

The Marginalization of the Palestinian in Philip Roth's *Operation Shylock*: A Postcolonial Study

Siham Hadj Henni

The University of Jordan, Amman, Jordan

Mahmoud F. Alshetawi

Department of English, School of Foreign Languages, The University of Jordan, Amman, Jordan

Abstract—This paper approaches Philip Roth's semi-autobiographical novel *Operation Shylock* (1993), an appropriation of Shakespeare's *The Merchant of Venice*, from a postcolonial angle attempting to find an answer to Spivak's question: Can the Subaltern Speak? It focuses on how Philip Roth silences the Palestinian "Other" in his narrative telling the story of the Palestinian-Israeli conflict from a Zionist perspective. More interestingly, the study explains how Israelis interpret the reasons behind their victimization of the Palestinian using the argument that they were already victims of the Holocaust and a long traumatic past struggling to maintain social self-esteem and a tolerant acceptance in the world. Furthermore, it exposes the ways Philip Roth depicted the state of mind of Jewish characters in the novel and the effect of war trauma on their treatment of the "Other". Then, the study provides a critical reading of how Philip Roth legitimizes the victimization of the Palestinian neglecting his existence using Edward Said's *Orientalism*.

Index Terms—Subaltern, silencing, Palestinian, Jews, victimization, conflict

I. INTRODUCTION

To start with, the Jewish experience all over the world for seeking a home to settle in is reflected in Jewish literature. Authors raised the Jewish question via literature depicting how Jewish community suffered alienation and marginality while fighting to gain acceptance and social respect. In most of American literary works Jews are threatened by Palestinian terrorism and the only thing they seek is peace. Leon Uris's *The Haj* would be a good example of how American narrative allies with Jews and excludes Palestinians. The author is clearly anti-Arab as he creates the character Haj Ibrahim as an uneducated leader who acts out of his Arabic primitive traditions, and who learns sex from a Jewish lady. Uris negatively stereotypes Arabs and makes them confess their negative qualities; the character Nuri claims, "We are people living in hate, despair, and darkness" (1985, p.32). This study is a continuation to Saddik M. Gohar's paper *Narrating the Palestinian in Philip Roth's Operation Shylock* as it completes it via presenting a detailed textual analysis to prove that the Palestinian is "muted" in a pro-Israeli narration. Gohar (2010) asserts "Roth's fiction, like other American novels dealing with the Middle East conflict, is an attempt to silence the Palestinian subaltern" (p.108).

Arguably, Jonathan Rynhold in his *The Arab Israeli conflict in American Political Culture* illustrates the reasons behind the American support for Israel and refers to the American culture as a strong reason. Also, American sympathy towards Israel is more than a cultural aspect; it is political too. Israel is a good ally for America, "Americans continue to view Israel as an ally in a struggle against common enemies like radical Islamic terrorism and Iran" said Jonathan (p. 15). Gohar in *The Distortion of the Arab-Israeli Conflict in American Fiction: A Study of The Haj* (2007) has approached *The Haj* as a biased narrative told from a pro-Israeli perspective and illustrates how the Palestinians are portrayed as "barbaric race threatening the existence of Israel" (p. 31). Gohar has never been biased to Arabs or Palestine in particular in his study of *The Haj*. He states that Jews existed in Palestine and criticized the character Ahmed for his ignorance of this fact, he views "Ahmad's biased argument runs counter to history because the Jews have been part of ancient Palestine sharing a homeland with other, races and religions for ages" (p. 32).

II. THE DEPICTION OF PALESTINIAN-ISRAELI CONFLICT IN JEWISH LITERATURE

This study illustrates how Arab-Israeli conflict is treated in Philip Roth's *Operation Shylock* from a postcolonial perspective. *Operation Shylock: a Confession* (1993) portrays the struggle between Palestine and Israel from a biased Jewish-American perspective. The Jewish American author Philip Roth narrates the Arab-Israeli conflict by voicing his Jewish protagonist to narrate his story. The reader ends up with an unbalanced narrative while referring to the Palestinian-Israeli dichotomy, for the narrative is told by one side telling its story as well as the story of the other side. This paper focuses on two major important issues: it discusses how Roth marginalizes the "other" and mutes him as it gives a critical reading of his use of Jewish Diaspora to promote for the Zionist project.

Theorists have discussed the act of narrating the story of the “other”, without allowing him to tell his own story in different discourses. In her *Can the Subaltern Speak?* (1988) Gayatri Spivak has discussed this issue putting it in a colonial and neocolonialist mold questioning the voice of “the subaltern”. In this context, Philip Roth tells his semi-autobiographical work through the voice of his protagonist Philip narrating the Palestinian-Israeli conflict marginalizing the Palestinian character Ziad. Roth does not allow Ziad to speak about his Palestinian nation by minimizing his textual parts to the extreme and centralizing Philip as the source of both narratives; the Israeli as well as the Palestinian. Roth’s desire to give priority to the voiced Jewish Philip over the voiceless Palestinian Ziad serves certain goals leading to the re-division of power. Accordingly, Spivak (1988) asserts, “we never desire against our interests, because interest always follows and finds itself where desire has placed it” (p. 68). Thus, Philip is exercising his power as a colonizer to classify the colonized in a way which serves his interests.

