society's norms in order to bring about a civic or secular moral order. Durkheim attempts to impose and defend a status quo that is morally oriented and offers a vague and simplistic explanation of deviance (Pfohl, 1985, 1994). This classical thought of Durkheim, contributed to legitimizing modern day ideologies which set a foundation for perceiving and defending the existing order while constructing suitable norms for appropriate social conduct. This ideology implies the right to construct and regulate every aspect of human behavior both on a national and global level. This is a symptom of systemic anomie. Systemic anomie is both endemic and more dangerous than normative chaos. Responding to states' activities in
contemporary terrorism shows signs of endemic systemic anomie.

The endemic state of systemic anomie of contemporary terrorism manifest itself in how society defines terrorism as well as provide legitimacy to develop state policies to counteract terrorism and insurgency which are terrorist in nature and orientation. It is systemic anomie that gave rationalization to the old colonial powers "allied forces" the legitimacy to interfere in the political business of the government of the third world such as Latin America and the Middle East. For example, this is done to impose political and economic constraints on a society to insure what is referred to as "democratic rule." Systemic anomie of contemporary terrorism gave the United States government the right to engage in covert activities, carried out by the Central Intelligence Agency, to discredit revolutionary movements in the third World continents, for example, Africa, Latin America, and the Middle East. Revolutionary movements for example were perceived to be a threat to democracy and the democratic rule. These agencies of global social control planted "democratic" political leaders who presented no opposition or threat to U. S. interests in those countries. This was done on behalf of democracy and the so-called "new world order." I will turn my attention to Merton's theory of structural strain (Chomsky, 1988; Herman, 1992; Herman & Chomsky, 1988).
Robert Merton (1938, 1968) expounds on Durkheim's theory of anomie by linking deviance to the disparity between culturally approved goals and culturally approved means of accomplishing those goals. Merton believes that society should be, and is the source for the creation of goals and the means to accomplish the goals. Thus, people can accomplish their goals by using the existing means of acquisition and should not deviate from the ascribed "legitimate" means (Merton, 1938, 1968).

According to the above notion, Merton perceives society to contain conformists and non-conformists. Merton was not particularly concerned with the conformist because they present no danger to the order and stability in society (Merton, 1938, 1968).

Table 1 summarizes Merton's theory of structural strain. Merton perceived deviance to occur when culturally approved goals could not be reached by the existing culturally approved means. Deviance occurs when there is a disparity between a goal and the available means of achieving the goal. Merton's attempt is to answer the question, Why do people break rules? (Merton, 1938, 1968).

According to Merton, Americans are bound together in a common cultural commitment to the goals of the great American dream. This view is exaggerated and is therefore invalid because it ignores the heterogeneous nature of American society in terms of the goals and means to achieve
the goals (Merton, 1938, 1968; Pfohl, 1985, 1994).

Table 1
Merton's Typology of Individual Adaptation to Anomie

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item/f</th>
<th>Culturally Approved Goals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I.</td>
<td>Conformist: Accept both the goals and means provided by society and conformists present no danger to society.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.</td>
<td>Non-conformists: Accept or reject the goals or means. Types of non-conformists:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. The Innovator: accept the goals, but uses innovative techniques that society doesn't approve of, such as stealing, cheating, and embezzlement of money.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. The Ritualist: rejects the goals provided by society and at the same time ritualistically follows the culturally approved goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. The Retreatist: rejects both the goals and the means to accomplish these culturally approved goals, i.e., homeless individuals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. The Rebellious type: reject both the culturally approved means and goals and at the same time replace means and goals with new ones that society doesn't approve of.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


An important limitation in Merton's theory is the question of structural consistency and the link to deviance and social control. Merton's structural analysis is not
extensive enough, and he fails to offer a clear explanation of structural inconsistency embodied within the capitalist system as well as an explanation of the inconsistent activities of the transnational capitalist class. Gouldner (1970) was able to identify the affinity between Merton's theory and Marx's analysis. Gouldner believes that Merton's theory and Marx's analysis implied that there were contradictions inherent in the social structure of a capitalist society. Capitalism presents a contradictory message to those who labor under its economic constraints. The ideal is to provide a free market of opportunity with the belief that those who work hard can rise as far as their abilities permit. At the same time, capitalism systematically limits access to decisions affecting the allocation and distribution of economic resources to those who control what Marx refers to as "the means of production" in society. This fundamental contradiction is built into the political-economic structure of capitalism. Merton has settled for a critique of the lack of equal opportunities and for a reformist strategy aimed at expanding access to the American dream. He fails to acknowledge that equal access to the political and economic resources of society is a myth, and in reality access is blocked by the structural organization of the capitalistic system. This criticism has given Merton the title of "a cautious rebel" by fellow sociologists because he is seen standing outside
the system and making criticisms that call for radical social change (Gouldner, 1970; Pfohl, 1985, 1994).

To summarize, Durkheim's anomie theory and Merton's structural strain theory are ideologically bound and can only offer a general theory of deviancy. They can not be used to explain specific forms of terrorism, such as state terrorism nor deviances of the transnational capitalist class (Gouldner, 1970; Pfohl, 1985, 1994).

