

Evil Tendency and Human Conscience in Jean Genet

النزعة الشريرة والضمير الإنساني عند جان جينيه

Himeur Hocine *
 حسين حيمر
 himeurhocine@yahoo.com

Philosophy
 Abu Baker Belk aid University -
 Tlemcen - Algeria

Received: 30-03-2025

Accepted: 26-12-2025

Published: 31-12-2025

Abstract:

French writer Jean Genet was known for his life of vagrancy and banditry. Before his literary fame, he wrote his best-selling books while in prison, thus intersecting with the Italian thinker Antonio Gramsci, author of the Prison Notebooks. Jean Genet's unconditional support for just causes extended beyond moral support to material aid, as he distributed all of his wealth, which he had amassed after becoming a prominent writer. Against this background, we can explain Jean Genet's radical political leanings, which led him to ally with the Black Panthers against racism in the United States and the persecution of certain minorities through religious extremism and political violence; with the Algerians in their revolution against the French occupation; and with the Palestinians in their uprisings against the Zionist entity.

Keywords: Jean Genet ; commitment; colonialism; the poor; the oppressed.

ملخص:

اشتهر الكاتب الفرنسي جان جينيه بحياة التشرد واللصوصية، قبل شهرته الأدبية، وألف جان جينيه كتبه الأكثر مبيعاً وهو في السجن، فهو بذلك يتقاطع مع المفكر الإيطالي أنطونيو غرامشي صاحب كتاب "دفاتر السجن"، وكانت مواقف جان جينيه اللامشروطة والمساندة للقضايا العادلة، وقد تجاوز دعمه المعنوي للمساعدات المادية، فهو الذي وزع كل ثروته التي جمعها بعدما صار كاتباً بارزاً. في ظل هذه الخلفية يمكن تفسير نزعة جان جينيه السياسية الراديكالية التي دفعته للتحالف مع السود (البراك بانثرز) من العنصرية في الولايات المتحدة، واضطهاد بعض الأقليات بالتطرف الديني والعنف السياسي، ومع الجزائريين في ثورتهم ضد الاحتلال الفرنسي، والفلسطينيين في انتفاضاتهم ضد الكيان الصهيوني.

الكلمات المفتاحية: جان جينييه؛ الالتزام؛ الاستعمار؛ الفقراء؛ المضطهدون.

1. Introduction:

An indistinguishable mark in the writings and positions of Jean Genet (1910–1986) is his identification of the opponent he chose to confront. Whatever the genre and form of his writings, they always appear as a shocking or rebellious act against authority and hegemony, and against the culture and practices that each produces. In this perpetual battle, Jean Genet does not ride on the horse of freedom of opinion and belief -although he sometimes raises its banner- but rather positions himself as a true defender of right and truth. This position, which Jean Genet chose for his writings and positions, has provoked waves of criticism and interaction, ranging from misunderstanding and condemnation, to innocent confusion at times, and not-so-innocent defamation at other times. Jean Genet's chosen position stems from his own perspective on life and society.

2. A Harsh Life Experience and Shocking Writing

2.1 Life jean genet Experience

Jean Genet's literary and intellectual career can be summed up in the harshness he faced throughout his personal life, from birth (a foundling raised in foundling asylums, which did not complete his studies due to his deviance and crimes, which repeatedly led to his early imprisonment...). He chose to write novels, plays, and journalism as a means of settling his scores with a harsh society. While this mental/intellectual/ideological premise dominated most of Jean Genet's writings, its manifestations are abundantly evident in the interviews and writings of the author of "The Diary of a Thief," published in 1991 under the striking title: "The Declared Enemy" (1- Genet. 1991.P. 425.). This book includes texts, speeches, and dialogues that Jean Genie produced between 1964 and 1985, which were characterized by their dominant political nature and established the roots of his permanent rebellious tendencies in the face of tendencies of hegemony and domination in social and political life at the national level (France) and between states and nations at the global level, as Edmund White emphasized in his massive book about the writer's biography (2 -White.1993. P.686). Jean Genie established his rebellion by publishing in magazines of poor reputation and accused of pornography (3 -The magazine Playboy, 1964.) or by explicit opposition to French policy in the field of its colonial history or its policy towards Arab and African immigrants in French society, or in its diplomacy regarding issues of national liberation and

world peace. Jean Genet added to his list of civil “perversions” his support for the protest movements of American blacks, especially the “Black Panther Party,” fiercely denouncing the arrest of both George Jackson and Angela Davis, announcing that he had become their official spokesman (4- Genet. 2010.P. 45) because he, like them, had known prison, which was his true school in life, just as it was for the French poet Arthur Rimbaud, whom Jean Genet made a model for his personal and poetic career.