Throughout the novel the reader understands that the character Philip believes in the Zionist project and the settlement of Jews in Palestine neglecting the existence of Palestinians in this land. For this interest, Ziad “the subaltern” is muted, to a certain extent, in the novel and the voice is given to the Israeli Philip so he can manipulate the narrative according to his interests. Spivak refers to the role of western scholarship in narrating the story of oppressed communities marginalizing and humiliating them. Philip asserts,

Don’t tell me how the Palestinians are accommodating. Don’t tell me how the Palestinians have legitimate claims. Don’t tell me how the Palestinians are oppressed and that an injustice has been done. Stop that immediately! I cannot raise money with that in America. Tell me about how we are threatened, tell me about terrorism, tell me about anti-Semitism and the Holocaust (Roth, 1993, p. 125).

Philip’s speech illustrates how the colonizer attempts to silence the colonized purposefully preventing his story to be narrated and his voice to be heard. This is exactly the role of western intellectuals in empowering their narrative through eliminating any other counter-narratives. The narrator Philip is a well known intellectual and author who has a considerable influence on audience, and that is why he is chosen by the author Philip Roth to voice the Israeli Jewish community at the expense of the Palestinians. To Spivak, the intellectual is highly positioned to participate in dividing power, “the intellectual, within socialized capital, brandishing concrete experience, can help consolidate the international division of power” (Spivak, 1988, p.69). Thus, Philip makes the “subaltern” muted to free himself from any chains while empowering the Zionist project and gain more allies and partisans. He centralizes the Jewish experience at the heart of the novel pushing the Palestinian one to the margin, ending up with a biased narrative apparently based on an unfair division of powers.

Furthermore, the narrator Philip did not only mute the subaltern; instead, he gives him a fake voice which leads the reader to construct a negative image about him. When Philip and Ziad met in Jerusalem the latter felt nostalgic to his home and past starting to describe how his family and his father particularly suffered after the destruction of their home by the occupier. Philip has no reaction, he asks:

“What do you do here, Zee?”

Smiling at me benignly, he answered, “hate.”

I did not know what to reply and so said nothing.

“She had it right, the expert on my mentality, what she said is true, I am a stone- throwing Arab consumed by hate. (Roth, 1993, p. 113)

Describing a Palestinian who is defending his land against the occupier by “a stone thrower” and referring back to hate as the only reason is a biased representation. Philip never questions the source of this hate or considers the act of throwing stones a reaction to an action which takes place previously, a reaction to colonialism. The narrator only focuses on his narrative by promoting the ideology of hatred of Jews or Anti-Semitism so the audience sympathizes with the settlement of Jews in Palestine and supports the Zionist enterprise.

Moreover, when Ziad talked to Philip about the different confused feelings and attitudes he felt, the latter pays no attention. He views Ziad as an unstable man who knows nothing about what he is talking about, “And I said nothing, did not so much as challenge one excessive claim or do anything to clarify his thinking or to take exception where I knew he did not know what he was talking about” (Roth, 1993, p. 121). This is apparently, using Spivak’s terms, the role of “colonialist elitism” in “misrepresenting the so called third world” (oppressed community). Later in the novel, Philip, whether directly or indirectly, addresses Ziad as an unfaithful to his community by thinking of him as a spy who betrays the question of his people. Philip says, “I studied him with the coldhearted fascination and intense excitement of a well-placed spy” (Roth, 1993, p. 121). This is direct accusation of betrayal through which the narrator portrays the Palestinian himself, Ziad, as a non believer of his cause. He is using both his voice and Ziad’s one to empower the Jewish question and, in return, to exclude the Palestinian one. According to Spivak, Philip’s manipulation of the subaltern’s voice is a colonialist tool to spread the Zionist ideology without facing any resistance or opposition.

According to Philip, each act which does not serve the Israeli Zionist interest is viewed as a tenet of Anti-Semitism which is rooted from hatred of Jews. “We recognize that by choosing Jews as the target for our hatred, we have become anti-Semites and that all our thoughts and actions have been affected by this prejudice” (Roth, p. 100), Philip asserts in explaining one of the tenets of Anti-Semitism. Anti-Semitism is but a stalking horse to voice the Jew and simultaneously silence the Palestinian “other” aiming to settle in this land and achieve stability which makes an end to the Jewish Diaspora.

Using history and signaling attention to Jews' victimization are recurrent factors in the novel used as an expedience to dispossess Palestinians from their motherland. Philip says, "To remind the world ... that the Jews were victims before they were conquerors and that they are conquerors only because they are victims" (Roth, 1993, p. 124). This proves that Philip sees conquering Palestine as a result to "the memory of Jewish victimization" and apologizes it as "nothing more than a self defense". So, isn't the act of throwing a stone on the conqueror apologetic for the Palestinian? Isn't throwing a stone on the invader who targets to maraud his land but a modest reaction for "self defense"? Actually those Palestinian reactions are a kind of resistance rather than a violent anti-Semitic act.