The proposed theory is concerned with the labels used to describe the terrorist and the implication of the labels. The labels, such as barbarians, imply negative assumptions regarding the terrorist and positive assumptions of those who are supposed to judge them such as agencies of social control. This language leads to the perception that the terrorists are not educated, backward, and barbaric people and that the judges are better educated and more informed than the terrorists. This assumption is invalid because terrorists come from various walks of life, with some of them being educated and others not. Another assumption implied from the labeling language is the anomie state of the terrorist. The language suggests that the terrorists suffer from a "permanent" and dangerous condition of anomie that need to be addressed. To assume that the terrorist is confused by society's norms is insufficient argument because terrorists are aware of society's norms and their actions are attempts to change the existing
norms that are perceived to be ideological and oppressive in nature and orientation (Example: The activities of the Palestinian resistance movement during and before the Palestinian uprising). The focus should be on the condition of systemic anomie because it is the leading cause behind contemporary terrorism. To link contemporary terrorism to normative chaos is an oversimplified and incomplete analysis of contemporary terrorism. The link is an incomplete theoretical analysis of terrorism and it reduces the phenomena of contemporary terrorism to a set of international deviances that are in direct opposition to and it challenges society's norms. This is what is referred to as "acceptable" forms of conduct and political behavior. The question that comes to mind is "acceptable" to whom? or, Who has the "right" to construct and impose acceptable forms of conduct and political behavior? This process of constructing definitions is ideologically tainted and organized in a way to benefit the powerful elite (Chomsky, 1988; Herman, 1992; Herman & Chomsky, 1988).

I will digress for a moment to give a definition of two concepts that are used extensively in this new view of contemporary state terrorism which are; systemic anomie and normative chaos. The definitions will reflect how I applied and operationalized the concepts for the purpose of this question. First, systemic anomie is defined as a highly sophisticated and organized activities of the state
that are aimed at creating confusion to further its political and ideological motives at home and abroad. These activities are ideological in nature and orientation and serve the domestic and foreign policy of the state. Systemic anomie of the states is reflected in the propagandic activities of the state, implemented by the mass media to further the state's domestic and foreign policy and interests. This condition of systemic anomie was obvious in the allied forces' campaigns of information which targeted Iraq during the Gulf crisis because Iraq engaged in activities that were not acceptable by the allied nations. The propagandistic campaign was aimed at misinforming the public and at the same time seek national support for the allied forces' patriotic effort and that is to free Kuwait from the clutches of a mad man.

In terms of normative chaos, the operational definition of this concept is similar to Durkheim's classical thoughts. Normative chaos refers to a state of confusion which is created when the imposed norms are no longer applicable to the existing conditions due to the fact that societal norms are constantly changing and therefore, necessitates the presence of new norms. A society suffers from normative chaos only when the norms are not clear to the people who have to follow them. It is therefore society's responsibility to clarify and make the norms known. The next example will illustrate the case of
systemic anomie and normative chaos.

The proposed theory of state terrorism addresses the condition of systemic anomie and the implications of the power involved in the process of creating normative chaos. Systemic anomie gives the powerful elite the legitimacy to engage in propagandistic activities that are aimed at creating divisions in the world in order to better serve their ideological needs. The official definitions of terrorism reflects a bias, especially when the states intention is to linking contemporary terrorism to normative chaos which reduces the phenomena to a set of international deviances that are aimed at challenging the accepted rule of conduct in a society. The selected U.S. definitions of terrorism are accepted and enforced by the state and its various social control mechanism such as the FBI, CIA, Department of Justice, and finally, the State Department.

**Department of Defense, 1983**

The unlawful use or threatened use of force or violence by a revolutionary organization against individuals or property with the intention of coercing or intimidating government or societies, often for political or ideological purposes.

**FBI, 1983**

The unlawful use of force or violence against persons or property to intimidate or coerce a government, the civilian population, or any segment therefore, in furtherance of political or social objectives.

**State Department, 1984**

Premeditated, politically motivated violence
perpetrated against noncombatant targets by subnational groups or clandestine state agents.

Department of Justice, 1984

Violent criminal conduct apparently intended:
. to intimidate or coerce a civilian population
. to influence the conduct of a government by intimidation
  or coercion, and finally,
. to affect the conduct of a government by assassination or kidnapping.

The vice-presidents task force on combating terrorism, 1986

The unlawful use or threat of violence against persons or property to further political or social objectives. It is usually intended to intimidate or coerce a government, individuals, or groups to modify their behavior or policies" (Kidder, 1986, p. 12).

It is obvious from the above that state definitions of terrorism focus its definition on normative chaos. The definitions are constructed in a way to deliberately overlook the state's role and participation in contemporary terrorism. This is also a symptom of systemic anomie. The political, economic, and sociological forces involved in contemporary terrorism and state terrorism in particular, will be elaborated on extensively when addressing the next question.

A Critical Assessment of Contemporary State Terrorism: A Middle Eastern Perspective On State Terrorism - A Case for Systemic Anomie and Normative Chaos

The phenomenon of state terrorism is complex and it involves sociological and political dimensions that
identify and define the goals, the tactics, and the perpetrators of terrorist activities. The issues that are addressed by the sociological and political dimensions focus on the problematic nature of defining state terrorism. Additionally, the literature on terrorism is more focused on explaining the phenomena of state-sponsored terrorism and at the same did not give adequate attention to the phenomena of state terrorism.

The sociological and political dimensions of state terrorism must address the concepts of power, authority, and the legitimacy of authority. When examining the concepts of power, authority and legitimacy the general question is, "Who has the power, authority and legitimacy of authority and who doesn't? The ideological implications or consequences of the existing definitions of terrorism are considered to be another political dimension that experts on terrorism failed to address. The case in the Middle East can best illustrate this process of definition construction and the ideological implication of said process. The literature on Middle Eastern terrorism tends to be Eurocentric in nature and orientation. Experts on Middle Eastern terrorism such as Wilkinson and Jenkins have failed to incorporate in their analysis the complex cultural and political reality of the people of the Middle East. Often times, they have associated Islamic fundamentalism with terrorism which clearly showed that these theorists have
failed to understand the complex political, social, and cultural reality of the Middle East (Wright, 1985). This is considered a symptom of a systemic anomie.