Natalie Fredette has argued that the underlying motives behind Jean Genet's positions defending the freedom of leaders of protest movements against racism, colonialism, and social injustice worldwide are not related to defending freedom of opinion, but rather out of respect for the courage that leads people to link words with action in rejecting marginalization, exclusion, and oppression. She considers this a clear reduction of manhood and human humanity through the refusal to accept their status as victims (5- Genet. 2010. P. 81). In doing so, he enshrines an existential philosophical position close to Albert Camus's view in his book (The Rebel).

When Jean Genet supported all those who resisted racial oppression (in the United States and South Africa), social oppression (Arab and African immigrants in Europe and France), and national oppression (in occupied Palestine), he valued the awareness of rebellion in linking words with action in all its positions.

In addition to the spirit of rebellion against the injustice of life's circumstances that had grown within his psyche since his birth and his being thrown into an orphanage by a mother who left him only his father's nickname (whose fate was unknown!!), Jean Genet experienced the harshness of life at school, on the streets, and in prison. Prison was a school of deviance and a field for discovering the special qualities of manhood that combined a tendency to resist the tyranny of the police, jailers, and administration, as well as the attacks of vile prisoners. This is the understanding that almost all critics of the novel “Keral Duprast” (1953) (6 - Genet. 1981. P. 252) Agreed upon, and who's glorifying themes of violence and sexual perversion (among males in prison) tainted Jean Genet's reputation over the years. Some critics have reduced the content of Jean Genet's writing to the spirit of chivalry and his masculine zeal in resisting sexual oppression, in order to belittle the motives behind his solidarity with the efforts of Black activists against racial discrimination, the Algerian

revolutionaries resisting French colonialism, and the struggle of Palestinian guerrillas against Zionism and its allies in Lebanon, which constituted the central theme of Jean Genet's political writings.

During the 1960s, Jean Genet faced a profound intellectual crisis linked to his need to establish an ideological horizon for his various political and literary positions, something his hardline opponents and critics failed to understand. The vital issue Jean Genet worked on during that period was defining a specific concept of commitment at the level of writing and personal practice. He believed that the writer must embrace the concept of commitment and make it acceptable to readers and intellectuals. This was the turn Jean Genet took during the 1960s, a Sartrean turn that led him to reconsider his own literary project with the aim of delving into the political sphere, considering that political engagement in public affairs opens broader horizons for influencing and changing society. Through his experience, he became convinced that reality is not changed by narrative and aesthetic creativity, but rather by commitment to real field work and the transition from "false movements" to "real weapons" and from "hollow movements" to "solid actions" (7- Genet. 2010 P. 47.). On the basis of these intellectual and literary reviews, Jean Genet began to doubt the usefulness of his novel and playwriting due to their weak ability to influence the conditions of human reality. In light of this (existential) crisis and the questioning of the meaning of writing (narrative and literary writing in particular), Jean Genet collected his articles and political writings and published them in the book (*The Declared Enemy*), as a sign of a break in his life, his creative experience, and his (ideological) convictions, as Nathalie Fredette demonstrated, who emphasized that the "solid works" resulting from commitment and "real actions" that Genet demands and by which he denounces the "hollow movements" and "symbolic actions" naturally associated with writing or theater (..) sometimes find themselves in conflict with "play and narration" and "imagination and judgment" (8- Fredette.1993. P. 85.)

The turning point that Jean Genet established in his writing in the 1960s was not a "moral whim" or the result of a new intellectual aberration. Rather, it was the fruit of a philosophical crisis that led him to rebel from the personal sphere to the realm of writing and creativity. It posed the questions he harbored within an intellectual horizon that defined the forms and objectives of writing. This was the approach pursued by distinguished writers and thinkers during the early second half of the twentieth century, such as Jean-Paul Sartre and Michel

Foucault (in France), Heinrich Böll and Günter Grass (in Germany), and Pier Paolo Pasolini (in Italy), etc.