Spivak considers the colonizer's attempt to silence the subaltern and classify him as the other an act of "epistemic violence". She affirms, "the clearest available example of such epistemic violence is the... heterogeneous project to constitute the colonial subject as Other" (Spivak, 1988, p. 76). More significantly, in *Operation Shylock*, the author Roth allows the narrator Philip Roth to place Ziad as the other hindering him from telling his own narrative; this disability is achieved through the insertion of the historical element, "colonialist historiography", using Spivak's term. Philip empowers his narrative via the memory of the Jewish community narrating the social contempt it confronted and describing its victimization, "to establish Israeli military expansionism as historically just by joining it to the memory of Jewish victimization" (Roth, 1993, p. 124). Instead of voicing his community, Philip makes Ziad participating in the epistemic violence; he is supposed to explain that stones were the only available tool for his community to defend its land and face the Israeli occupier. It is predictable for a Palestinian to reveal to what extent he and his community are attached to their land, to reveal that throwing stones on the most well-armed colonizer in the world is a telltale of resistance and courage rather than fear and powerlessness. Surprisingly, the character Ziad is not courageous enough to reveal this truth; he distorted this powerful symbolic reality being content only by attributing the act of throwing stones to children. Ziad tells Philip, "No, no ... it is the children who do it, not the old men. Don't worry Philip. I don't throw anything, the occupier has nothing to fear from a civilized fellow like me" (Roth, 1993, p. 113).

To Spivak, excluding the other while narrating history by imperialist intellectuals is itself an act of colonialism which needs resistance and confrontation by the colonized "other". She says,

To confront them is not to represent (vertreten) them but to learn to (darstellen) represent ourselves... it would also question the implicit demand, made by intellectuals who choose a "naturally articulate" subject of oppression, that such a subject come through history as a foreshortened mode-of-production narrative (Spivak, 1988, p. 84).

Spivak's suggestion to re-position the "other" and retrieve his presence in narratives is highly significant in treating colonial texts; she invites the subaltern to voice himself and tell his experience from his own perspective. Ziad's story and history are given little room in Philip's narrative, and once the subaltern is allowed to say something it should be about his master rather than about himself. Ziad tells Philip,

I read aloud to my son just two nights ago your story "The Conversion of Jews" I said, he wrote this when I knew him... I loved *Portnoy's Complaint*, it was great, great! I assign it to my students at the university. Here is a Jew, I tell them, who has never been afraid to speak out about Jews. An independent Jew and he has suffered for it too: I try to convince them that there are Jews in the world who are not in any like these Jews we have here. But to them the Israeli Jew is so evil they find it hard to believe (Roth, 1993, p. 114)

Ziad is telling his son the story of Jews and how they suffered for a long time instead of engraving the story of his nation and the history of its national resistance in his mind. Similarly, this intellectual teacher at the university, who is supposed to avail from his position and give voice the Palestinian community, is teaching his students Jewish literature rather than selecting his Palestinian literature which raises their nationalism and broadens the awareness of their own history. Why should a teacher assign a novel such as *Portnoy's Complaint* to his students at the university? A novel which discusses the question of American Jews, their assimilation, and their relation to Israeli Jews, a novel which extremely speaks about sexual desire and frustration. Spivak calls the subaltern to speak about himself rather than speaking for his colonizer if he has any sort of intention to confront him and achieve freedom pushing away the epistemic violence exercised on him and regain self respect. Furthermore, the subaltern should split up his vision from the one of the colonizer because the latter's vision will never help to voice the former. Thus, the more the colonized sticks and relates himself to the colonizer the more he participates in his silence and help the oppressor to achieve his target.

Ziad's reference to his disability to convince his students that there are good Jews and the spread of the idea that all evil comes from Jews among them is an attempt by Philip to confirm the myth of Anti-Semitism in Palestine and reveal the indigenous inhabitants of this land as enemies to the colonizer. Ziad and his students represent a stereotypical image of Palestinian intellectuals who hold antagonism and hatred toward anybody who holds Jewish blood in his veins. Spivak is suggesting for the oppressed communities to separate themselves from the oppressor when telling their narratives, "I am suggesting, rather, that to buy a self-contained version of the west is to ignore its production by the imperialist project" (Spivak, 1988, p. 86). For instance, Ziad speaks about the Jewish Diaspora and agrees with Philip on all the facts he presented about both sides Jews and Palestinians. He should question each fact told from the imperialist vision; he should not teach about Jews in a time where he and his community are in a massive need to document their history and root their existence from their own perspectives.

Edward Said has also referred to the significance of narration in colonial discourses and its power in eradicating the presence of many oppressed nations. Narratives are a very important colonial tactic intellectuals resort to in an attempt to legitimize the occupation of an already populated land. The more powerful the narrative is the more true it becomes no matter if it is built upon a myth. Therefore, this is what Philip Roth attempts to achieve in his *Operation Shylock*; he is using distorted facts to tell the other's story (the Palestinian). Throughout making Ziad silent, Philip is free to mention only historical facts which serve legitimizing the presence of Jews in Palestine. In *The Question of Palestine*, Said explains in details the unbalanced equation between Palestinian and Israeli narratives,

Conversely in the case of Israel, when speaking warmly for and on behalf of Israel is considered de rigueur for anyone in either public or intellectual life, the sheer impossibility of finding a space in which to speak for the Palestinians is enormous; indeed, every statement on behalf of Israel intensifies and concentrates pressure on the Palestinian to be silent, to accept repression. Thus, it is legitimate and acceptable to be with Israel and against the Palestinians. (Said, 1980, p. 40)

Accordingly, the main purpose of muting the other and imposing pressure on him is to achieve colonial targets, and most significantly with no oppositional stances from all over the world. That is why empowering narrative is a valuable pawn on the colonial board; Philip is empowering the Israeli cause and arguing for the military occupation of a heavily populated land throughout his narrative which excludes the "other". Hence, the more silent the Palestinian is the more powerful and convincing the Israeli becomes, and the more supporters the Zionist project gain!

