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The Palestinian resistance will continue no matter what we write about it. In the summer of 2005, I had the opportunity to study at Birzeit University near Ramallah in Israel’s Occupied Palestinian Territories. Of course, I was horrified by the construction of the wall, the annexation of land, the checkpoints, the daily, sometimes hourly harassment of innocent people by the Israeli army, the constant surveillance—the dehumanizing ‘matrix of control’ Israel exerts in order to ensure the dominance of an expansionist regime of some three hundred thousand illegal settlers in the West Bank. But more than this common outrage, I also left with an unmistakable impression of the entrenched, inspiring, imperfect, relentless dignity of the Palestinian people. That being said, geographical Palestine is fast disappearing—like the evaporating inkblots on the inset of Elyas Khoury’s *Gate of the Sun*—and with it, the last hope of the two-state solution.

This summer, a conference at York University in Canada will attempt to revisit the question of partition. To support their vision, the conference organizers invoked the liberal outlook of humanist Jewish intellectuals such as Martin Buber and Judah Leon Magnes as proponents of a one-state solution. Perhaps this was also part of a strategy to negotiate the conference’s public legitimacy in a politically volatile and polarized academic environment, fraught as it is with endless accusations of anti-Semitism and ideological bias.¹ Here, the haunting of present-day politics by the ghosts of the past reminds us of “the sites of trauma, memory, remediation, and the fracturing of temporality”² that is increasingly part of our attempts to understand and reckon with the question of Palestine. From our vantage here in Lebanon, at the American University of Beirut, I suppose we have some of our own liberal ghosts to deal with. In true Anglo-American style, as a history of ideas, and because both of their positions regarding Palestine are problematic in their own way, I propose that we now confront the specters of Michel Chiha and Isaiah Berlin.
II.

The reasons that would compel us to compare Michel Chiha to Isaiah Berlin are surprisingly numerous. Both men are widely seen as liberal intellectuals tied inextricably to the public conversations and politics of their time. They both wrote essays on liberty. They loved poetry, culture and rational conversation, revealed in cosmopolitan milieus, and inspired those who knew them by their captivating intelligence. Both were born into socially conservative, minority communities (Orthodox-Jewish Latvian and Chaldean-Christian Lebanese, respectively) to wealthy families active in commercial trade. When the late Edward Said writes of the exilic imagination produced by the displacement of intellectuals, we might also recall that Michel Chiha evaded Ottoman conscription during the First World War by re-locating to the relative safety of British colonial Egypt—with Bchara el-Khoury, Yousef el-Sawda and the grand liban national architects in exile. Meanwhile, Isaiah Berlin had fled Latvia with his parents, in the early years of the Russian revolution, to settle in London. There, he eventually attained a storied donship and professorship at Oxford, consorted with the likes of Bertrand Russell, W. H. Auden and T.S. Eliott and built his reputation as a brilliant historian of ideas renowned for his encyclopedic knowledge.

Samir Khalaf tells us, in his introduction to the English translations of Michel Chiha’s Le Jour editorials (1945-1954) that Chiha also had occasion to study in England. The sense he gained there of the “resilience of the unwritten British constitution,” Khalaf argues, would come to inform his participation in the drafting of the Lebanese constitution of 1926. His collected writings indicate how closely Chiha followed British politics, with particular attention to the matter of Jewish settlement in mandatory Palestine. His knowledge of prominent Oxford lecturers and historians such as Cyril Falls suggests that Chiha might have heard of Isaiah Berlin, one of the young rising stars of All Souls College.

There were also many differences between the two. Chiha was the picture of perfect Francophile politesse, Berlin, the “patron saint of untidiness.” On issues such as free trade, the family, and law and order, Chiha represented the ‘conservative’ Burkean side of liberalism, while Berlin embodied more of the modern, left-leaning liberal outlook which “tended to vote Labour and supported Roosevelt’s New Deal.”
Berlin was knighted by the Queen in 1957 for his services to conversation,\textsuperscript{10} but in Lebanon, Chiha was no less a national treasure who “filled the whole country with his strong personality.”\textsuperscript{11} “Our relief,” wrote Charles Helou, the fourth President of Lebanon, “was to be able to compare this Lebanese, for his spirit and character, to the greatest of this world and of our times...”\textsuperscript{12} And so it would certainly follow in the spirit of Helou’s words to compare Michel Chiha and Isaiah Berlin. Most importantly for our present purposes, their diverging opinions about the question of Palestine should encourage us to draw a critical distinction between professed liberal values and real politics, which I shall attempt to explore in the latter part of this essay. But let us first begin with dialogue on geographies and on liberty and nationalism, in order to set the stage, as it were, as Hamlet enjoins the Ghost; “come let us go together.”\textsuperscript{13}