2.2 Jean Genet and his commitment to supporting the Palestinian cause

Jean Genet was aligned with the causes of liberation from colonialism and racial discrimination worldwide, and he supported the forces and struggle movements that were integrated within that movement since the fifties. Genet was a supporter of the independence movement in Algeria (as a French colony) and expressed solidarity with all the struggles of the Palestinian people to liberate their country from Zionist settler colonialism. Jean Genet's approach to the Palestinian issue was not based on racial theory or religious ideology. Rather, it was a political-historical approach based on the origins of the crisis, which are organically linked to the colonial movement (and its specificities in the region). In Jean Genet's view, Zionism perpetuates two intertwined crimes: (settler) colonialism on the one hand, and racial discrimination (against Arabs) on the other. Jean Genet's support for the Palestinian resistance was comprehensive and constant until his death (1986). He expressed solidarity with all popular struggles in the occupied territories and all Fedayeen operations, both inside and outside the Zionist entity, as stated in his book (*The Declared Enemy*), including bloody operations such as the Munich operation (1972). Furthermore, Jean Genet's support for the Palestinian cause was not a matter of emotional sympathy for the (victims), something that the author of (*The Declared Enemy*) usually does not fail to demonstrate, as he was careful to ensure that his position was rooted in the historical and political dimensions of the issue. Therefore, Jean Genet was not automatically a supporter of the Palestinians, without expressing some criticism of their struggle or social practices in the camps that he visited and stayed in for a considerable period on two occasions that formed the basic material for his wonderful book "*The Prisoner in Love*" (9), in addition to his (small) book about the Sabra and Shatila crime (10) that occurred during his visit to the camp in 1982.

In "*The Declared Enemy*," Jean Genet pointed out that the fate of 000Palestinians under Zionist control is "sacrifice" as freedom fighters or sacrifice as a dominant force (under Israeli influence), which has made them human beings deprived of the elements of humanity capable of protecting their intimacy and developing their feelings (11). This makes them

psychologically shattered people clinging to a past that cannot be returned (12). For Jeannie, the Palestinian issue is a humanitarian issue that cannot be ignored or dealt with neutrally, because it tests the human conscience, which justifies siding with it and showing solidarity with it so that "not every Palestinian is a person living in a shroud" (13) and writing "disturbing words on dried human bones" (14). Although the content of the book "The Prisoner in Love" and its editing style make it a narrative writing intertwined with autobiographical writing and interacting with a difficult oppressive climate imposed on defenseless people who do not have the means to live and are deprived of dreams and happiness (especially women, the elderly, and mothers!!! (15)). the book came after a period during which Jean Genet decided to stop writing following the suicide of his "friend" Abdullah. Genet had abandoned the idea of writing seven plays that would devote his view of existence and history, after discovering (in 1979) that he had cancer. However, his coincidental presence (after the Zionist invasion of Lebanon) of the Sabra and Shatila massacre (1982) pushed him to return to writing about the Palestinian issue, as pessimism, death, and failure surrounded Jean Genet's life and existence around him. All that remained for him was "to count a few meters of white cloth" (16) because death had become a companion of his daily path "with four hours in Shatila." Genet began to see, hear, and smell death. In everything that surrounds him (17), therefore, writing became for him something different from what he had represented at the beginning of his experience, or even during his review of the issue and his deep roots in the concept of committed writing. Writing became for Jean Genet, after the Sabra and Shatila massacre, a testimony, an accusation, and an attempt to prick the human conscience and expose the evil tendency in humans, which Zionism and Israel blatantly embodied (a matter that made him the target of defamation campaigns by its supporters). The Palestinian struggle experience and its lifelong accompaniment (in the camps) formed the focus of deep intellectual thought and contemplation for Jean Genet, as he considered the Palestinians a symbol of humanity's (symbolic) battle against evil and oppression, emphasizing that they possess no weapons other than the ancient dreams and ambitions of humans. Jean Genet believed that the Palestinians would not be able to continue their resistance unless they relied on themselves, their spirit, and their "roots" (18). This, in his opinion, made the role of mothers, the land, trees, and memory the protective foundations of each person's personality, even if the balance of military and political power (in the region) suggested that their struggle might not

be victorious. The Palestinians embody a legitimate battle and a just cause that a pure human conscience can only support (19).