Philip Roth chooses his narrator Philip to tell the narrative and speak for both his nation and Palestinians as well as allowing the other to be present and represented. When Kamil came to the Jewish court to attend his brother's trial, a sixteen year old boy who was accused of throwing Molotov cocktails on Israeli soldiers, he was not allowed to speak and has been harshly silenced by the Jewish judge. Roth uses the word "whisper" each time he refers to Kamil when speaking, "Kamil was once again whispering..."my brother has been given an injection"" (p. 131). Roth's reply to Kamil's whispering was simply "maybe he got an injection from medical personnel because he was already ill" (p. 132). This cold response from Philip reveals how little care was given to raise the interests of the "other" and how a sixteen year old boy was injected and nearly paralyzed for he has thrown cocktails on the most well armed soldiers in the world. When Kamil explains to Roth that Israelis are "torturing in ways that don't leave marks", Roth started to become angry, "Kamil's whispering was beginning to get on my nerves". Thus, Palestinians are present in the narrative; however, represented rather than representing themselves, and once the other started to utter some facts the master started to get angry neglecting him.

Said has discussed in *The Question of Palestine* the issue of representing the Palestinians in narratives, "we must understand the struggle between Palestinians and Zionism as the struggle between presence and interpretation, the former constantly appearing to be overpowered and eradicated by the latter" (Said, 1980, p. 08). Zionism as a colonial project eradicated the presence of Palestinians in Palestine through humiliation, military oppression, and marginalization as well. This marginalization is highly present in narratives; it empowers the occupiers to achieve what Edward calls "the political will" and authenticate their slogan "a land without people for a people without land". The colonial narrative represents and interprets the "other" the way occupiers wanted it to be more than it gives facts and realities about it; it keeps it present but muted to serve its targets.

Any attempt to make the Palestinian voice heard or any endeavor to give a chance for the Palestinians to represent themselves and to be critical about the Zionist constitution are considered a plot against Israel. Being tolerant and unbiased while listening to the Palestinian narrative is viewed as a trick full of hatred and antagonism against Jews. Edward Said says, "to oppose such an idea in the west was immediately to align oneself with anti-Semitism" (p. 24); that is to say, to be against the project of reconstituting Palestine as a land for Jews is considered a determined fact of enmity to Jews. Philip asserts, "Helping to detoxify others is the cornerstone of our recovery. Nothing will so much ensure immunity from the illness of anti-Semitism as intensive work with other anti-Semites" (Roth, 1993, p. 96).

Narratives falsify facts and represent them in accordance to the political and economic needs they serve. When the fake Philip Roth calls Jews to be back to Europe and deconstruct the Zionist ideology he was described as a dangerous anti-Semite and an enemy to his race. The Fake Philip confesses that the Jewish state is harming the Palestinian existence and causing oppression and injustice to the indigenous inhabitants of the land. He says,

To make a Jewish state we have betrayed our history, we have done unto the Palestinians what the Christians have done unto us: systematically transformed them into the despised and subjugated Other, thereby depriving them of their human status. Irrespective of the stupidity of Yasir Arafat, the fact is this: as a people the Palestinians are totally innocent and as a people The Jews are totally guilty. (Roth, 1993, p. 331)

The double Roth has been hated and insulted by all the pro-Zionists in the novel for his attempt to give a voice to the subaltern and defend his human rights and he was accused of Jews-hatred and anti-Semitism. Thus, whether a Jew or an Arab if you show any sense of disagreement for the Israeli existence in Palestine your disagreement is but anti-Semitism. In this context Edward Said illustrates in *The Politics of Dispossession* how the Palestinian resistance is considered as an obstacle for the Zionist establishment and consequently viewed as an act of the anti-Semitic construct. "the Palestinian popular resistance to the exclusions of Zionism is simply a version of Arab anti-Semitism, or still another threat of genocide against the Jews" (Said, 1994, p. 03).

Similarly to Spivak's call for the subaltern to tell his story by himself, the Palestinian should have his own version of narrating the Arab-Israeli conflict. He should make a transition from being an exile in his land to becoming a Palestinian who fights silence via voicing his community, to use Said's words. Philip Roth's novel is seen as a biased narrative because it tackles the issue of anti-Semitism and simultaneously excludes the issue of anti-Arabism and anti-Palestinianism. Shouldn't we consider the marginality, dehumanization, and muting the Palestinian an act of Anti-Arabism? Isn't the military oppression and destruction the Palestinians face each day an act rooted from a feeling of hatred towards Arabs?