\section*{On geographies}

At age twenty-five, Isaiah Berlin made a brief visit to Lebanon in the summer of 1934. It was two years before the Arab revolt in Palestine when a forty-three year-old Michel Chiha launched the opposition journal, \textit{Le Jour},\textsuperscript{14} which would go on to print so many of his editorials.\textsuperscript{15} Like the great American poet, Robert Frost, Berlin “was fascinated by human variety far more than he was moved by natural beauty”\textsuperscript{16} —\textit{and yet} Henry Hardy’s collection of Berlin’s correspondence reveals one notable exception:

...Baalbeck & Beirut & the great road South, with the magnificent green slopes of the Lebanon on the left & the Sea on the right—it really is so beautiful that even I who have no eyes was absolutely amazed & stopped talking...\textsuperscript{17}

The symbolic geographies of the Mountain and the Sea lie at the heart of Michel Chiha’s political philosophy.\textsuperscript{18} Even if his reading of port cities suggests a radically different conception of democracy and the \textit{mediterranee}, Rancière also insisted that representational politics persist in the landscapes that encompass them.\textsuperscript{19} Chiha explains his endless draft sketches of the nation’s symbolic geography in his \textit{Visage et Presence du Liban},\textsuperscript{20} an exhibition of ‘becoming’ which parallels Henri Bergson’s metaphor of Paris in infinite photographs, or the urban fragments of Venice in Italo Calvino’s enigmatic novella, \textit{Invisible Cities}. Berlin believed profoundly in the power of ideas to shape the course of human history,\textsuperscript{21} and so would have been interested in Chiha’s representations—which always sought out a common national language amidst a plurality of
Lebanese cultural idioms. Still, Berlin would not have accepted a particular essentializing mode that equated the West with civilization, the sun and the sea, and the East with barbarism, the mountain and the desert.\textsuperscript{22}

\textbf{On Liberty and Nationalism}

It was the sun of a Beirut summer that inspired Chiha to pen his essay on liberty.\textsuperscript{23} \textit{Sur la Liberté} is an exposition on what Isaiah Berlin identified as ‘positive liberty’ in his now widely read 1958 inaugural lecture.\textsuperscript{24} Chiha writes,

\begin{quote}
“Ainsi la liberté et la morale, la liberté et la loi, la liberté et la sagesse, la liberté et la justice se rejoignent et s’équilibrent.”\textsuperscript{25}
\end{quote}

Liberty, for Chiha, is found in the law, as justice is found in order, wisdom in restraint and morality in discipline. As Berlin often pointed out, ‘positive liberty’ in this sense of self-mastery, at the group level, can easily lead to political modalities of control, discipline and uniformity, which is perhaps why we see it in Chiha’s articulation of Lebanese nationalism. What Berlin called ‘negative liberty’, though, also appears in Chiha’s work. In \textit{Plains-Chants}, it is,

\begin{quote}
“This liberté qui est l’honneur de l’espèce et qui permet le bien et le mal... qui donne à l’être raisonnable un pouvoir souverain...”\textsuperscript{26}
\end{quote}

This passage is reminiscent of J.S. Mill’s injunction that the individual should do as he thinks best, free from the intervention of the state or the tyranny of the majority. I think it is useful to think of Michel Chiha as a champion first of ‘positive liberty’, and Isaiah Berlin as a champion first of ‘negative liberty’—although each understood and recognized the implications of both modes of human freedom.

Isaiah Berlin’s philosophy rests upon ideas and human agency in history as well as the complexity and tentativeness of human existence—in a lack of fundamental moral certainty. Values are plural; no one utopian moral theory can account for all essentially distinctive desires. Thus a ‘tragedy of choice’ exists between multiple incommensurable goods. Liberty, then, must always be given priority to allow for the necessary deliberations of rational conscience.