These references lead us to examine our understanding of Jean Genet's intellectual and political bias toward the Palestinian cause. This bias is not merely political, but rather the author elevates the issue to higher levels of symbolism, existence, and belief. Zionist critics and thinkers have considered this a fundamental challenge to the credibility of the foundations of the Zionist project and its outcomes. Jean Genet reduces Zionism to a project of colonization, oppression, subjugation, exploitation, and the plunder of others, their land, property, and rights. In other words, it is a consecration of the power of (eternal) evil inherent in humankind, which the Jewish religion - in ancient times - attempted to treat and eradicate.

3. Interpretation of results: The Issue of Commitment in writings jean genet

3.1 Efforts jean genet and truth

Naturally, Jean Genet's writing and his positions in support of the Palestinian cause embodied the concept of commitment, a matter clearly evident for the author of "The Prisoner in Love," who called for "committed pens." However, Genie did not make his work a dry political document, but rather a sophisticated literary achievement that blended opinion, conscience, and biography. It was not a commissioned or requested work, even though Yasser Arafat had requested it from Genie during the author's first visit to the Palestinian camps in Jordan in 1970 (20). Jenny's support for the Palestinian resistance was not based on a partisan basis, as he did not interfere in the internal conflicts that emerged within it, because he was not a political activist on the one hand (21), and because he considered himself a free and independent person in his opinions and honest in what he reported of events, sayings and actions on the other hand (22), and because he chose to be in a marginal position, not belonging to a nation or a movement..." on the third hand (23).

The aforementioned precautions did not push Jean Genet to dilute his goal in writing, which centered on exposing the harsh conditions and suffering faced by the Palestinian people as a result of displacement and Zionist colonialism, on the one hand, and on observing the difficulties of the resistance struggle waged by Palestinian guerrillas against Israel and some other countries (including some Arab regimes), on the other. The scene depicted by Jean Genet constitutes a historical document, a personal testimony, and a reflection on the course

of human history, all at once. These are efforts that require truth, frankness, and a high moral and ethical spirit. Jean Genet chose to emphasize these efforts because he knew he was writing his last book and living the final months of his life (due to his illness) awaiting the "absence" that would, as he put it, arrange all the facts of existence (24). While the content of the book "The Prisoner in Love" was based on the idea of solidarity with the Palestinian cause, the problem of writing in it raised again the issue of commitment among intellectuals and writers in a relatively new horizon, as Jean Genet did not aspire to play the role of Jean-Paul Sartre in accompanying revolutions. Rather, his primary motivation during the years he spent alongside the resistance was his feeling that "the revolution had begun to subside, to cool down, and to return to the path until it disappeared. And heroic songs might be written about it, as he put it, adding: "I looked at the resistance as if it would disappear tomorrow" (25). That is, Jean Genet feared the deterioration of the global balance of power until it would stifle the Palestinian resistance. Therefore, he sought to provide testimony about it, declare his support for it, and call for assistance so that "evil" would not triumph over humanity. For Jean Genet, committed writing (and committed thinking) accompanies and supports the work of supporters of just causes, provided that this is accompanied by a constant and cautious evaluation of the outcomes and fates of the struggle for those causes. This is what Jean Genet practiced with regard to the Algerian revolution, which he strongly supported and frankly criticized. He also revealed, reviewing a possible deviation of the Palestinian resistance in light of the real deviation experienced by the Algerian revolution, in his opinion: "Like Algeria and other countries, and ignoring the revolution in the Arab world, it is only concerned with the land that will see the emergence of the second state after the twentieth, which will bring with it what is required of it: order and law. That rebellion, which has lived for a long time outside the law, dreams of transforming into a law for which Europe will be like heaven" (26).