There is an urgent need for the Palestinian to document his harsh colonialist experience in literature empowering his narrative via telling it from his own point of view and exclude the question: who would speak for the Palestinian? Silencing the Palestinian is not an issue pinned down to narration in literature; instead, it is highly present in political negotiations to solve the Arab-Israeli conflict. In his article *Who Would Speak For the Palestinians?* Edward Said refers to the United States' set of conditions for the Palestinian to attend a talk which concerns him and furthermore which determines his destiny, "it has made clear that none of the Palestinian representatives can be members of the Palestine Liberation Organization or affiliated with it" (1984, p. 104). Why not setting conditions for Israel for instance? Why not requiring anti-Zionist Jews to attend the talk? Who has the validity to classify Palestine as a subaltern and Israel as its master?

Philip Roth's narrative does not portray the real face of the Palestinian-Israeli conflict; Roth tries to reveal uniquely the human and innocent side of his race neglecting any incident that may oppose his target. The narrator describes George Ziad as "a frightening talker" for if he is allowed to tell his narrative he reveals a counter Israeli façade that is attempted to be totally hidden, and by doing so he would be an enemy to the Zionist constitution. Roth reveals how Israeli soldiers are soft and human with Palestinian citizens, when a soldier talks to his mother he informs her that he does not beat anyone and that he tries his best not to do so. The soldier also describes how women and children were staring at him when he gives orders to take out Palestinian male. Is not depriving women from their men and children from their fathers an act harsher and crueler than beating?

Though Jews argue that they have experienced marginalization and cruelty in their Diaspora they are exercising the same marginalization and cruelty on Palestinians if not in a sharper degree. They see or pretend to see Zionism as their fate rather than their constructed enterprise. "It is Israel's fate to live in an Arab sea, Jews have accepted this fate rather than have nothing and no faith" the Israeli army officer tells Philip (Roth, 1993, p. 101). More significantly, in one way or another, they are confessing that Palestine is not theirs; instead, they came to it to possess a land, a culture, and a heritage. They dispossess to possess. No matter to what extent Philip Roth is empowering his narrative and purifying it from any act of inhumanity, he is confessing, though against his desire, the existence of Israeli military forces on the Palestinian land. He is confessing that there is an act of colonialism, violence, and unjust settlement which destroyed Palestinians and dispossessed them from all their human rights. Accordingly, Said comments,

Although Israeli's army is responsible for the destruction of Palestinian society, the expulsion of hundreds of thousands of Palestinians, and the deaths of many thousands more, all resistance to it is considered terrorism, because Israel and the United States say so, And of course no one should have anything to do with terrorists. (1994, p. 105)

In his *Gaza's Torment, Israel's Crimes, Our responsibilities* Noam Chomsky has discussed the way Israel is exercising violence on the Palestinian population, "when Israel is on good behavior, more than two Palestinian children are killed every week" (Chomsky, 2015, p. 146). He describes Israel's occupation of Palestine as "exercise in savagery" and confessed, as it is mentioned in the title, that Palestine's destruction is Israel's responsibility. Significantly, Chomsky refers to the role of narrative in gaining allies and international supporters for Israel's colonialism and how narrative misleads the general opinion. Chomsky considers the passive international stances and reactions towards the cause of Palestine as a very candid admission of the Israeli narrative. He says,

The inability or, unwillingness, to act seems to be first and foremost an acceptance of Israeli narrative and argumentation for the crisis in Gaza. Israel has developed a very clear narrative about the present carnage in Gaza: it is a tragedy caused by an unprovoked Hamas missile attack on the Jewish state, to which Israel has to react in a self-defense. (Chomsky, 2015, p. 148)

Noam Chomsky explains how Israel targets to narrate its propaganda machine out of context and find justifications for Palestine's destruction. Israel is arguing for its genocide in Palestine as a reaction toward an action, as a self defending and protecting. The contradiction in Israel's justification is the historical pattern because it uses the historical element. Furthermore, it neglects a whole history of an already existing community which has its history, heritage, and particularly a land. Before justifying Israel's claimed reactions there is an urgent call for justifying its presence in an already populated land, a ground which has its indigenous inhabitants. So, why are Jews attempting to possess a land of another community? Why are they dispossessing before possessing? Why have they justified their victimization of indigenous Palestinians by already being victims? Is this a beginning phase of a revengeful process? If so, are Palestinians the right population from which Jews should take revenge? In an attempt to answer these questions one should refer to Edward Said's way in discussing the myth of Orientalism and relate it to the myth of Diaspora.

Said explains in *Orientalism* how the west has created the myth Orientalism to justify all its deeds concerning the orient. "Orientalism as a Western style for dominating, restructuring, and having authority over the orient" (Said, 1978,

p. 03). So, the myth of Orientalism is but a Western allegorical argument to dominate the orient. In other words, it is a theoretical plan for the Imperialist project. In parallelism, the myth of Diaspora is an Israeli argument to justify and legitimize the Zionist project. Pro-Zionist authors use Jewish Diaspora in their literary works to gain sympathy towards Jews and gain as much allies as possible to establish a state in Palestine. To justify the unfair division of powers between the colonizer and the colonized there is a need to promote a myth to convince the world that the weak cannot develop unless the powerful helps him. Said (1978) says, "Many terms were used to express the relation: Balfour and Cromer, typically used several. The Oriental is irrational, depraved, (fallen), childlike, thus, the European is rational, virtuous, mature, normal" (p. 40).

