



2024


Gaza Shoah

Lama Abu-Odeh

Georgetown University Law Center, la34@law.georgetown.edu

This paper can be downloaded free of charge from:
<https://scholarship.law.georgetown.edu/facpub/2568>
<https://ssrn.com/abstract=4683195>

This open-access article is brought to you by the Georgetown Law Library. Posted with permission of the author.
Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarship.law.georgetown.edu/facpub>

 Part of the [Comparative and Foreign Law Commons](#), [Human Rights Law Commons](#), and the [International Humanitarian Law Commons](#)

Gaza Shoah:

Zionism's Efficacious Role as Ideological Supplement in the US

Lama Abu Odeh

December 24, 2023

One of the most stunning developments since October 7, is that the party (the Democrats) that had spent the past few years condemning racism, producing a cultural revolution of sorts, has gone all in on the genocide of Gaza¹. From hyper sensitivity to words and feelings and daily condemnation of “hate speech” to ruthless indifference if not full-throated defense of the murder of babies and toddlers in Gaza. To understand this quick transition, in which the beliefs of yesterday are quickly replaced with their exact opposite one has to understand the efficacious role that Zionism plays in forming the US ideological scene at the elite level. One way to think about it is that Zionism operates as an ideological supplement in the US. What I mean by that is that Zionism intervenes as an outside force to fill a gap in the current ideological formation from left to right. It does so by resolving internal conflicts on the left, playing the role of the limit on, or the constraining force of, the liberal center, as well as expressing the repressed aspirations of the right. By performing this sweeping operation it creates a semblance of ideological unity among actors who otherwise despise each other. This is not something that Zionism is able to achieve unless it is able to enter the interstices of ideology and speak to it within its own terms.

¹ Israel's military campaign in Gaza is among the most destructive in recent history. In just over two months it has caused more destruction, proportionally, than the allied bombing of Germany in World War 2, which took place over many many years. Two thirds of all structures in Northern Gaza have been destroyed as well as a quarter of buildings in the Southern area in Gaza. Gaza now is a different color from space. “Gaza is facing one of the worst punishment military campaigns in history,...it now sits comfortably in the top quartile of the most devastating bombing campaigns ever.” Israel used 2000 pound bombs to rain on Gaza including the areas the Israeli army told civilians to flee to as “safe zones.” Gaza has thus far received what is equivalent to two Hiroshima bombs (and counting). 1% of the Gazan population has been killed in just two months, (21000), 70% women and children. The count of children dead is 10000 (and counting). Many remain buried under the rubble so we don't know the exact number of the dead. Entire families of Gazans have been wiped out off the civil registry. The number of injured 55000 (and counting). All hospitals in Gaza have been targeted by Israel's campaign and made practically inoperable, same with mosques, churches, and schools. Gaza city has been wiped off the map as close to 1.8 million people have been displaced from their homes, pushed to the south of Gaza seeking shelter from unrelenting bombing. Two UN employees have been killed every day in Gaza, unprecedented in UN history. And on and on...

It is true that the American political class, Democrats and Republicans alike, is on AIPAC's dole. It is also true that legacy media is dominated by Zionist Jews. But this internal corruption of the system has to speak ideologically in order to achieve some hegemony over public opinion. What enables Zionism to do that is its double tongue. Zionism is the ethnocidal project ²of an historically ethnically cleansed group that insists on building a state on a land inhabited by its own native population. Its ethnocentric aspiration and violent drive appeal to the right, its victim history, to the left. So in order to intervene effectively, it has to split itself as the need arises.

Zionist Intervention on the Left

In the aftermath of the election of Trump, Democrats everywhere adopted the stance of anti-racism to do battle with the right wing populism that brought him to power. The idea being that those who supported Trump were disgruntled white losers who were nostalgic for a different America where white supremacy reigned (Hillary Clinton's "basket of deplorable"). Anti-racism became the privileged *parole* of the political language of elite white liberals. Upwards of 800,000 jobs created under the Biden administration went to minorities. The black bourgeoisie increased in numbers and visibility as a result of DEI programs implemented across the span of many institutions. As more blacks joined white liberal elites, the Professional Managerial Class (PMC) in positions of administration, media establishments, art and entertainment industries, advertisement sector, and academia, the discourse of anti-racism came to be fashioned by the needs, views, and experience of those rising minorities. Much of the discourse aimed to describe "whiteness": its historic crimes, its enduring failures, its unconscious bias, its attitudes, its language. The point was to transform the public discourse of the institutions to accommodate those criticisms and many white liberals running the institutions responded to the demand dutifully. Some took the attitude of self-flagellation, some accommodation and indulgence of the