Jean Genet's concept of commitment stems from a philosophy of rebellion deeply rooted in his thinking and his understanding of existence and reality. He supports revolution (and resistance) as long as it remains faithful to its original premises (opposing the concept of order). If it turns against this, the rebel's supportive stance becomes one of opposition and "intimate enemy of his friends" (27), confirming what Jean-Paul Sartre had indicated in his book on Jean Genet (28) when he said that he was passionate about the principle of betrayal if circumstances turned against him. Betrayal, here, means a reaction to the betrayal of the

revolutionary project by yesterday's revolutionaries. It is well established that Jean Genet (who does not attach any inherent value to state authority) always dreams of the revolution remaining a permanent revolution and not transforming into a system and law. He also has reservations about the traditional concept of commitment (in its Sartre a sense), making it an unchanging value in its assessment of circumstances. Although Jean Genet, in his approach to the reality of the Palestinian resistance, adhered to his "chaotic" and always rebellious concept of commitment, he faced explicit criticism regarding this, from critics who sometimes adhered to the concept of commitment and at other times rejected it. Jerome Notter considered Jean Genet's concept of commitment to be closely related to the concept familiar to him. Rather, he saw Genet's writing on the Palestinian resistance as "complicit writing," as it relies on "the writer's radical involvement in a political reality (...) as a result of his intimate relationships with life and writing, and does not involve any external involvement with a political cause" (29). Jerome Notre's opinion does not align with Jean Genie's true stance on the Palestinian cause and his close ties with its forces and activists. Therefore, he fails to discern the intellectual and literary dilemma that preoccupied Genie and determined the forms he employed to express his relationship with the Palestinian issue outside the logic of political writing, especially since the impressionistic spirit or emotional narrative were never characteristic of Jean Genet's literature. However, Jerome Notre's criticism aligns with another critical and intellectual current, one that supports Zionism and has made Jean Genet a target for criticism due to his support for the Palestinian national cause.

3.2 Jean Genet and Zionist Criticism

Since the early 1950s, Jean-Paul Sartre has undermined all critical studies on Jean Genet. He wrote a massive book about him, in which he included analyses of varying depth and diversity. However, these analyses included aspects that were not overwhelming or influential at the time of the book's publication, and which later became a framework from which Genet's critics, especially those who were hostile to him for ideological, moral, or political reasons, could launch their attacks. We will not dwell long on the critics who followed in Sartre's footsteps and who limited their work to the literary, aesthetic, or even philosophical aspects of Jean Genet's writing, such as Georges Bataille, who, in his study of

the author of "The Declared Enemy," almost reiterated the most important ideas Sartre presented, especially those related to issues of evil, the sacred, and the aggressive psyche in Genet's literature. Bataille asserted that Genet based his writing on the principles of rejecting pleasure, rebelling against others, aggression toward others, and the generalization of evil and violence as a form of alienation from society (30).

Although Sartre established the general framework for understanding Jean Genet's literary project and its intellectual dimensions, the most important aspect of that framework, whose primary material was philosophical issues, has declined in importance today in favor of religious, political, and ideological aspects, especially with regard to Genet's position on Judaism and Semitism. Jean-Paul Sartre wrote that "Genet is an anti-Semite, or he plays with it, and we imagine anti-Semitic statements. Should Jews be deprived of political rights? He doesn't care about politics; should they be prevented from practicing the liberal professions and trade? This means that he

doesn't want to rob them, since merchants are his first victims (...). Does he want to kill them all in massacres? But massacres don't concern Genet, and the crimes he dreams of are individual crimes (...). In all this hatred, I see only this: as a victim of pogroms and persecutions for centuries, the Jew embodies the image of the martyr. His gentleness, humanity, patience, and sharp intelligence command our respect for him, but they do not provide him with standing in Genet's eyes (...). What Genet hates about the Jew is that he finds in him his own special status" (31). This passage defined the perspective of scholars of Genet's literature, following Sartre, and placed Jean Genet in the corner of anti-Semitism, which, for them, had transformed - in its content - into hostility toward the State of Israel and Zionism. Criticism of Jean Genet's literature became almost entirely generative and ready-made. This criticism, at every opportunity, repeats what resembles the negative axioms attributed to Genet's thought and practices, which have become limited to his homosexuality, his family origins, his fascination with violence and aggression toward others and toward all basic areas of belonging, including the challenge to his patriotism, his metaphysical fascination with evil, and his affirmation of his hostility toward Zionism, Semitism, and Israel. Jean Genet's critics have brought up his early writings to confirm his anti-Semitism, such as his novel "Funeral Processions" (1948), in which he describes the effect of a Nazi soldier's sexual attraction on a young Frenchman who belongs to one of the

French militias during the World War, or his play "Protective Barriers," which came to denounce the French colonization of Algeria (32).