Another symptom of systemic anomie is reflected in these theorists fascination with Islamic fundamentalism. Religious fundamentalism is not a new phenomena that is exclusive to the Middle East. Our world is full of fundamentalism: Christian, Jewish, and other forms of religious fundamentalism. Experts on Middle Eastern terrorism have failed to account for the complex makeup of the Middle East. Therefore, an expanded analysis of the complex cultural, social, and political reality of the people of the Middle East is a must.

Social Diversity and Unity in Diversity in the Middle East

Andersen, Seibart and Wagner (1993) presented an overview of the political, social, economic and ethnic conditions of the Middle East that served to unite the region despite its various diverse ethnic and cultural elements. They contend that the Middle East is a region that is united through the use of language, Islam ideals, and family and kinship networks, despite its ecological diversity or pluralism. Nomads, townspeople, and urbanites are independent social units that compliment each other. The Arabic language and family kinship networks are used to accomplish unity in the middle east. The religion of Islam
has shown to be the most powerful force that unites this region of the world (Andersen, Seibart, and Wagner, 1993).

In order to understand Islam's relationship to contemporary terrorism, one has to understand the complex nature of such a force. The central beliefs of Islam are:

First, Islam is defined as the total submission to the will of God or Allah. Second, Muslims believe in the absolute powers of God or Allah, which means that Islam is a monotheistic religion. Third, the prophet Muhammad is considered to be the seal of all prophets, past and present, and the last prophet to bring the message of God to the believers and the non-believers (Anderson, Seibart, & Wagner, 1993).

According to the authors, Islam as a religion is misunderstood by the west. These misconceptions are used to justify western ideologically motivated foreign policy in the Middle East. These misconceptions are centered on the following myths including; Islam is an exotic, militant, intolerant, ultra conservative, and sexist religion (Anderson, Seibert, and Wagner, 1993).

The above misconceptions regarding Islam influence U.S. foreign policy in the Middle East and its effects western's perception of the region. There is nothing unique about Islam. Islam shares important features with other world religions; for example, the militant and the ultra conservative nature of Islam is shared with Judeo-
Christian traditions such as the holy crusade movement and Christian fundamentalism that is reported to be on the rise in the United States. Islam is not the only religion that is moving towards a total way of life governed by Islamic principles and laws. Another important misconception about Islam is that it establishes separate spheres of influence, public versus private, and secular versus sacred. Again, this is not a phenomena exclusive to Islam. As a matter of fact, Christianity today is moving towards mixing the public with the private and the secular with the sacred and even the political. This fact is supported just by looking at how the U.S. government and the American public is attempting to come to grips with the dilemmas of abortion, homosexuality, and prayer in schools (Anderson, Seibart, & Wagner, 1993).

Robin Wright in her book entitled Sacred Rage: The Crusade of Modern Islam (1985), gives an explanation of why Islam is associated with contemporary terrorism in the Middle East. According to Robin Wright, the Palestinian question was used often by the west to link Islamic fundamentalism with terrorism. She believes that the conflict between the west and Islam goes beyond U.S. foreign policy in relation to the state of Israel. Muslims in the Middle East are still coming to terms with the oppressive experience of colonialism. Colonialism created borders in the Middle East dividing the nations. This was done in an
effort to break the cultural traditions and heritage of the Middle Eastern people as well as usurping the mineral resource of oil. The colonial powers of France, Britain and the United States are responsible for the destruction of the political structures that existed for a long period and replaced them with secular monarchies and dynastic political systems. Muslims perceive the state of Israel to be an extension of western imperialism which was created by the west at the expense of the Palestinians (Wright, 1985).

Next, I will address ideological implications of the propaganda model as it manifested itself in the literature on the phenomena of contemporary state terrorism in the Middle East.

The Implications of the Propaganda Model: The West Perception and a Palestinian View on State Terrorism

Wilkinson, in his work entitled Terrorism and the Liberal State (1986) gave a simplistic view of the criminal nature of state-sponsored terrorism, but stopped short of addressing the criminal nature of state terrorism. He uses the principles that set the foundation for the liberal state to establish an argument against political terrorism. He applied the "rule of law" principles to build a defense against political terrorism. Wilkinson's thesis that a modern state function by a set of laws that are established by the legislative branch, and those laws have to be
applied to political terrorism. Political terrorism involves criminal acts against property and innocent victims and therefore should be punished by using the same set of laws that governs everybody's behavior in the modern state (Wilkinson, 1986).

Wilkinson also used Max Weber's theory of power, authority, and legitimacy to establish his defense against political terrorism. It was Max Weber who developed the three forms of authority based on the principles of power and legitimacy and these are: charismatic authority, traditional authority, and legal-rational (bureaucratic) authority. Traditional and charismatic authority exist in primitive and simple societies and legal-rational authority exist in advanced and modern societies that are linked by organic solidarity which brings about rationalism and bureaucratic rule. The question is, What did Wilkinson borrow from Weber's theory of authority and power?

Wilkinson focused on the legal-rational form of authority which is challenged by traditional and charismatic authority. The legal rational authority combined with the principles of liberal democratic state set the base for his position against political terrorism. Wilkinson believes that terrorists acts committed by individuals, loosely organized groups, highly organized groups, or the state should be punished because they infringe on the civil rights and liberties of innocent individuals who
have no connection with the terrorist operation (Wilkinson, 1986).