² Israel is an apartheid state per several human rights organizations but the Zionist drive is not so much to discriminate against Palestinians; it is to absent them altogether: drive them out of the land, "transfer them", displace them, ethnically cleanse them, to enact on the ground what Zionists had originally claimed, "A land without a people for a people without a land."

For that purpose, and as the Gaza shoah had made plain for the world to see, Israel wants Palestinians to run, to scurry, to despair, to grieve, to plead, to lose limbs, to thirst and hunger, to go mad, to be savaged, to take last breath under the rubble, to submit in pain and torture, to live with fear and anxiety not knowing when the next bomb will come, to be orphaned, to lose one's child, to wish death, ...and to die.

new discourses promoted by their new colleagues, some fell into silence and withdrew while others bolted (see liberals below).

There was a wrinkle to all this, however. As the white liberal PMC reshaped itself to accommodate the new comers and learnt to signal its new virtue, a certain nervousness hit the anti-racism ideological landscape. Zionist Jews within this class, many of whom went all in on the new anti-racism discourse, were unsure whether they would be treated by the newly empowered anti-racist fellow PMCs as another minority or whether they would now be considered in the reconfigured landscape “white”. The previous generation of blacks had treated Jews as allies and fellow travelers given the history of the civil rights movement. Many boomer blacks, faced with Israel vs Palestinians would side with the former given a sense of loyalty to the joint struggle. Sometimes it felt like the less exacting choice as the upward mobility of some blacks depended on Jewish largesse on offer in the various institutions they worked. Some would fall silent unable to decide. But it was slowly becoming clear that the younger blacks neither had that memory nor shared the same fealty. The younger blacks saw Jews as “white.” For a generation that tended to understand its contemporary position as continuous with an older oppressive regime of slavery and Jim Crow, the civil rights era doing little to change its fortunes, the apartheid in Israel, as Tanahasee Coates returning from a trip to Hebron in the West Bank explained in an interview with Democracy Now, “looked uncomplicated and familiar.” In Hebron, he saw the racial segregation of the Baltimore he had grown up in³.

A showdown that took place at Georgetown Law in May of 2022 brought all that to the fore. A Zionist professor protested the invitation of Muhammad El Kurd by a newly formed “Justice for Palestine” student group in collaboration with the student organization National Lawyers’ Guild. El-Kurd, whose family home in Sheikh Jarrah was expropriated by Jewish settlers, had become famous recording the daily unfolding of the eviction his family suffered. El-Kurd grew to become a talented writer, poet, speaker and activist on behalf of the Palestinians. He also became a reporter for the Nation magazine having filed for them tens of reports on the state of Israeli occupation by the time he appeared on the Georgetown Law campus.

³ https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=df_u7yJj3k

The Zionist professor charged that El Kurd was an anti-semite and her case against him seemed to echo the talking points ADL had circulated among its followers designed to discredit El-Kurd every where he was invited to speak. Following the objections this professor raised, a statement was issued on behalf of the “Jewish Faculty” calling on the Dean to denounce the invitation of an anti semite and demanded that the Dean develop guidelines on who students could invite to speak at Georgetown Law. The statement solicited and received many signatures by other members of the faculty in solidarity, Jewish and otherwise. The fact that the event had already occurred by the time the showdown reached its apex, and that the event proved “event-less” per the account of the Dean’s representative who had attended the talk, did not seem to make a difference. We were subjected on the faculty email list to several days of various “meltdowns” by Jewish members of the faculty referring to history of pogroms, relatives who died in the holocaust, and anti semitic reactions to curly hair. Apparently, the speech of El-Kurd, who was evicted from his home by Jewish settlers, was at continuum with previous pogroms and holocausts committed by Europeans, because he had mentioned in a poem he wrote when he was 13, that Israelis removed organs from the bodies of killed Palestinians before their bodies were returned to their families. This was reminiscent of the “blood libel” charge of medieval times, they argued, even though Israel had admitted to stealing organs from dead Palestinians without family consent and despite the established fact that Israel had the largest skin bank in the world.