The publication of "The Prisoner in Love" sparked a wave of political criticism, viewed as an anti-Israel work. This was the latest in a series of vicious circles in the ongoing struggle between supporters and opponents of Zionism in France, marking the beginning of a shift in the balance of power between them (only in terms of intellectual and ideological influence within the cultural elite!), shifting in favor of the pro-Zionists. The initial storm against the book subsided, only to return in the form of an intellectual and ideological trial in which the literary issue did not occupy a significant position. This occurred in early 2003, at the initiative of the magazine

"Modern Times" (founded by Jean-Paul Sartre after World War II, and which, after his death, transformed into a pro-Zionist group aligned with Sartre's intellectual orientations in the final stages of his life). Eric Marty published a lengthy study entitled "Jean Genet in Chatila," showing that the original and permanent content of Jean Genet's thought was his anti-Semitism, and that this content was the key to understanding and analyzing all his literary and political writings (33). In its critical campaign against Jean Genet (for political reasons related to his support for the Palestinian cause), Eric Marty's study went beyond all traditions and methods of intellectual criticism and dialogue because it tried to float the issue in one dimension, which is anti-Semitism, participating in that enormous effort made by European Zionist circles (and French in particular) through publishing houses, newspapers, and magazines (34) that formed the team of soft and effective power for the benefit of Zionism in Western Europe. On this basis, the debate that accompanied the publication of Jean Genet's books "Four Hours in Chatila" and "The Prisoner in Love" shifted from a dialogue about the horror of Zionist criminality to exposing all of Jean Genet's literary and intellectual output on charges of racism, anti-Semitism, and openness to Nazi ideas. Eric Marty asserted that Jean Genet's personality and ideas could only be understood in light of three religious, mythological, and political figures or figures: Sodom, Cain, and Adolf Hitler. These are references to the issue of homosexuality, the instinct for evil, and anti-Semitism (35). This provoked reactions from critics and intellectuals who demonstrated the inconsistency of Marty's approach and his manipulation of historical facts and the methods of intellectual

criticism (36). Eric Marty classified his criticism of Jean Genet's positions and opinions according to an arbitrary method, some aspects of whose weakness were revealed by the confrontation of some French (leftist) intellectuals, such as René Cécati, by publishing two additional books on the issue, confirming in this that the confrontation of ideas of solidarity with the Palestinian (and Arab) right in Zionist circles in France is a systematic and planned matter on a wide scale and with effective means (37). Marty considered that Jean Genet fell into anti-Semitism because of his "metaphysical passion for evil" (38) and "his hatred of the good inherent in humans" (39) and because he considered the Jew to embody the strange, distant and disgusting other (40). Marty added, in an acrobatic leap, that Jean Genet is incapable of loving Jews because of his penchant for evil (which Palestinian Arabs inevitably represent!), because the Jewish religion is built on values and principles that Genet has completely rejected since childhood, and because of his status as a foundling and a deviant rebel against a society so cruel that it has rendered him ideologically nihilistic. This type of criticism aims to achieve an automatic transition from disparaging the person (Jean Genet) to disparaging his thought and positions (supporting the Palestinian cause and opposing Zionism). This is a communication technique that has no connection to the logic of argumentation and original criticism at the level of thought and philosophy, but rather relies on methods of marketing efficiency. The critical methodology with which Zionist circles confronted Jean Genet's writings relied on the method of striking the present with the absent, i.e., refuting ideas and opinions by affirming the validity of adjacent ideas. As Pascal Durand demonstrated when he spoke of transforming some statements and theses into self-evident, indisputable truths, even though they do not possess these specifications, by placing the critic in a position of neutrality and on the basis of abstract comprehensiveness (41). This is embodied in the concept of "world discourse," developed by Pierre Bourdieu, which suggests that the speaker or critical writer does not serve a private interest through his rhetorical or critical work, but rather serves only the basis of the text or discourse on which he is working (42). Confirming the anti-Semitic nature of Jean Genet's ideas and positions leads to the rejection of his political ideas, and it also aims to withdraw the law of rejecting anti-Semitism and transform it into a rejection of opposition to Zionism and Israeli policy. Therefore, searching for ways to prove Genet's anti-Semitism is the path to success in criticizing the truth of his positions related to Palestine. Any Zionist-based criticism of Jenny Gantz's political and intellectual positions is lost in the generalities of anti-Semitism, the