Perdue raises another issue related to the implication of state terrorism and criminality. Perdue in his work entitled *Terrorism and the State: A critique of Domination Through Fear* (1989), states that Wilkinson's argument of punishing political violence and terrorists stops short of saying that governments and the ruling elite who intentionally and non-intentionally engage in all forms of political violence or campaigns of violence are not punished. The dominant ideology of the "terrorism industry" is selective in terms of who is punished and why. The terrorism industry engages in creating laws and labels that are applied to the powerless while state terrorism continues and is not punishable. Perdue (1989) provides evidence to support his argument from the cases of South African apartheid system, the military occupation of Palestine by the Israelis, the military occupation of Northern Ireland by the British army, and various incidents of racial and ethnic genocide in the Middle East and Eastern Europe.

The phenomenon of terrorism is complex and it involves political, economic, sociological, and ideological dimensions. The political, economic, and social factors allow for the creation of an environment conducive to let terrorism flourish. Political violence and terrorism in any form, no matter who are the perpetrators, is criminal, and
deviant in nature and should be punished.

I will base my theoretical analysis of contemporary terrorism on the limitations and the inconsistencies of Paul Wilkinson's theory of contemporary terrorism. Wilkinson's theory of terrorism is influenced by the structural functional paradigm in sociology, which is the oldest and the most prominent paradigm in sociology. Durkheim, Spencer, and Comte set the classical foundation for this paradigm with Durkheim's work on solidarity and social cohesiveness being especially influential. Merton and Parsons put Durkheim's thoughts together to develop the modern version for this paradigm. I will provide a summary of assumptions that this paradigm operates on.

The structural functional paradigm, or what is sometimes referred to as "systems theory" or "consensus," operates on the following assumptions.

1. Society is made up of interdependent parts such as the politics, economy, and education with each contributing something to the function of society.

2. Each unit is unique and contributes to the social order and stability by fulfilling its manifest certain functions.

3. If something happens to disrupt the social order, its parts will adjust (adoptive functions) in a way to produce a new form of stability (change = adaptation) (Ritzer, 1983, 1988).
Talcot Parson's theory of the functional imperative of society's subsystem clarifies this paradigm. Parson defines a function as a set of complex activities designed to meeting the needs of the system. He believes that there are four functional imperatives that are necessary, and even are characteristic of all systems and the functions are as follow:

1. Adaptation functions: a system should be able to adopt to the external environment and adopt the environment to its needs.

2. Goal attainment functions: a system must define and achieve its primary goals.

3. Integration functions: a system must negotiate the interrelationship of its component and manage the relationship among the other three functional imperatives.

4. Latency or pattern maintenance functions: a system must furnish, maintain and renew both the motivations of individuals and the cultural patterns that create and sustain such motivations (Parson & Platt, 1973). Figure 3 describes Parson's theory of functional imperatives.

According to Parsons (1969), the emergence of the state and its dominant position in modern societies can be explained in terms of the functions that it serves in the maintenance of the social system as a whole. He identifies four important functions of the state: (1) enforcement of
norms, (2) arbitration of conflict, (3) planning and direction, and (4) regulation of its relations with other societies. The theme that underlies these functions is the social order. It was Thomas Hobbes (1588-1697) who speculated on the devastating effect society will suffer when a strong political authority is not present. Hobbes believed that people create a state by an implicit contract in which the people surrender much of their own liberty to a higher authority to prevent chaos (cited in Ritzer, 1983, 1988).

Figure 3. Systems and Function.


Robert Dahl (1961, 1982) introduced a liberal oriented structural functional theory of power in a society which is referred to as the pluralist model. Dahl applied the pluralist model to the political process in the United States which is the basic principle of the legal-rational
form of government. According to Dahl, power is dispersed among various competing interest groups. The political system responds to the needs of the various constituencies that make up the society in order to strike agreements and compromises. Thus, politics is an arena of negotiation that creates agreements and compromises. The pluralist believes that some people have more power than others and that minority groups can organize to gain power and therefore survive in a pluralist democracy. This is done through voting and the public as a whole can participate in a pluralist form of democracy (representative democracy). It is believed that the sources of power in the pluralist model involves: wealth, political office, social prestige, and personal charisma (Dahl, 1961, 1982).

Robert Dahl's pluralist model is similar to that of Wilkinson's liberal democracy which is based on Weberian principle of a legal-rational form of authority. Wilkinson (1974, 1986) believes that a liberal democratic state operates on the following principles: political obligation, rule of law, and the role of force. These principles are created for the sole purpose of regulating the behaviors and motives of everyone within the context of this liberal form of democracy. Wilkinson, like Merton, is a structural functional theorist, who has been labeled "cautious rebel" because he has completely ignored the question of social change and the structural causes that support
contemporary state terrorism. He is basically interested in how the liberal democratic state functions, survives, and comes to terms with the challenges brought on by contemporary terrorism, while ignoring the challenges brought by issues of power, authority, and legitimacy of authority (Wilkinson, 1975, 1985). These are the issues that lead me to conclude that Wilkinson's theory of contemporary terrorism is incomplete as a general theory and therefore could not be used to explain contemporary terrorism in the Middle East.