The showdown ended when the Dean refused to play the role of adjudicator of student politics and insisted on confining himself to his administrative role.

What was interesting was that while the statement issued by the “Jewish faculty” had solicited quite a few signatures, many abstained from signing. It was this abstention that was visibly frustrating to those who took to the faculty list, pleading the case that supporting the Jewish faculty’s statement was a show of solidarity Jews desperately needed. And what was most conspicuous about those who abstained was their age group. Most of those who were under 40 years old did not sign.

The statement issued by the Jewish faculty was in fact not new but done in repetition of a previous statement. *That* statement was issued almost a year before, this time by the black faculty condemning the remarks caught on video by the adjunct faculty member Sandra Sellers.

Sellers was recorded talking to her adjunct co-teacher about how much she dreaded the approaching end of semester when she had to grade papers only to discover black students were the worst performers. Sellers and her colleague were suspended then fired. The statement issued by black faculty condemning Sellers and her colleague as racist received almost universal endorsement by the other members of the faculty.

When the Jewish faculty issued its own statement on El Kurd, it was pitching for a repetition: one in universal solidarity from other faculty members, and the other in administrative decisive action. It got neither. Something else was hoped for: a return in favor. Just as the Jewish faculty had extended its solidarity to the black faculty, and went all in with the black faculty's statement, then others should do the same. What became clear was that in the new anti-racist dispensation, Jews were not necessarily a minority that invited immediate sympathy in the way blacks did.

I should say at this point that the new anti-racism that swept over academic institutions in the aftermath of Trump's election, filled me with dread. I was opposed to the formation of anti bias committees which my Dean had put in place, in effect soliciting grievance from students over what other students and members of faculty said in the classroom. Not only was it a dangerous assault on academic freedom, but the new regime was familiar to me as a Palestinian academic. I had spent my career in academia tip toeing my way, worried I might say something offensive to my Zionist colleagues, whose outraged feelings hung like a sword over my neck. The new anti-racism seemed like a universalization of this condition, a kind of a loan of *device* from Zionists to blacks on how to use anti-racism to regulate speech they did not like. I recognized it for what it was and I opposed it. The liberals on the faculty said nothing. They tolerated it as a statement on their joint struggle against anti-racism, even if this extension of *device* would prove to be a burden for Zionist jews as they were not sure what would be made of it.

In the aftermath of the assault on Gaza, Zionist nervousness came to the fore as many black students joined hands with Palestinian, Arab, Muslim and progressive Jewish students calling for a ceasefire in Gaza. The more news of Israeli atrocities and the more images of dead and mutilated children dug from underneath the rubble in Gaza filled social media, the more intense the activism became. The new anti-racism saw Israel as an apartheid state. Poll after poll showed

that the young in the US had more sympathy for Palestine than Israel. The future, it seemed, was Palestinian.

A decisive intervention had to be made. The new anti-racism had to be corrected on how the status of minorities lined up and where Jews stood. It was *Israelis* who were the victims of Hamas atrocities, and it was *American Jews* who were harassed by Pro Palestinian activism. It wasn't that Palestinians were entrapped by Israel in a concentration camp called Gaza, subjected to a genocide by Israel's bombardment and needed anti Israel activism.⁴

A joint intervention by US Congress, Zionist alumni and donors to various universities, in conjunction with Zionist Jewish faculty sought to put things in order in the new anti-racism dispensation. Anti-Zionism equals anti-semitism, Congress declared. Anti Zionist activism jeopardized the sense of safety and well-being of Jewish students, alumni of elite universities insisted, supported by Jewish faculty. Heads of elite universities were subjected to a brutal interrogation by Congress, and one was already pushed out of a job. The fate of the others remains unclear.

And so quickly and in no time, Zionist elites declared it was *Jews*, not Palestinians, who were the honorary victims. The intervention by Zionists to enact change from above is nothing new. Zionism since its inception had relied on intervention from above-mobilization of powerful states and legislatures to enact its wishes and designs. The only populace it relied on to go along was the American one. For the first time in its history, it can see it was losing this one too, by losing its youth. It boded ill for the future.