sanctification of evil, sympathy for Nazism, and the rejection of Western civilization (of Judeo-Christian origins). This is the foundation upon which the entire Zionist intellectual and ideological system stands, which seeks to obscure any criticism of Zionism as a colonial and racist ideology and to equate any criticism of Israel and Zionism with anti-Semitism and a bias toward Nazi and racist ideas.

The publication of "The Prisoner in Love" sparked a wave of political criticism, viewed as an anti-Israel work. This was the latest in a series of vicious circles in the ongoing struggle between supporters and opponents of Zionism in France, marking the beginning of a shift in the balance of power between them (only in terms of intellectual and ideological influence within the cultural elite!), shifting in favor of the pro-Zionists. The initial storm against the book subsided, only to return in the form of an intellectual and ideological trial in which the literary issue did not occupy a significant position. This occurred in early 2003, at the initiative of the magazine "Modern Times" (founded by Jean-Paul Sartre after World War II, and which, after his death, transformed into a pro-Zionist group aligned with Sartre's intellectual orientations in the final stages of his life). Eric Marty published a lengthy study entitled "Jean Genet in Chatila," showing that the original and permanent content of Jean Genet's thought was his anti-Semitism, and that this content was the key to understanding and analyzing all his literary and political writings (33). In its critical campaign against Jean Genet (for political reasons related to his support for the Palestinian cause), Eric Marty's study went beyond all traditions and methods of intellectual criticism and dialogue because it tried to float the issue in one dimension, which is anti-Semitism, participating in that enormous effort made by European Zionist circles (and French in particular) through publishing houses, newspapers, and magazines (34) that formed the team of soft and effective power for the benefit of Zionism in Western Europe. On this basis, the debate that accompanied the publication of Jean Genet's books "Four Hours in Chatila" and "The Prisoner in Love" shifted from a dialogue about the horror of Zionist criminality to exposing all of Jean Genet's literary and intellectual output on charges of racism, anti-Semitism, and openness to Nazi ideas. Eric Marty asserted that Jean Genet's personality and ideas could only be understood in light of three religious, mythological, and political figures or figures: Sodom, Cain, and Adolf Hitler. The, instinct for evil, and anti-Semitism (35).

This provoked reactions from critics and intellectuals who demonstrated the inconsistency of Marty's approach and his manipulation of historical facts and the methods of intellectual criticism (36). Eric Marty classified his criticism of Jean Genet's positions and opinions according to an arbitrary method, some aspects of whose weakness were revealed by the confrontation of some French (leftist) intellectuals, such as René Cécati, by publishing two additional books on the issue, confirming in this that the confrontation of ideas of solidarity with the Palestinian (and Arab) right in Zionist circles in France is a systematic and planned matter on a wide scale and with effective means (37). Marty considered that Jean Genet fell into anti-Semitism because of his "metaphysical passion for evil" (38) and "his hatred of the good inherent in humans" (39) and because he considered the Jew to embody the strange, distant and disgusting other (40). Marty added, in an acrobatic leap, that Jean Genet is incapable of loving Jews because of his penchant for evil (which Palestinian Arabs inevitably represent!), because the Jewish religion is built on values and principles that Genet has completely rejected since childhood, and because of his status as a foundling and a deviant rebel against a society so cruel that it has rendered him ideologically nihilistic. This type of criticism aims to achieve an automatic transition from disparaging the person (Jean Genet) to disparaging his thought and positions (supporting the Palestinian cause and opposing Zionism). This is a communication technique that has no connection to the logic of argumentation and original criticism at the level of thought and philosophy, but rather relies on methods of marketing efficiency. The critical methodology with which Zionist circles confronted Jean Genet's writings relied on the method of striking the present with the absent, i.e., refuting ideas and opinions by affirming the validity of adjacent ideas. As Pascal Durand demonstrated when he spoke of transforming some statements and theses into self-evident, indisputable truths, even though they do not possess these specifications, by placing the critic in a position of neutrality and on the basis of abstract comprehensiveness (41). This is embodied in the concept of "world discourse," developed by Pierre Bourdieu, which suggests that the speaker or critical writer does not serve a private interest through his rhetorical or critical work, but rather serves Only the basis of the text or discourse on which he is working (42). Confirming the anti-Semitic nature of Jean Genet's ideas and positions leads to the rejection of his political ideas, and it also aims to withdraw the law of rejecting anti-Semitism and transform it into a rejection of opposition to Zionism and Israeli policy. Therefore, searching for ways to prove Genet's anti-Semitism is the path to success in criticizing the

