

resolutions and the international support they received. The Israeli government has yet to present a viable plan for peace; its program does not add much to the 1984 program which was based on NO negotiations with the PLO, and «self-rule» for Palestinians in the occupied territories. Israel is against the establishment of a Palestinian state anywhere between the Jordan river and the Mediterranean Sea. This is an indirect suggestion by both Likud and Labor that a Palestinian state should be established in Jordan, rather than in Palestine.

The new government of «national unity» is in reality a government of national paralysis. Likud has not offered anything outside the framework of the Camp David agreements, while Labor is in harmony with Likud over the three No's: No to negotiations with the PLO, No to withdrawal from the 1967 occupied territories, and No to a Palestinian state.

According to *Haaretz*, the inner cabinet discussed a report prepared by Israeli experts in its mid-March meeting. This report suggests that the Israeli government should conduct negotiations with the PLO and find a political solution, because «the intifada might continue for years to come.»⁵ The report warned of Israel's deteriorating image in the world and the weakening of US-Israeli relations in the continued absence of a political solution.

On the other hand, the latest report by the Brookings Institute urges the US administration to place the Arab-Israeli conflict on its priority list, and warns against a protracted stalemate which might endanger US interests. The report adds that what is needed is more than bringing the two sides to the negotiating table. There is an urgent need for a realistic strategic policy to achieve peace.

The intifada has established itself

formidably and has now become a way of life for Palestinians living under Israeli occupation, who are now erecting the structure of the future Palestinian state. There is now international consensus for a negotiated political settlement. The US has finally come to realize the futility of excluding the PLO from such negotiations. The Palestinian people and their leadership want a negotiated settlement; the majority of Israelis want a negotiated settlement; and the Israeli government is still holding out. A continuation of Israeli intransigence will only prolong the bloodshed and isolate the Zionist state even more.

¹ Database Project on Palestinian Human Rights, February 1st; Shomron was speaking at a Knesset Foreign Affairs and Defense Committee briefing on January 10th.

² *Destour*, Arabic, February 10th.

³ *Ibid.*

⁴ AP, February 13th.

⁵ *Haaretz*, March 20th.

A Garrison State

In previous issues of *Democratic Palestine* we have printed a study on the role of the Zionist state in the Middle East, focusing on its wars, nuclear power, reactionary alliances and special military operations in the service of imperialism. Below, the concluding installment of this study deals with aspects of its internal structure that allow the Zionist state to play this role.

The connection between the Zionist state's internal structure and its regional role lies in its origin as a settler colony. Predicated on the Palestinians' dispossession on the one hand and massive external support on the other, 'Israel' carved out its enemies and alliances which provided the rationale and source, respectively, of its military build-up. At the same time, it created its own crisis which was described from the demographic angle by Yigal Allon (former Palmach commander, deputy prime minister and foreign minister), as follows: «... the rate of Jewish immigration which followed the establishment of the State of Israel proved to be much lower than expected and the Jewish birth rate in the country did not exceed that of the indigenous Arab population, and so the dream of the Jewish people rapidly becoming a solid majority within an undivided Erez Israel, *without* an exodus of the Palestinian Arab population, vanished into thin air. The military victory of 1967 did not change an iota of this basic demographic reality despite a temporary rise in Jewish immigration figures which followed the Six Days War» (*Middle East Review* 12, no.2, Winter 1979-80).

It is clear from this statement that aggression is the only outlet for fulfilling the Zionist dream - How else to effect the desired Palestinian exodus? It is equally clear that aggression-like that of 1967 - only brings another stage of the built-in Israeli crisis.

FIRST STRIKE POLICY

The Israeli policy of preemptive first strikes as seen in the 1956 and 1967 wars, repeated invasions of Lebanon and innumerable air and commando raids, actually began «at home». According to Samuel Divan, Ben Gurion's advisor on Arab affairs, in a 1958 interview: «Ben Gurion always reminded us that we cannot be guided by subversion which the Arab minority (in 'Israel') has *not* engaged in. We must be guided by what they might have done if they had been given the chance» (quoted by Sami Hadawi, *Palestine in Focus*, 1969). It was this thinking that guided the organization of the IDF, border guards, Shin Bet, police and the Israeli state apparatus in general. Because the society was a settler colony and the enemy was within, the Israeli military build-up was not

Democratic Palestine, March 1989