The above is an example of how Zionism entered the anti-racism debate that emerged in the aftermath of Trump's election and the BLM marches within the left of liberalism. It intervened heavy handedly by settling the debate on behalf of Jews so that they can regain their lost status as minority.

Zionism as Constraint on US Liberalism

⁴ The parallel here with what had happened at Georgetown is clear: it was the injured feelings of a Zionist PMC professor that took precedence in victimhood over the eviction of El-Kurd and his family by Jewish settlers.

Perhaps one of the saddest spectacles of the Gaza Shoah, apart from the devastation it inflicted on the people of Gaza, is the desperation and sense of helplessness it inflicted on the professional internationalist liberal class protesting it. If there was an achievement Western liberalism could point to, surely, it was its design of international humanitarian law that was supposed to constrain the way wars were conducted in the aftermath of the tragedies of the two world wars. As Israel proceeded to commit every war crime listed in humanitarian law, this professional liberal class felt the exasperation of its own powerlessness: it saw itself tasked with overseeing a law that is unenforceable without the good will of the US that insisted on protecting Israel from it. Watching their wrinkled, pitiful, sad, and aghast faces, interviewed on various media outlet made you want to cry. While the whole world condemned Israel's actions and called for a ceasefire, the Biden administration consistently voted, both on the security council and in the General Assembly, to prohibit any such measure.

While the Biden administration moved heavy handedly using the UN post-World War Two colonial structure that gives it overriding power, Zionism moved domestically in the US to echo ideologically what the Biden administration had done internationally. The intervention was designed to create an Israeli exception to domestic liberalism parallel to the exceptionalism granted Israel through the modicum of the US veto to international liberalism. The audience for such a move is the moderate liberal center that habitually votes for the Democrats and for whom right wing populism amounted to domestic "fascism."

Paradoxically, in order to endow Israel with the exception from the reach of liberal expectation, US Zionists had to represent Israel as the privileged regional representative of liberalism. In other words, Israel should be exempted from liberal expectations, Zionists tell US liberals, because it has taken it upon itself to fight the battle on behalf of Western liberalism in a region that is profoundly illiberal. And since it is engaged in such a struggle, liberal expectations on the domestic level, such as the extension of humanitarian considerations to Israel's victims, the Palestinians, must cease. For don't US liberals understand that Israel is not fighting humans proper, but "animals, savages and barbarians" as many Zionist liberals took to X to proclaim⁵? It

⁵ Zionist original representation of what had happened on October 7 has been progressively modified as the truth of what happened came under investigation by Israelis themselves. There was no beheaded babies, as Biden claimed. There was no baked babies in the oven. Take out 200 people of the original 1400 claimed killed by Hamas

would be paradoxical surely, to proclaim, “animals, savages, and barbarians” human and endow them with rights! Not only are humanitarian legal terms such as “disproportionate” and “civilians” need not apply, but every atrocity committed by Israel had to be attributed to Hamas. It was *Hamas* that willed those abominable crimes, including the genocide of its own people, as Hamas knew how Israel would react to October 7. Zionism demanded of US liberalism to drop its ideas of “agency”, its humanism, and its adulation of freedom and its pursuit.

In other words what Zionism asks US liberalism to do is to limit its principles to those who are liberal (civilized) and withhold them from those who are illiberal (uncivilized) thus offering US liberals a secular version of the civilizational discourse that pervades the right: Judo/Christian civilization vs Islam; the Euro race vs other inferior immigrant races.

Those demands are not altogether strange to US liberalism as Samuel Moyn tells us in his latest book, “Liberalism Against Itself.” The liberalism that developed in the US in the cold war period, Moyn argues, was a compromise formation. It was a defensive liberalism that treated “liberty” in the West as a fragile creature confronting powerful enemies abroad (and potentially internally), namely, communism and fascism. It was a liberalism that was obsessed with the state (seen as malevolent) and that worried about individual freedom (seen as fragile). A liberalism that was horrified by violence (especially of post world war 2 anti colonial movements) and that shunned, according to Moyn, its enlightenment and romantic legacies which had preached in the 19th century the pursuit of freedom from social, religious and political constraints even if this pursuit was violent. This withdrawn liberalism however made an exception to Zionism: only Zionism could pursue its nationalist project “romantically” with all the violence this might entail. Naturally, what was given Zionism was withdrawn from its nemesis the Palestinians: their resistance to the Zionist project was illiberal violence through and through. The reason Zionism was given this exceptional license to be “romantic” is the fact that the majority of twentieth century liberal theorists were Jews who had escaped the Nazis.

as those were dead Palestinians. Hamas did not incinerate anybody because Israelis killed their own from the sky and through tank fire. As for the rape of women, no evidence has thus far been provided.