truth of his positions related to Palestine. Any Zionist-based criticism of Jenny Gantz's political and intellectual positions is lost in the generalities of anti-Semitism, the sanctification of evil, sympathy for Nazism, and the rejection of Western civilization (of Judeo-Christian origins). This is the foundation upon which the entire Zionist intellectual and ideological system stands, which seeks to obscure any criticism of Zionism as a colonial and racist ideology and to equate any criticism of Israel and Zionism with anti-Semitism and a bias toward Nazi and racist ideas.

Jean Genet died in 1986 without responding to his Zionist critics, but the campaign targeting his ideas and positions was directed against him and against those who shared his views and positions...

Conclusion:

The Palestinians were subjected to a horrific massacre by the Israeli occupation state in September 1982. This event sparked a great deal of uproar and outrage around the world. Immediately after the massacre, Jean Genet traveled to Beirut and toured the sites of the incident, which became a stain on history. Jean Genet saw with his own eyes the horrific consequences of the massacre, as the dead had yet to be buried. He was deeply affected by what he saw. After his return to France, the effects of the massacre continued to haunt him until he was able to write an essay titled "Four Hours in Shatila," in which he denounced the inhumane massacres committed against the Palestinians. When the Palestinian-American international intellectual Edward Said discusses Genet in his book "On Late Style," he mentions Jean-Paul Sartre and quotes Jean Genet's remarks about him. In that book, Edward Said says: "Genet continued to discuss Sartre's staunchly pro-Israel stance, saying, 'He was afraid to say a word

defending the rights of the Palestinians, for fear that his friends in Paris would accuse him of anti-Semitism.'" Jean Genet was no ordinary writer. In the 1980s, there were few other writers who were as committed to the Palestinian cause as Roger Garaudy. Jean Genet's books on the Palestinian issue were banned in France, yet his voice on behalf of the Palestinians resonated worldwide, even though the First Gulf War had a profound impact on the Palestinian cause.

Foot notes:

-
- (1) - Genet. 1991.
 - (2) - White. 1993.
 - (3) -The local pornographic magazine Playboy published an interview in its first issue in early 1964.
 - (4) - Genet. 2010.
 - (5)- Genet. 1981.
 - (6) -Fredette.1993.
 - (7)- Genet. 1986 (Reprises en Coll. Folio)
 - (8)- Bendhif-Syllas. 2012.
 - (9)-Bougon. 2009.
 - (10)-Sartre. 1952.
 - (11)- Neutres. 2002.
 - (12) -Bataille. 1957. PP. 201 – 203/ 205 - 211.
 - (13) -Sartre. 1952. P. 230.
 - (14)-Toffoli: Jean Genet's antisemitic question: Unknown sir "sens du monde". Autour de la reception criticize d'un captif amoureux; Postures N° 24.
 - (15) -Marty.2003.
 - (16) -Among these magazines (which have a respectable and effective sc
 - (17) -Ceccatty. 2006.
 - (18) - Marty. 2003.
 - (19) - Durand. 2004.
 - (20) -Bourdieu. 1975