How can we reconcile Berlin’s liberalism with his position on Jewish nationalism? Liberals are traditionally averse to nationalism because it seems to restrict the political space of toleration\textsuperscript{27}
for those excluded by definition from the national project—read; the Palestinians. Stephen Lukes\textsuperscript{28} and Kenan Malik\textsuperscript{29} have both reminded us of how Berlin’s value pluralism “encourages people to search for differences between them, rather than frame their identities around what they might have in common.”\textsuperscript{30}

This moves us closer to what Michel Chiha referred to as “the desire to live together” with all of the tension and conflict of incorporation that this desire entails.\textsuperscript{31} In classical fashion, Chiha attempted to give this drive substance through a philosophy of civic nationalism that closely mirrored Ernest Renan’s “plébiscite de tous les jours,”\textsuperscript{32} or Jawad Boulos’ “pacte tacite.”\textsuperscript{33} Representatives of Lebanon’s religiously demarcated communities would come together in the national assembly not principally as legislators but as a community of notables.\textsuperscript{34} Chiha saw Lebanon as a haven for minorities fleeing persecution (a theme Berlin would have been sympathetic to) but the executive powers granted to the Christian President of the Republic through the 1926 constitution reflected a desire to place “final control of policy in Christian hands.”\textsuperscript{35} Chiha saw the Christians (in an oligarchic power-sharing relationship with Sunni business elites) as the benign guarantors of a Lebanese ‘market state’.\textsuperscript{36} It is thus the inherent dignity\textsuperscript{37} of economic man that finds common expression in Chiha’s civic ideology, rather than liberty conceived in the mode of Berlinian humanism—it is, in fact, the classical liberty of laissez-faire capitalism.

III.

On ghosts

“If I am getting ready to speak about ghosts... it is in the name of justice.”

~Jacques Derrida, Specters of Marx, Exordium, p. xviii

Imagine Chiha and Berlin sitting down to pheasant Provençal under glass, with a bottle of that exquisite 1929 Chateau Lafite Rothschild, cigars and newspapers of course, and an evening full of discussion in the opulent surrounds of Chiha’s villa in Yarzeh.\textsuperscript{38} As Lyotard said, “it is impossible to think or write without some facade of a house at least rising up, a phantom, to receive and to
make a work of our peregrinations.” 39 Lately I have been imagining such ghostly salon affairs. As Derrida said, the appearance of ghosts of the past reminds us of “what is no longer present.” 40 But who could abide such visitations? I am sure, for instance, that the ‘Specter of Berlin’ would not scare Elyas Khoury. The sudden appearance of the ghost of Hannah Arendt, however, would most certainly cause Tzipi Livni a great deal of discomfort. And if the brutal targeting of civilians in wartime by a Jewish army does not sit well with the legacy of Adorno or Benjamin, nor would the humanistic ghosts of Magnes or Buber find many friends left amongst the “suburban squires” of the new Jerusalem... and all of this is to say that Edward Said was right when he proclaimed the audacious truth that he was the last Jewish intellectual. 41

Michel Chiha, Isaiah Berlin... reflections on Palestine

“On the whole,” writes Berlin’s official biographer, Michael Ignatieff, “[Berlin] fought the sentimental undertow of identification with Palestine all his life. He was a Zionist—but already he was troubled by the Zionist myth of Palestine as a land without people given to a people without land.” As an analyst employed by the Foreign Office in WW2, Berlin’s Zionism came into conflict with official British policy (most notably the White Paper ban on Jewish immigration in 1941) 42 recalling Chiha’s acerbic remark, “…ne voit-on pas qu’il devient difficile de rester un bon juif et un bon anglais en même temps?” 43

Ultimately, Berlin declined Chaim Weizmann’s invitation to live in Israel after 1948, and settled down at Oxford where he became a fixture of British public life. From then on he would defend the right of Jews to live in a country where they no longer faced the pressures of assimilation or exclusion, but “…he knew he could never be fully at home in Israel.” 44 Indeed, Berlin seldom wrote about Zionism directly, claiming that it wasn’t the role of Diaspora Jews to comment on Israeli affairs. 45