Boomer liberals watch legacy media which always lags-compared to social media- in modifying the original story. First impressions stay when corrections occur after a while. The truth is consistently manipulated to represent “Hamas” as “savage” and in association Gazans. Thus making them worthy of massacre.

This remains the case until today. Most members of the PMC think of themselves as liberal. Jews constitute a prominent presence in this class and many, if not most of them, are Zionist. Given this organic connection, one would be hard pressed to parse out Zionism from liberalism in the US. They are intertwined and reciprocally defining. Note the soft-glove-representation of Israeli war crimes: in journalism, among the expert political class, and in academia- even if those in power in Israel were the ultra settler right. Zionism in this class plays the role of deferring liberal intolerance of humanitarian crimes. If the right wing Zionist relishes the death of the Palestinian, and the liberal Zionist is Ok with it, “Oh pity the Palestinian, why does he have to resist his fate so hard!”, the non Jewish liberal is asked by the Zionist Jew of his class to stay mum about it, to tolerate it, to wait it out, to look away. This demand for tolerating the intolerable is the way Zionism in the US functions as an ideological constraint of US liberalism. A constraint that creates a time lag in the reactions of the liberal to the massacre of Palestinians or the sense that the liberal is always “conflicted” on how to judge this violence.

Take Bill Mahr as an example. He has thus far done two segments on his show on the Gaza Shoah. In the first one, aired a month after the invasion of Gaza by the IDF, he mocked the young for their pro Palestinian position, for don’t these young Americans understand that Hamas is anti liberal and doesn’t share their progressive politics: gay rights, women’s rights, trans rights? In the second one, as the Shoah in Gaza took a really dark turn, Mahr made fun of the Palestinians themselves for not accepting their fate, namely, expulsion from their land by the Zionists. Why can’t Palestinians just move on like other native populations had done before them? The joke here is that Palestinians are so “irrational” and so stupid they don’t understand they were nothing more than “dead man walking.” Being so stupid, they deserve their death, mutilation, hunger, disease, and displacement. Hahahahah

Mahr here is an articulate spokesperson for Zionism addressing US liberals. He is asking them to laugh at the death of Palestinians because irrational people cannot be pitied. They can only be disciplined harshly, being savages or child-like, into submission to their fate and that is what the Gaza Shoah is about. Through Zionism, US liberalism is made to tolerate genocide.

(Observe the chuckling liberals on Mahr’s panel as he reads his “New Rule!”)

This is not to say that the Zionist tolerance of violence against Palestinians will be the same as the liberal's. It's just that we don't know when the US liberal will bolt and rebel against Zionist tutelage and when he or she will declare that they have had enough. This is always an open question, in matters small and large, when it comes to Israel.

Interestingly, while US liberalism grants Zionism the "romantic" exception, left liberals grant it to Palestinians. This split is also generational: the younger you are, the more you are likely to be sympathetic not so much with Zionist violence, but with the violence of Palestinian resistance.

Zionism as Handmaiden for Repressed Expression on the Right

Gaza Shoah came to the right like rain falling on thirsty land. Nostalgic for a world before globalization, multiculturalism and social liberalism, seeing itself in perpetual retreat before the advancing liberalism, a liberalism that in its latest stage swapped places with the right to become the handmaiden of the authoritarian state (hate speech), and the friend of the deep state (surveillance), the right embraced Zionist dictates with open arms. Zionism gave the right a language to speak that gratified its nostalgia for the past of euro supremacy. For is there anything more beautiful than to watch a state-Israel- acting ruthlessly in the name of Jewish supremacy without the slightest care in the world, without minding "liberalism", domestic or international? That liberalism that is the bane of the right's existence especially since the rise of right wing populism? How free must Israel appear! And the beauty of it is that the right can cheer Israel on without fear of condemnation, without appearing cruel and demented. After all, it was all done in the name of fighting "anti semitism". Don't liberals care about the Jews or is it only blacks they care about?