One of the most crucial issues this research is raising is to illustrate how American Jewish authors use the myth of Diaspora in justifying their colonization of Palestine. It questions why are Jews re-exercising what was already exercised on them? Since they went through the same experience they are the first people who are aware of Palestinians' harm and destruction. Furthermore, to come up with rational explanatory interpretations of these problematic facts two vital elements should be taken into account: history and psychology. In his narrative, Philip Roth has depended on history to voice his community and their Diaspora's experience in the world. He refers to Diaspora as the key to understand the Jewish brain and decipher his behaviors, as the most responsible element on each reaction bred from a Jew. Furthermore, persecution and extermination are the most precious, though harmful, historical events a Jew possesses as a heritage to bequeath for his offspring and the only experience they have to narrate is the one of Shylock. Philip Roth refers to Shakespeare's Jewish character Shylock in his play *The Merchant of Venice* as "the villain of history in Europe" to summarize the Jewish experience and how were Jews homeless and despaired. Shylock is a stereotypical character who lives till now in history and literature and symbolizes how Jews were harshly and cruelly treated. Simply Shylock symbolizes the Otherness of Jews. Philip comments,

The miserly, money-maddened, egotistical degenerate, the Jew who goes to *synagogue* to plan the murder of the virtuous Christian—*this* is Europe's Jew, the Jew expelled in 1290 by the English, the Jew banished in 1492 by the Spanish, the Jew terrorized by Poles, butchered by Russians, incinerated by Germans, spurned by the British and the Americans while the furnaces roared at Treblinka. The vile Victorian varnish that sought to humanize the Jew, to dignify the Jew, has never deceived the enlightened European mind about the three thousand ducats, never has and never will. (Roth, 1993, p. 261)

Philip Roth is well known for his reliance on history and memory in most of his works. Bonnie Lyons treats Roth's *American Pastoral* as an example of how contemporary Jewish American writers highly depend on history and memory. She refers to the "Jewish preoccupations with time, memory, loss, and history as they develop their fiction" (p. 20). American Jewish authors are so assiduous in implementing the historical element in their literature as a mold for reconstituting or regaining the Jewish identity. In *Jewish American and Holocaust Literature* Alan Berger referred to the implementation of the past in literature and related to Freud's "notion of transference relation", a notion which means that the person may repeat the trauma of a past experience in the present to "another" person. (Alan, 2004, p. 106)

In *Healing Developmental Trauma* Heller and LaPierre (2012) have done a scientific illustrative study to explain how traumatic past affects the function of human mental faculties. They clarify how "trauma is a major contributor to the dysregulation and associated disturbances that lead to countless psychological and physiological problems, as well as to compulsive, addictive, and self-destructive behaviors" (p. 26). The shock of trauma causes a disconnection from the self as well as from the others which consequently "distort identity" and "undermine self-esteem": two major problems Philip Roth, his cousin Apter, and the Jewish author Aharon suffered from. Scientists have called the impact of trauma on human nervous system "the Distress Cycle", a nervous cycle which controls human emotions and behaviors. Laurence and Alline have focused on the Distress Cycle during childhood; they have argued that when a bad experience happens to a child he thinks that happens because he is bad and consequently construct a bad image about his "self". This constructed bad image in the child's brain causes him wrong perceptions about his ego and as a result it causes a nervous system dysregulation ending up to create a Distress Cycle.

Establishing the state of Israel in Palestine is an attempt to escape the Holocaust's legacy and seen as the suitable medication for Jews to recover and find a home where to settle. Philip declares, "Of course. In the aftermath of the Holocaust, Israel was the Jewish hospital in which Jews could begin to recover from the devastation of that horror." (p. 37) Jews will not recover from the Holocaust even by establishing their state and reach a settlement; memory of the Shoah, (the Holocaust) will always take a space in their minds. The narrator confesses in the novel his paralysis in escaping the past,

At first I tried to run away from myself and from my memories, to live a life that was not my own and to write about a life that was not my own. But a hidden feeling told me that I was not allowed to flee from myself and that if I denied the experience of my childhood in the Holocaust I would be spiritually deformed.... (Philip, 1993, p. 52)

Philip Roth as a member of the Jewish community is unable to divorce himself from the past and its remnants while writing his novel because he goes back to the Jewish historical calendar repeatedly. The past is present in his fictional characters and they act and react in accordance to it; the attempt to get rid of the past and restart a new life free of the memory of the Holocaust is apparent in his narrative too. Again, Philip says that memory is inescapable, "Many years

after the Holocaust, when I came to retrace my childhood from before the Holocaust, I saw that these resorts occupied a particular place in my memories" (Roth, 1993, p. 106).