His theory can be used to explain terrorism in the west because the Western conception of the political processes is based on the legal-rational bureaucratic form of leadership with an implied sense of authority from a pluralist democratic form. Wilkinson's inconsistencies are highlighted in how the west perceive the phenomena of contemporary terrorism in the Middle East. It is only reasonable to identify the inconsistencies because Wilkinson used his theory to explain the "complex" phenomena of terrorism in the Middle East. Further, his theory provided the West with social control policies and the legitimacy to use the policies to deter future as well as present acts of terrorism in the West and various third world nations including the Middle East. These counter terrorism strategies are considered terroristic in nature and orientation.
Asaf Hussain in his work entitled, *Political Terrorism and the State in the Middle East* (1988), provided a critical assessment of Western perception of terrorism in the Middle East. According to Hussain, Western academia has investigated the symptoms of terrorism and they failed to explore the root causes of the problem. Secondly, the Western academia approaches the subject of terrorism from an ethnocentric view. Their view reflected the U.S. political interests resulting in an ideologically tainted analysis. In their ethnocentrism and ideologically biased analysis of terrorism they ignored the phenomenon of state terrorism. When they attempted to study state terrorism, they chose a "neutral" and "cautious" position because it appeared to be a safe or comfortable stance (Hussein, 1988).

Hussein provides the following criticism of the Western academician's analysis of terrorism in the Middle East. They failed to recognize the structural factors embodied in the Middle Eastern political context and these factors include:

1. Religion and politics are separate entities in the West but not in the Middle East.

2. Most of the Middle Eastern rulers, whether monarchs, military dictators, or westernized political leaders, control the reins of state power without political legitimacy. Therefore, patrimonial systems of power are
created where the few have the power.

3. Middle Easterners believe that the root causes of all problems is man-made.

4. Middle Eastern political systems lack effective channels for political participation for the masses.

5. Those who take control of state power also command the economic resources of the country.

6. Middle Eastern states suffer from what he calls a "polarized political culture" (Hussein, 1988).

Hussein further states that in democratic societies there are recognized modes of political participation through which political groups may articulate their demands. There is no need for political terrorism, when the "rule of law" (Wilkinsons' principle) is considered to be above everything. The "rule of law" is secular and doesn't apply to the situation in the Middle East. He contends that Western scholars perceive Islamic fundamentalists as using Quranic principles to regulate the political, social, and economic sectors of the Middle East, as abnormal, volatile, and dangerous in nature. He believes that Western scholars, using their ethnocentric views, attempt to impose secular "modern" standards on the people of the Middle East (Hussein, 1988). Additionally, Hussein contends that the Just War Doctrine provided the state with the appropriate legitimacy to carry on its terroristic activities.
Nicolo Machiavelli, in his work entitled *The Prince*, translated by George Ball in 1961, set the foundation for the just war doctrine. "He, the prince should not deviate from what is good, if that is possible, but he should know how to do evil, if that is necessary" (Machiavelli, 1961, cited in Stohl, 1988, p. 278). According to Stohl, the just war doctrine was developed to justify state participation in war, but eventually also expanded to include the proper manner of waging war. However, he raises the following questions: Can the doctrine be expanded to provide legitimacy to terrorist activities carried out by state or non-state actors? It is obvious that Western scholars agreed with this doctrine because it gave the state the legitimacy to participate in terrorist activities and label non-state actors as criminals because their activities placed them outside the bounds of the "acceptable" limits of moral behavior. This also gave credibility to the idea that terrorist acts put innocent citizens at a disproportionate threat of harm (Machiavelli, 1961; Stohl, 1988).

Hussein’s perception of the just war doctrine is that it is full of value-loaded concepts like stability, responsibility, and security. These value-loaded concepts allowed for the emergence of Western hegemonic domination which is reflected in the perception that the western "allied forces" have the important and difficult task of policing the world in defense of peace, security, and
democracy. It would be ludicrous to believe that a state would not participate in illegal acts of terrorism. The power of colonial/neo-colonial policies are oppressive and violates the human rights of all who fall under their reign. To define and sanction deviance involves the concepts of power, authority, and the legitimacy of authority. Thus, by covering the methods used to make rules and enforce the definitions on its members, to ignore or minimize the impact of power, authority, and legitimacy of authority on the political, social, economic, and religious beliefs of the Middle East would only provide a biased analysis and definition of terrorism. Therefore, creating a negative perception of the mass uprising and or revolutions groups who responded to the oppressive tactics of the state. It is the ideology of the ruling elite who contribute to the political definition of terrorism and set the norms for appropriate diplomatic behavior. Any disruption in the system sets into motion the social context appraisals, i.e., military, media, criminal justice system, that are designed to maintain the status quo. These are actions taken by the state that are clearly a violation of human rights and therefore criminal. It is safe to conclude that certain forms of terrorism (non-state actors) is criminal in nature and orientation. At the same time, state terrorism was viewed as a necessary evil which is sometimes referred to as "coercive diplomacy." Coercive diplomacy's
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basic assumption is that peace is indivisible, and any threat to peace, wherever it occurs, must be resisted (Hussein, 1988). If coercive diplomacy becomes the current political thought, when do the actions of the state become illegal? The final task is to provide a brief synopsis of the proposed theory of state terrorism that will shed light on the complex reality of state terrorism in the Arab-Israeli-Palestinian conflict, most importantly, the phenomena of the Israeli occupation and the legitimacy of the colonialist state of Israel.
EPILOGUE

The Colonialist Occupation of Palestine and the Future of the State of Israel: A Palestinian View on State Terrorism

In this study an attempt was made to develop a specific theory on state terrorism that will shed light on the complex reality of the colonialist occupation of the West Bank and Gaza Strip. The legitimacy of the colonialist occupation is closely tied in with the legitimacy of the state of Israel and that is why such questions are difficult to ask even Israelis finds such questions to be problematic in nature (Ruether & Ellis, 1990).