Everything the right wanted to say about blacks but couldn't because of "cancel culture" it can now say vicariously say about Palestinians.

Megan Kelly declared on her show that the people of Gaza should be "shipped to Egypt and not allowed to come here" with which Jeremy Boreing of the Daily Wire heartily agreed, "Yea they are not like us. We don't want them here." Kelly was particularly bothered by pro-Palestinian campus activism because they "hurt the feelings of my Jewish friends."

History has yet to move for Kelly. She is stuck on October 7th, a fetishistic focus on “Jewish injury” that apparently justifies everything that happened afterwards. She has made no mention, none whatsoever, of the Gaza Shoah as if to say, “Serves them right: man, woman, and child, they deserve to die, in whatever number, please don’t bother me, for they brought it unto themselves!” Kelly’s nostalgia is for September 11 and the war on terror; a nostalgia for an incinerating imperial machine that can lay to waste all those brown people! And what a relief after all those years the cancel culture of liberals forced the right to pay homage to these people as “minorities”.

“Screw’em” shiksa Kelly wants to say.

What is interesting about the American right is that it has imbibed almost perfectly the post World War 2 Euro-American consensus to make Palestinians pay for the holocaust. Well if they were going to pay for it, we might as well describe them as Nazi-like, maybe even the real Nazis. Didn’t Netanyahu claim that it was Sheikh Amin Hussein who convinced Hitler to kill the Jews? In the midst of the Gaza Shoah, Rod Dherer of the New Conservative writes on X,

"View from my cafe table on the square in the historic heart of Jewish Vienna this past summer. Unbearably poignant to see Jewish children playing on a sunny afternoon next to the Shoah memorial. Those demonic ghouls will never, ever eliminate this great people."

Why experience persecutory guilt about what happened to the Jews of Europe when you can project all those feelings unto the Palestinians-let them bear the guilt of Europe’s crimes. Zionism was not opposed to that arrangement at all since it gave credence to its ethnocidal strategy towards the Palestinians, for it was their hatred of the Jews that made Zionists kick them off their land (repeatedly).

In this wonderful reciprocal arrangement, Zionism exonerates the right of its anti semitism as the right uses Zionism to enact its fantasies of unabashed-liberal-approved- racial supremacy.

As with the exchange between Kelly and Boreing above, Zionism also allows the right the opportunity to decry the ills of immigration, without being accused of racism. The frequency of

pro-Palestinian protests across US cities, as well as in every major European capital alarmed the right. “Who are those people? I have nothing in common with them? Where did these people come from? Why do we let them in? How must my Jewish friends feel around them?!”

As whole Arab and Muslim American families walked in protest against the Gaza Shoah, exercising their democratic right, the right went into meltdown having spent years accusing them of being culturally “undemocratic.” It turns out it was the sight of the veil and kofiya that was really disturbing. Something else was really disturbing: the sight of the reproductive Muslim, especially for the right that is fighting, in US and in Europe alike, against the declining birth rates of its contemporaries. Surely, this reproductive, child loving Muslim will inherit the West! Surely, the future is Muslim!

Israelis killing children in Gaza in the thousands, surely, is a sight for soar right wing eyes. Kill those children, kill them, there are just too many of them!

The only segment on the right that hasn't Zionized itself is the populist right. Ben Shapiro went stark raving mad when Tucker Carlson asked rhetorically, “Why is my country financing wars abroad when Americans are dying of Fentanyl!” This open discussion of resources: those that go to Israel are ones better spent domestically, is objectionable to Zionism and the thought of it could not be tolerated. While the populist right resists Zionist capture, it still shares with the rest of the right, the incapacity to think of the humanity of Palestinians. The Gaza Shoah is “wars abroad” or “Israel's war” or “Israel's mess” that is of no concern to me. But at least this populist right objects to the continuous bridge of weapons and finances that Biden has erected to subsidize the Gaza Shoah; and that is nothing to scoff at.