As a result, victims of war and social oppression would no longer act in a normal way in society due to the dark memory which enslaves them and controls their behavior to a certain extent. Victims of the Holocaust found no way to recover from their victimization unless they victimize the other and oppress him; they legitimize this through blaming the ancestors who were responsible of the Holocaust. Philip asserts, "Jews were victims ...they are conquerors only because they are victims" (Roth, 1993, p. 125); this apologetic claim proves the unstable state of mind of Jewish victims which threatens the security of society. In the novel, the unstable psychological state of Jewish characters occurs repeatedly as a result of the Jewish experience. The character Apter, for instance, could not overcome his dark victimhood during his childhood. Philip tells his story,

In 1943, his entire family had been consumed by the German mania for murdering Jews. He had been saved by German officer who had kidnapped him at the Polish transport site and sold him to a male brothel in Munich... Apter was nine. He remains chained to his childishness to this day, someone who still, in late middle age, cries as easily as he blushes and who can barely meet one's level gaze with his own chronically imploring eyes, someone whose whole life lies in the hands of the past. (Roth, 1993, p. 15)

Apter is but a slave to his memory and as a victim he is no longer in possession of his mental faculties or behaviors, and further he cannot gain respect as a normal man people always look at him in a doubtful eye. For instance, when he called Philip to inform him that there is a man in Jerusalem who takes on his character Philip did not take this seriously and ignored him. Philip says he did not believe him for "his hunger is unappeasable for those who are not here"; Apter's past prevents him from living the present or thinking of the future as his memoir is a slave to the past. He always refers to people who are no longer alive, people who were victims of the German murdering of Jews. Apter's unstable psychology is mirrored in his paintings, when a tourist asks him why he paints such terrible paintings and if this is also Hitler's fault Apter replies that he has already seen Hitler's paintings and that he is a better artist than him. Apter is a victim even of his own race, "In Apter's stories, people steal from him, spit at him, defraud and insult and humiliate him virtually every day and, more often than not, these people who victimize my cousin are survivors of the camps" (Roth, 1993, p. 58).

Interestingly, speaking about how intellectuals can empower political projects through their narratives the Israeli author Aharon Appelfeld is a good example in the novel. In an interview between him and Philip he says that he has always tried not to give up to his memory and tried to be creative and not to stick to his own past experience. Till now, readers think Appelfeld is encouraging creativity and invention in literary production; however, and astonishingly he is avoiding telling the reality of the Holocaust because "the reality of the Holocaust surpassed any imagination, if I remained true to the fact no one would believe me", justifies Appelfeld (Roth, 1993, p. 81). The effect of the Holocaust was heavily harmful to Jews' psychology to the extent that they work hard to feed their hatred to those who are not from a Jewish race. The character Supposnik, for instance, tells Philip that similar to Aharon and other Jewish children he was waiting for help and for integration after the Holocaust but no one replies to their hopes, "the ones who harmed me were the non-Jews, and the ones who helped were the Jews. After this I loved the Jews and developed a hatred for the non-Jews" (Roth, 1993, p. 17). He later explains how he was shocked when he has read Shakespeare's *The Merchant of Venice* focusing on Shylock's three words "three thousand ducats" and describes how since Shylock's trial the Jew till nowadays is still on trial.

Psychological disorder, self-imbalance, and illusion were common remnants of the Second World War and the Holocaust for Jews; in the novel most of the characters are suffering a confused state of mind. The narrator Philip Roth was highly suffering loss and despair due to the nightmares and flashbacks of the past; hallucinations and the intense urge to cry and scream accompanies him all time day and night. The feeling of belonging to nowhere and being nowhere was so dangerous to the mind due to the loss it causes, "my mind began to disintegrate, the word disintegration seemed itself to be the matter of which my brain was constituted", says Philip. Zepinic (2016) refers to war trauma as the most dangerous experience for the psyche of its victims and the non-victims as well. In his *Disintegration of the Self-Structure Caused by Severe Trauma* he claims, "The experience of war, either as a combat or war imprisonment, is the most devastating traumatic experience... The traumatic experience caused by man-made disasters strengthens the development of negative emotional and cognitive schemes about the self and the others" (Zepenic, 2016, p. 12). Thus, Philip before going to Jerusalem suffered a hard traumatic frenzy to the extent that he intended to commit suicide, "I was in the disaster of self-abandonment...because I thought about killing myself all the time" (Roth, 1993, p. 19).

Philip could not enjoy a peaceful night without taking Halcion pills and he refers to a psychiatric doctor who describes the effect of taking this dangerous drug medication,

A Dutch psychiatrist listed symptoms associated with Halcion that he had discovered in a study of psychiatric patients who had been prescribed the drug; the list read like a textbook summary of my catastrophe: "... severe malaise; depersonalization and derealization; paranoid reactions; acute and chronic anxiety; continuous fear of going insane; ... patients often feel desperate and have to fight an almost irresistible impulse to commit suicide. (Roth, 1993, p. 20)

The psychiatrist describes a very important symptom of the mental disorder, "depersonalization", a state in which the victim feels no longer a coherent body; instead, he feels himself fragmented into isolated entities. In essence, it is not

the pill which causes the mental disorder to Philip; it is his traumatic past which leads him to this paralyzed condition. Philip later begins to understand that there is something in his inner self which makes this destruction and he reveals that he is "half convinced" about the effect of the drug. Philip refers to something deeper than a pill, more sensitive, and goes back further in seeking the reason, something "concealed, obscured, masked, suppressed" (p. 22). Philip confesses that "the drug perhaps intensified his collapse, it was I who had made the worst happen", it is the post trauma anxiety!