Just as Chiha’s cosmopolitanism “stretch[ed] his Lebanese nationalism to the breaking point,” 46 Berlin’s own liberal values had made his ardent Zionism problematic—as revealed in the comments of his close friend, the Croatian pianist, Alfred Brendel. 47 If Berlin could castigate T.S. Elliott for imagining the Jews placed outside of the borders of the city, 48 then how could he condone the exile and eviction of Palestinians from their homes in 1948? As the years went on,
and the situation proved intractable, Berlin continued to place his hope for a peaceful resolution to the Palestinian-Israeli conflict in liberal Zionism, and *Peace Now*. Unfortunately, as Gideon Levy recently pronounced in *Ha’aretz*, nothing is left of the peace movement in Israel.⁴⁹

On the other hand, I believe that Chiha’s prescient analysis—and his stand with the Palestinians against their dispossessionswill prove to be the version ultimately vindicated by history. Chiha called for the internationalization of Jerusalem, he believed in the territorial integrity of Palestine, and even accepted limited Jewish immigration as a cultural and economic boon to the region. He accurately predicted that the creation of the state of Israel would not only harm the Palestinians, but would usher in an era of destabilizing violence, extremism and persecution with dire consequences for Lebanon as well; “we are the immediate neighbors of this ambition and power,” he wrote in an October 1947 editorial in *le Jour*. “Jewish intentions can only take their hoped-for course by trampling over us.”⁵⁰ Still, one question remains: why did Chiha support Palestine when so many of the pro-Western bankers, adepts of free trade, poets, nationalists and purveyors Phoenician myths were—like Emile Eddé—actively colluding with the Jewish Agency in an effort to establish a formal Zionist-Lebanese treaty?⁵¹

Perhaps Chiha feared that Tel Aviv would come to eclipse Beirut economically and take its place as intermediary between the West and its nascent commercial interests in the Middle East.⁵² Or, he might have been simply pandering to the “dominant view of the Arab-Israeli conflict developed among Arab ruling classes” of his time, which he had in large part produced through his own influential writings.⁵³ Whether he hoped to endear himself to the sources of Palestinian intellectual and financial capital displaced by the Zionist project, or whether his feelings were actually inspired by a genuine sense of social justice, Chiha relied so heavily on the polemical phantasm of a crypto-Marxist conspiracy of wealthy Jews pulling the strings of world governments,⁵⁴ that a sympathetic liberal-humanist reading of his *Palestine* strains credulity.⁵⁵ At least Isaiah Berlin would have held him to task for this if they had met in Beirut. At the same time, Berlin might have learned directly from the eloquent Michel Chiha, of the “disaster on its way” ⁵⁶ if the Jewish state was to antagonize Islamic constituencies, disrupt the coastal political economy, and in so doing threaten the stability of Chiha’s Lebanese constitutional order.
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Among the dead cities

Where does a liberal stand in the aftermath of the latest IDF military assault on Gaza? Here, liberal philosophy has given way to real politics; the unchecked militarism of a “rogue state,” as Avi Shlaim made clear in his January 2009 Guardian op-ed, continues to oppress its occupied population and threaten regional and global stability. At the domestic level, the resurgence of Benyamin Netanyahu and his Jabotinskian vision of the ‘iron wall’, the power of Avigdor Lieberman and his neo-fascist Israel Beiteinu, the utter collapse of the Israeli peace movement, and the development of an ever more brutal Israeli technological machinery of war brought to bear against the divided Palestinian people... all of this heralds the endgame of the disaster Chiha foretold sixty years ago. The ‘bent twig’ of Zionism now more closely parallels that “pathological nationalism” that Berlin described in a 1972 Thames Television discussion with Stuart Hampshire—but would never admit could be true of Jewish nationalism. And yet his warning resonates, that “all divisions in a sense carry with them potential dangers of collision of an irrational kind,” and while nationalism, according to Berlin, is yet one more “ordinary” aspect of human diversity and variety, it so often leads to violent confrontation, to fanaticism, to “death [and] suffering...” And so, where A.C. Grayling encourages us to consider the morality of bombing civilians in wartime from the vantage of fire-ravaged Dresden in his Among the Dead Cities, or Raimond Gaita from Hiroshima and Nagasaki, reading Michel Chiha’s Palestine should leave us now walking in the wreckage of the crowded slums of Gaza, in the aftermath of Israel’s latest campaign of barbarism against the Palestinian people in 2008. At least we know that there can be no liberty, no flourishing of the individual who is subject to colonial settlement and ethnic cleansing. What liberal values are possible then, which do not recognize the rights of the Palestinians?
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