The proposed theory on state terrorism in the Arab-Israeli-Palestinian conflict is based on the following assumptions. First, terrorism in any shape or form should not be tolerated in the civilized world. Second, terrorism is not limited to the third world, but rather is a universal phenomena that exists in advanced societies as well as the United States, France, and Israel (Barak, 1990). Third, ethnic apartheid, neo-colonialism, western imperialism and hegemony, and the colonialist occupation of the West Bank and Gaza Strip are the most advanced brutal forms of state terrorism that plague our world today.

The colonialist occupation of the West Bank and Gaza
Strip and the creation of the state of Israel in Palestine are the best illustration of western imperialism and hegemony. These are issues Palestinians in the occupied territories are addressing and have been addressing since the creation of the state of Israel and even before, especially as early as 1917 when the United Kingdom, ex-colonial power, gave the Jews the right to immigrate to Palestine as specified in the Balfour Declaration of 1917 (Anderson, Seibert, & Wagner, 1993). The text of the Balfour declaration reads as followed:

His majesty's government view with favor the established in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people . . . . It being clearly understood that nothing shall be done which may prejudice the civil and religious rights of existing non-Jewish communities in Palestine or the rights and political status enjoyed by Jews in any other country (The Middle East, Global Studies Series, 1988, p. 22; refer to Appendix B for the complete text).

The question to be asked is what gave an ex-colonial power such as the United Kingdom the right to facilitate the process of establishing a national home for Jews in territories that is already inhabited.

The world system approach of Wallerstein and others can provide insight into the dynamics and the conduct of the ex-colonial power of United Kingdom. This example of superpower diplomacy reflects the United Kingdom sense of arrogance, especially, since they felt they had the right to decide the fate of both Jews and Palestinians.
Wallerstein's work provided a theoretical framework to explain the experiences of colonialism which most of the third world had to contend with. However, the third world nations have broken away from colonialism but, the Palestinians are still contending with the vicious form of classical colonialism. Furthermore, the third world is dealing with a new form of colonialism and that is neo-colonialism which manifested itself in the creation of the transnational capitalist class and state (Wallerstein, 1974, 1979, 1982).

The western world, including United Kingdom, France, and the United States were directly involved in the creation of the state of Israel. Furthermore, these nations continued to give support to the state and even legitimacy despite its colonialisit and terroristic nature and orientation without any regard to basic human rights of the indigenous population the Palestinians.

The colonialist occupation of the West Bank and Gaza Strip by Israel is terroristic in nature and orientation. This terroristic nature is reflected in the various administrative and civil policies and practices of the Israeli (discussed in detail in Chapters III and V) authorities that are aimed at controlling the endogenous population at any cost and thus subvert and force the colonialist state on the endogenous population. The colonialist policies of the state of Israel illustrate a vicious cycle of violence.
Extreme oppressive practices by the Israelis forced the Palestinians to respond by resisting such practices and the cycle goes on (Brown, 1981) (refer to Appendix R for the components of the cycle of violence).

The human cost of such policies was paid dearly by the Palestinians during the occupation and most importantly, during the Palestinian uprising of 1987. This human cost have been documented by various human rights organizations working in Palestine, such as Data Project and Al-Haq which made it their job to monitor human rights violations in the occupied territories (Al-Haq/Law, 1988; Bassiouni & Cainkar, 1989). (Refer to Appendix O for a compiled report detailing the human cost paid by the Palestinians).

In addition to the human cost paid by the Palestinians, this theory contends that the colonialist occupation is terroristic in nature which is obvious in the official policies of the state that are aimed at establishing a state of ethnic apartheid (Jews versus non-Jews). Examples of such policies include the law of return, citizenship laws, and laws aimed at usurping Palestinian land in order to establish Jewish settlements in the occupied territories and therefore strengthening the grip on the territories. These laws tend to favor one ethnic group over the other. Furthermore, Jews and Palestinians are structurally and physically segregated. The Palestinians are confined mostly to the occupied territories with having
them surrounded by Jewish settlements that are aimed at protecting the security of the state. The Israeli government official position regarding the settlements in the occupied territories is that such settlements are needed to protect the state of Israel from real and perceived threats that is either coming from the outside world (hostile Arab nations such as Libya, Syria, and Iraq) and from within (Palestinians resistance movements). This official position manifested itself in Israeli policies and practices of depopulating Palestinian land and replacing the Palestinians with Jews from abroad who the minute they entered the country were citizens as long as they profess their love for the state of Israel (Davis, 1987; Khalidi, 1992). (Refer to Appendices H through N for a complete report defining the impact/consequences of such policies.)

In conclusion, the proposed theory on state terrorism clarified the complex reality of the colonialist occupation of the West Bank and Gaza Strip. It contends that the occupation is illegal, immoral, illegitimate, and certainly terroristic in nature and orientation. Additionally, the western world, most importantly, the United States and United Kingdom have to evaluate and critically assess their foreign policy in regards to the Palestinians and the state of Israel. Western imperialism and conspiracies of power are terroristic in nature because such orientation justified and legitimized situations where power is abused by
the states both on the national and global level. This abuse of power is best exemplified in the process of creating an illegitimate state in Palestine which had to resort to terrorist tactics in order to force and maintain its existence and sovereignty in the occupied territories. This has been the base for the Palestinian's anger towards the west. In order for the west to understand Palestinian anger towards them they have to ask the question "How is it possible that we, the west, allowed for the creation of an illegitimate state and continued to support it despite its blatant human rights violation against the Palestinian people.
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The Balfour Declaration of 1917
The Balfour Declaration

The text of the Balfour Declaration is as follows:

I have much pleasure in conveying to you on behalf of His Majesty's Government the following declaration of sympathy with Jewish Zionist aspirations which has been submitted to and approved by the Cabinet:

His Majesty's Government view with favor the establishment in Palestine of a National Home for the Jewish people and will use their best endeavors to facilitate the achievement of this project, it being clearly understood that nothing shall be done which may prejudice the civil and religious rights of existing non-Jewish communities in Palestine or the rights and political status enjoyed by Jews in any other country.
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Israel After 1967 War
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Borders of Israel and Israeli Controlled Areas as Depicted by the Economist of July 20, 1985
Borders of Israeli and Israeli controlled areas as depicted in THE ECONOMIST of July 20, 1996.
Appendix E

Palestine 1945: Zionist and Palestinian Land Ownership in Percentages by District
5. PALESTINE 1945:
Zionist and Palestinian landownership
in percentages by district

The source for this map is Village Statistics
(Jerusalem: Palestine Government, 1949). It was
subsequently published as United Nations map
no. 94(b) in August 1960.

The category of "public ownership" under the
British Mandate derived from that known as mir,
under the Ottoman system of land tenure.
Subsumed under the latter category, however,
in addition to state domain, were many other
subcategories that admitted a whole range of
private and communal usufruct and leasehold.
Appendix F

Jewish Population in the West Bank
Jewish Population in the West Bank*

* Not including 120,000 Jews living in annexed Jerusalem. Population figures vary (sometimes by as much as twenty percent) depending upon the source. The figures for 1989 and 1990 were cited by Danny Rubinstein in Ha'aretz, December 14, 1990. These numbers should be considered conservative approximations.
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The Jewish Population in the West Bank and Gaza Strip
## APPENDIX

THE JEWISH POPULATION IN THE WEST BANK AND GAZA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Jewish Population</th>
<th>Population Growth</th>
<th>Growth by Percent</th>
<th>Government</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>3,176</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>by the end of Labor government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>5,023</td>
<td>1,847</td>
<td>58.1</td>
<td>Likud in power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>7,361</td>
<td>2,388</td>
<td>46.5*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>2,639</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>12,424</td>
<td>2,424</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>16,119</td>
<td>3,695</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>2nd Begin government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>21,000</td>
<td>4,881</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>27,000</td>
<td>6,500</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>Shamir government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>44,146</td>
<td>16,646</td>
<td>60.5*</td>
<td>national unity government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>52,960</td>
<td>8,814</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>60,500</td>
<td>7,540</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>Shamir replaces Peres as PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>70,000</td>
<td>10,500</td>
<td>15.0*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>7.5*</td>
<td>2nd national unity government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>81,200</td>
<td>6,200</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>96,000</td>
<td>14,800</td>
<td>18.23</td>
<td>Likud, Sharon as Housing Min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991+</td>
<td>112,000</td>
<td>16,000</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>141,000</td>
<td>29,000</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>estimated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Listing of Israeli Settlements in the Occupied Territories - Gaza Strip
## Appendix

### Listing of Israeli Settlements in the Occupied Territories

#### Gaza Strip

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Settlement</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elei Sinai</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bdolah</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beni Azmon</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gadid</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gan Or</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ganei Tal</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duguit</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efar Darom</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morag</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meve Dekalim</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misanit</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netzer Hazani</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netzarim</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peat Sade</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katif</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raphiach Yam</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efar Yam (not counted as settlement)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>3220</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix I

Listing of Israeli Settlements in the Golan Heights and East Jerusalem
## Golan Heights

**Settler Population:** 12,000*

### Settlements (36)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Settlement</th>
<th>Settlement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mt. Hermon Ski Lift</td>
<td>Ma'ale Gamla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newe Ativ</td>
<td>Ramot Transformer Substation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nimrod</td>
<td>Natur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senir</td>
<td>Haspin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Odem</td>
<td>Nov</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Rom</td>
<td>Ramat Haasifim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sela’ Allon</td>
<td>Avne Etan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merom Golan</td>
<td>Geshur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sha’al</td>
<td>Eli ‘Al</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oretal</td>
<td>Bene Yehuda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>En Ziwan</td>
<td>Giv'at Yo'av</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allon HaBashan</td>
<td>Israeli Aircraft Industries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qidmat Zevi</td>
<td>Plant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qazrin</td>
<td>Ne’ot Golan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qazrin Industrial Center</td>
<td>Afiq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qeshet</td>
<td>Kefar Haruv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ani’am</td>
<td>Nevo Hama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had Nes</td>
<td>Mezor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yonatan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


---

## East Jerusalem

**Settler Population:** 140,000

### Jewish Neighborhoods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighborhood</th>
<th>Neighborhood</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neve Ya'acov</td>
<td>Givat HaMivtar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pisgat Ze'ev</td>
<td>Sanhedria Extension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French Hill</td>
<td>Ramot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rekhes Shoufat</td>
<td>Old City Jewish Quarter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramat Eshkol</td>
<td>East Talpiot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ha'ale Gamla</td>
<td>Gilo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix J

Listing of Israeli Settlements in the Northern West Bank
## Northern West Bank

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Settlement</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Avnei Hafetz</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ornit</td>
<td>2500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Itamar</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alon Morei</td>
<td>1200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alfei Menashe</td>
<td>3000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elkana</td>
<td>2600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ariel</td>
<td>10000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beracha</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barkan</td>
<td>520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ganim</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rumash</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hinnanit</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hermesh</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Itzhar</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yakir</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kedim</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kfar Tapuah</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mevo Dotan</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maale Shomron</td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nofim</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salit</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enav</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emanuel</td>
<td>4000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ez Ezfraim</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zofim</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edumim</td>
<td>2200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karnei Shomron</td>
<td>4300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gvinot Shomron (included in K. Shomron)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiryat Metzim</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revava</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reihan</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sa-Nur</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shavei Shomron</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaarei Tikva</td>
<td>1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaked</td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total** 36320

