

The Zionist left destroyed Palestine; The right will burry the Zionist enterprise?

The Zionist movement was colonial and European from its inception. It succeeded managed to join the British, who sought to control the country, and turned the zionists into their settler arm. Settler colonialism in Palestine was implemented through the division of labor: the British were the colonial empire, and the Zionists were the settlers who put the plan into action.

Since the 1920s, the Zionists "redeemed the land," meaning they bought land parcels exclusively for Jews and "conquered" them, which meant Jewish settled on these lands. This involved the displacement of Palestinian Arabs from these lands, who lived legally on them many years, even though they weren't their owners. Most of the "pioneers" settlers in labor groups and kibbutzim in the 1920s and 1930s were leftists, including Hashomer Hatzair and others.

The leadership of the Jewish community prior to the state (HaYishuv in Hebrew) was Ashkenazi secular and anti-religious, with elements of anti-Semitism (which also manifested itself in nowadays). The Zionist movement had no interest in the culture and history of the country and certainly not in its Palestinian inhabitants. The land was the place to conquer in order establish the Jewish national home.

Hatred of Arabs, Orientalism, continued after the establishment of the state and towards Arab Jews too, with the concept of the melting pot whose goal was to civilize Arab Jews, that is, to turn them into Europeans and to eliminate their Arabness.

Until 1948, the future of Palestine was uncertain, but with the UN Partition Resolution its fate was doomed. The Palestinians could not accept a plan that took away half of their land. Arab countries, Jewish communists and ultra-religious Jews opposed it, but the plan was accepted by the United Nations. From there, the land deteriorated into severe violence between Zionists and Palestinians. The power balance favored the

Zionists, and also because Palestinians perceived the whole region as their home, they were expelled and lost their homes. The Zionists destroyed Palestine and took control of 78% of the land. This was all done under the leadership of the Zionist left.

Despite the expulsion of 750,000 Palestinians, who were the majority of the land's inhabitants, and the establishment of a Jewish state, the Zionists in the Declaration of Independence promised peace with their Arab neighbors and safeguarding the rights of all inhabitants. These words were empty from the moment they were written, but they were good enough for the international community to support the new Jewish state. This support was partly motivated by anti-Semitic sentiments - a preference for Jews being away from Europe - and feelings of guilt over the Holocaust.

As long as the left led the country and continued to promote the false narrative of seeking peace, the world supported Israel. Even during the Suez Crisis and the occupation of Sinai in 1956, Britain and France supported Israel. In 1967, Israel completed the occupation of Palestine, and immediately afterward, despite hesitations and debates, whether honest or not regarding withdrawal, established settlements in the West Bank. Again, it was the Labor Party that led the way. Still, as long as Israel conveyed that it desired peace within the framework of two states, the world accepted it.

In 1977, a political turn-over occurred, and the right-wing came to power. Under Begin's leadership, the only significant Israeli de-colonial move took place: withdrawal of the Sinai Peninsula in exchange for peace with Egypt.

Since the completion of the occupation in 1967 the settler movement Gush Emunim, led by rabbi Zvi Yehuda Kook, saw in the expansion to new territories as messianic signs and pushed to establish settlement in The West Bank and later in Gaza Strip. While the political left used the religious component as a mobilizing one, and that's why the Uganda option was changed by "Eretz Israel", the hard core settling movement took it as their core project and got the support of Labor government to establish settlements.

The governments of the right, and especially the current government, is pushing Israel towards a direction it has not attempted before. This direction was well articulated in the "Submission Plan" written by Bezalel Smotrich a few years ago. According to that plan, Israel would hack the hopes of the Palestinians for an independent state and take full control of the West Bank. It suggests that Palestinians should be encouraged to emigrate voluntarily from the "Land of Israel," with Israel providing generous economic support and vocational training for those who choose to leave. Those who remain in major cities in the West Bank would have municipal autonomy at best. Any opposition from them would be met with extreme military force. (It is not in my interest to wonder about Smotrich's intentions, but it is hard to believe that he sees a chance that there will be Palestinians who will accept his plan).

This is the difference between the right and the left, and it is not insignificant: the left destroyed Palestine but managed to preserve the illusion of peace; the right, whose leaders grew up in the brutal apartheid of the West Bank and Gaza, is not interested in this at all. The right seeks to erase the gap between the fake statements and what actually happens on the ground: a brutal Jewish supremacy regime. The right's narrative is much more coherent.

On the other hand, the left conquers but is also enlightened. It is violent but ashamed of the outliers that occasionally emerge. It shoots and weeps. Even today, in the impressive demonstrations of the liberal Zionist camp, he shouts "democracy" but expresses patriotic militarism and is indifferent to the absence of Palestinian citizens from the demonstrations. If he had remained in power, it would not be possible today to think about the end of Zionism.

The right, on the other hand, has always been more forthright about its true intentions. Since Jabotinsky's "Iron Wall," the right knew that there would be neither an enlightened

occupation nor peace with the indigenous people of the land. They would always opposed colonial occupation, which is why it could only exist under the protection of the Iron Wall. Jabotinsky probably meant an army infinitely stronger than any Arab army, but the left managed to add to the Iron Wall the support of the great powers.. These two components make the Zionist enterprise invincible.

It is the right that is currently rushing to the final subjugation and the disappearance of the Palestinians as a "problem" that will most certainly bring about the end of the Zionist enterprise. However, the world, let's hope, will not allow this Israeli right-wing plan to succeed. Guilt over Israel's horrors under the patronage of the great powers will eventually outweigh historical guilt and interests in developing weapons and experimenting them on Palestinians.

Internally too, the right-wing in Israel poses a danger socially, economically, and security-wise. Without the high-tech money and the manpower of the military reserves, which will be affected when the "leftists" stop enlisting, and with the Jews emigration increasing, Israel will not hold.

Even if the current right-wing government falls soon and is replaced by a more centrist government, this process will slow down but not disappear. The general direction of Israel is to the extreme right. After expelling most Palestinians and preventing their return, selling the peace illusion, signing the Oslo Accords which briefly created euphoria and genuine hope, the only option left for the colonial settlement enterprise that it has not truly attempted "to the end" is to subdue the Palestinians entirely, physically and mentally, even without the need or intention to physically annihilate them.

This move is the hubris that will subdue its perpetrators. It is the too much that cannot be fulfilled. The collapse of zionism will be difficult for the Israelis who were raised for generations on "the land is only ours". Then they will be faced with the choice of the French settlers in Algeria in 1962: to remain as equals to the countrymen or to flee and

seek their future elsewhere. In any case, today it is at least possible to imagine a free Palestine and one democratic state to live in.

Eitan Bronstein Aparicio,
Brussels, September 2023