Andrew D. Yablon '92 in his recent column, distorted the Palestinian question.

Yablon argues that Jordan has no legitimate claim to the West Bank because "Jordan's borders are arbitrary partitions created by European colonialists when they divided the Ottoman Empire." If this argument were to be used as a basis for legitimacy, one has to accept that Israel also has no legitimate claim to the territories it occupied after the 1967 war because it was annexed by Jordan after the 1948 war, not as a result of colonial partitioning. This, of course, makes the claim of Jordanian sovereignty over the West Bank more legitimate, as it is based on the right of nations to self-determination.

Yablon's column continues:

He criticizes those who support any substantiation that "Palestinians faced with the choice of either a Jordanian or an Israeli occupation than under the current Israeli occupation." Jordanian colonialism is a mere illusion, he claims, because the Palestinians in the West Bank were given Jordanian nationality, and they have to vote for their representatives in the Jordanian Parliament. What is terrifying is that the call for a Palestinian state, alongside the Jordanian state, is not enough, according to Yablon, because the Palestinians have to agree to give up the larger part of a land which was entirely theirs less than 80 years ago, in order to be allowed to keep the smaller part, because they would rather live in a two-way street than to keep suffering and dying for a goal they cannot achieve.

Yablon's logic is not only self-serving, but also intellectually dishonest. He conveniently ignores that violence and suffering are a result of constant Israeli occupation. He states that "the Palestinians raised Jewish settlements and shed Jewish blood long before there ever was a Jewish homeland," ignoring that violence and bloodshed was, and still is, a two-way street (does he need examples?). Moreover, by using the Holocaust victims to gain sympathy for his point of view, he trivializes that tragic part of history, and introduces facts which have no relevance to the issue he is discussing.

He claims that "the Palestinians have systematically rejected diplomatic initiatives in favor of more violent means of expression." This is a result of colonial partitioning. Clearly, Yablon is using the argument that the Palestinians have rejected the peace process as a result of the Israeli occupation for his point of view, he trivializes that tragic part of history, and introduces facts which have no relevance to the issue he is discussing.

He states that "the Palestinians have been driven more violent means of expression," because they would rather live in a two-way street than to keep suffering and dying for a goal they cannot achieve.

Yablon's logic is not only self-serving, but also intellectually dishonest. He conveniently ignores that violence and suffering are a result of constant Israeli occupation. He states that "the Palestinians raised Jewish settlements and shed Jewish blood long before there ever was a Jewish homeland," ignoring that violence and bloodshed was, and still is, a two-way street (does he need examples?). Moreover, by using the Holocaust victims to gain sympathy for his point of view, he trivializes that tragic part of history, and introduces facts which have no relevance to the issue he is discussing.