**Source:** "Israel's Settlement Activities," Report Number Four of the Settlements Watch Committee, Peace Now, Jerusalem, January 22, 1992.
Appendix K

Listing of Israeli Settlements in Central West Bank
### CENTRAL WEST BANK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Settlement</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abir Yaakov</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adam</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alon</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bet El</td>
<td>1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bet El b’</td>
<td>1300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bet Arie</td>
<td>1400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bet Horon</td>
<td>550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gvivon Habadasha</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Givvat Zeev</td>
<td>6000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gvivon (included in G. Zeev)</td>
<td>15000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dolev</td>
<td>380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Har Adar</td>
<td>1100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halamish</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hashmonaim</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talmon (A.B.C)</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kochav Hashahar</td>
<td>550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kfar Adumim</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mevo Horon</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migdalim</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maale Adumim</td>
<td>15000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maale Ephraim</td>
<td>1700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maale Levona</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maale Mikmash</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitzpe Rachel</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hattitiahu</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nili</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nahliel</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naale</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atteret</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eli</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alei Zahav</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almon</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ofra</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ofarim</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peduel</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psagot</td>
<td>650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rimonim</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shilo</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: 38920

Appendix L

Listing of Israeli Settlements in Jordan Valley and North Dead Sea
# Jordan Valley and North Dead Sea

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Settlement</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Almog</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argaman</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bet Haarava</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bekaaot</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guitit</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guigal</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vered Yericho</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamra</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yeitav</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yatif</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mehola</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechora</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hitzpe Shalem</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hitzpe Yericho</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masoa</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massa</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naaran</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netiv Hagdud</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pezael</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalia</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roi</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shemot Mehola</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tomer</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>3520</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix M

Listing of Israeli Settlements in Gush Etzion
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Settlement</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alon Shvut</td>
<td>1400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elazar</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efrat</td>
<td>2500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beitar</td>
<td>1700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hadar Beitar</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Har Gvilo</td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kfar Etzion</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karmei Zur</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migdal Oz</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metsad (Asfar)</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maale Amos</td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neve Daniel</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nokdim</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoref (Bat Ain)</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kedar</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosh Zurim</td>
<td>270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tkoa</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>9330</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix N

Listing of Israeli Settlements in South Hebron Hill
### SOUTH HEBRON HILL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SETTLEMENT</th>
<th>POPULATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adova</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eshkolot</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bet Yatir</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hebron</td>
<td>550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hagai</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tene (Omarim)</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karmel</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livne (Shani)</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maon</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susia</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otniel</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pnei Hever</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiryat Arba</td>
<td>5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shima</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telem</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>7445</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix O

Summary of Human Rights Violations Under Israeli Rule During the Uprising
### SUMMARY OF HUMAN RIGHTS VIOLATIONS UNDER ISRAELI RULE DURING THE UPRISING

December 9, 1987 to December 8, 1988
(with comparative figures from 1987 - December 8)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VIOLATIONS</th>
<th>1987</th>
<th>Dec. 8 - Dec. 9, 1987</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DEATHS</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>433 (a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Due to Occupation Forces</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shot</td>
<td>287</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beaten/Electrocuted</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teargassed</td>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under investigation or possible official responsibility</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INJURIES</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>46,000 (b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXPULSIONS (c)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>33 (4 from 87)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ordered; appealing</td>
<td></td>
<td>26 (1 cancelled)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADMINISTRATIVE DETENTIONS: Orders</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>5,000 (d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOWN ARRESTS: 6 Month Orders</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CURFEWS, AREA CLOSURES &amp; SIEGES (c)</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>2,000 + days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLOSED MILITARY ZONES (Temporary)</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1000s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROLONGED SIEGES (over 7 days)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>150 +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSTITUTIONAL CLOSURES</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>(f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OLIVE &amp; FRUIT TREES UPROOTED</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>100,000 + (g)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEMOLITIONS &amp; SEALINGS</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of houses &quot;for security reasons&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demolished</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partially or totally sealed</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partially Demolished</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20 +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of Unlicensed buildings (mostly homes)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demolished</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orders to Stop Building</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other pretext or unknown</td>
<td>13 (h)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># OF PERSONS DISPLACED</td>
<td>1000 +</td>
<td>5000 + (est.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
Appendix P

House Demolition and Sealing
(December 1987-December 1988)
House Demolitions and Sealings - Total
December 1987- December 1988

House Demolitions - Security
December 1987- December 1988
Appendix Q

House Demolition Unlicensed
(December 1987-December 1988)
House Demolitions - Unlicensed
December 1987-December 1988
Appendix R

The Spiral of Violence
The Spiral of Violence

"The Nature of Violence is Spiral"

Violence No. 1 called Injustice
- institutionalized violence.
- structured violence.
- violence of the status quo.
- when it gets too bad then comes V.N.2.

Violence No. 2 called Revolt
- When revolt breaks out then authority responds by using Violence Number 3.

Violence No. 3 called Repression: Means-
- using the military force to stop revolt and bring about stability in the country.
- This leads to increase of injustice (V.N.1) which leads to revolt (V.N.2) which will call for even heavier-handed repression.
- and so the circle will continue.
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