The narrator uses frequently expressions which indicate his loss, despair, and lack of self confidence and esteem "my thoughts were confused and contradictory", to repossess that part of myself that I thought it was lost", "I was sure that I'd never be able to use my mind again". Therefore, Philip describes himself looking at the food his wife Claire prepared claiming, "I could not find any reason to eat", an existentialist expression which signifies highly loss of faith in everything even in life. When Aharon and Apter called him to inform that there is a man in Jerusalem who is impersonating him, Philip was no longer able to deduct whether the calls are real or just occur in his dreams. "I began to wonder if those calls from Jerusalem, as well as my call to Jerusalem had not perhaps occurred in dreams", said Philip (Roth, 1993, p. 24). Thus, the post-Holocaust trauma and its impact on the Jewish brain and on the "other" as well are highly present in *Operation Shylock* to support Israel and justify its presence in Palestine.

III. CONCLUSION

To sum up, *Operation Shylock* is a biased narrative written from a Zionist perspective to serve Israeli establishment in Palestine. Philip Roth denies the existence of Palestinians as indigenous inhabitants of Palestine and focuses mainly on the Jewish community, its past, its present, and its expected future. He treated the Palestinian-Israeli conflict from one side as he silences the Palestinian and gives voice to the Jew. Roth sees the Jewish existence in Palestine as a solution to Jewish Diaspora; and sees Palestine as a land in which Jews would recover and reach a meaning to their identity. Additionally, he portrays stereotypically the Palestinian as a terrorist who threatens Israel and intimidates its peace. *Operation Shylock* depicts how Israelis use the fallacy of Jewish Diaspora and the remnants of the Holocaust to justify the Zionist institution in the land of Palestinians. In addition, being a victim of war never apologizes starting a war against an innocent community and colonize its land. Humiliating a whole nation and neglecting its existence would never be a solution to recover from a post-traumatic experience. Thus, Roth's novel is an illustrative example of how American-Jewish literature serves political dogmas, like the Zionist project, throughout centralizing the Jewish cause and marginalizing the Palestinian other.

REFERENCES

- [1] Alan. L. Berger and Gloria I. Cronin, (2004). *Jewish American and Holocaust Literature representation in the postmodern world*, State University of New York Press.
- [2] Chomsky, Noam, (2015). "A Brief History of Israel's Incremental Genocide" *On Palestine*, edited by Frank Barat, Penguin Random House, pp. 147- 150.
- [3] Chomsky, Noam. (2015). "Gaza's Torment, Israel's Crimes, Our Responsibilities" *On Palestine*, edited by Frank Barat, Penguin Random House, pp. 145- 146.
- [4] Gohar, Saddik M. (2007). "The Distortion of the Arab-Israeli Conflict in American Fiction: A Study of The Haj" *International Journal of Arabic English Studies* (Vol. 8, pp. 32-48).
- [5] Gohar, Saddik M. (2010). "Narrating the Palestinian in Philip Roth's Operation Shylock: A Confession." *Nebula* (Vol. 7, No 1, pp. 108-121).
- [6] Heller, Laurence, and Alline LaPiere, (2012). *Healing Developmental Trauma: How Early Trauma Affects Self-Regulation, Self-Image, and the Capacity for Relationship*. North Atlantic Books
- [7] Roth, Philip. (1994). *Operation Shylock*, Vintage.
- [8] Rynhold, Jonathan. (2015). "The Arab-Israeli Conflict in American Political Culture". Bar Ilan University.
- [9] Said, Edward. (1978) *Orientalism*. Vintage.
- [10] Said, Edward. (1980). *The Question of Palestine*. Routledge.
- [11] Shakespeare, William. (2005). "The Merchant of Venice" *The Oxford Shakespeare: The Complete Works*, edited by John Jowett and William Montgomery, Oxford University Press.
- [12] Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty. (1988). "Can the Subaltern Speak?" *Colonial Discourse and postcolonial Theory A Reader*, edited by Patrick Williams and Laura Chrisman, Columbia University Press, pp. 66- 111.
- [13] Uris, Leon. (1985). *The Haj*. Bantam edition.
- [14] Zepinic, Vito. (2016). "Disintegration of the Self-Structure Caused by Severe Trauma". *Psychology and Behavioral Sciences* (Vol. 5, No. 4, pp. 83-92).

Siham Hadj Henni was born in 08 April, 1994 in Chlef, Algeria. She received her BA in General English Literature in 2015 from Hassiba Ben Bouali University of Chlef, Algeria, her MA in American Studies in 2017 from the same university.

She is currently a Phd student of English Literature at the University of Jordan, Amman, Jordan.

Mahmoud Flayeh Al-Shetawi Al-Shra'ah was born on 1st of January, 1954 in Beitras, Irbid, Jordan. He received his BA in English Language and Literature from Kuwait University, 1977, his MA in English Literature from University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign, 1981, and his PhD in Modern English Literature/Drama, The University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign, 1983.

He is currently a Full Professor in the Department of English, School of Foreign Languages at the University of Jordan.