

the UN resolutions confirming this as their right. Israel Shahak, chairman of the Israeli League for Human and Civil Rights, explains this when he says: «People who were born, and lived most of their life in Jerusalem are not allowed to come back and to settle in their own city, if they are not Jews; of course, if a Dutchman converts to Judaism tomorrow he will not only be allowed to do so at once, he will also get an apartment in Ramat Eschol (an all-Jewish suburb of Jerusalem) built on Arab land conquered and expropriated in 1967» («What are my Opinions?», *Middle East International*, May 1975). Is there a more racist law anywhere in the world? Undoubtedly, Israel's aim is to preempt any attempt to realize the rights of the Palestinian people, foremost among them the rights to return to and self-determination in their own land. The long-term objective was and remains the elimination of the Palestinians as a people with national rights.

### Immigration and peace

Facts leave no room for doubt that the ongoing mass influx of Jews from the Soviet Union is being used to pursue far-reaching plans, namely the creation of «Greater Israel», to retain its grip on the occupied Arab lands and to assert its predominance in the region. In addition to changing the demography of the occupied territories, the new waves of immigrants will guarantee a perpetuation of the Palestinian-Israeli conflict, which means more war and instability. This influx, the biggest since the founding of Israel, will also serve to bolster the military establishment with new recruits. As well, many of the Soviet Jews are trained scientists, engineers and technicians whose expertise will certainly be put to military use. The possibility of achieving any kind of peace was dispelled with the coming of the Soviet Jews to Palestine, for the Israeli leadership is exploiting this influx to maintain their occupation of the Palestinian territories. Shamir's statement about needing a «big Israel» to absorb these immigrants is an obvious indication of this.

Day after day it becomes clearer that Israel has not changed its determination to maintain sovereignty over the occupied territories. Israel is not a state of peace, nor is it capable of making peace; while continuing to talk about «peace» in the region, it has been pursuing a relentless program of settling new immigrants in the occupied territories. Israel's intention is to «create facts» by changing the demographic, historical, natural and legal status of the Arab territories. By doing so, Israel violates international laws and conventions and the authority of the UN, meanwhile creating new obstacles to the peace process.

One of the major hinderances which impedes resolution of the Palestinian question is Israel's settlement policy and its refusal to withdraw from the occupied territories, which is the focal point now of the Middle East conflict. The two main Israeli parties assert that they are unwilling to accept

Kiryat Arba settlement, occupied West Bank



Democratic Palestine, July-August 1990

total withdrawal from the Arab lands occupied in the June aggression of 1967, or to recognize the rights of the Palestinian people. They are not interested in reaching a peaceful settlement to the Palestinian-Israeli conflict. Their «ultimate aim», Shamir said in March 1984, «is the same as it was 40 years ago - to fight to put the Land of Israel completely in our hands and to free all its parts of foreigners, that is, of Arabs» (quoted in *Zionism: Enemy of Peace and Social Progress*, issue 5, 1988, p.156).

This is the reality of Israel and its Zionist rulers, with practically no difference between one figure and another. They differ only in details, or in the tactics they use to achieve the same principle aims. If the Likud leaders believe in the sovereignty of the Jews over the whole of «Eretz Israel», so does the Labor Party. «There is no argument in Israel about our historic rights in the Land of Israel. The past is immutable and the Bible is the decisive document in determining the fate of our land», said Shimon Peres (quoted by The Arab League, op. cit., p.346). Peres' willingness to accept a «territorial compromise» is aimed at «freeing» Israel of an unwanted Arab population that «would eventually endanger the Jewish character of Israel» (ibid.). Thus the difference is only in the rhetoric they use to describe their tactics to gain a political advantage. Shamir described himself as one of the defenders of «Greater Israel»; Peres did also, but in another way. «Even if we have to cut our standard of living, we will absorb the immigrants», he said. «This is our most important job, to save Jews and give the state greater capabilities...Together, we shall bring them over here and make this country stronger» (Associated Press, January 9th). It is not strange, then, that Palestinians see no essential difference between the basic views of Labor and Likud on the immigration issue.

Shamir declared that Israel would have to keep the occupied West Bank and Gaza Strip in order to accommodate the hundreds of thousands of Soviet Jews. Peres said that immigrants could go and settle wherever they choose, including the occupied lands. Both of them express the same ideology - Zionism. In this regard, the author Noam Chomsky said, «Contrary to illusions fostered here [in the US], the two major political groupings in Israel do not differ in a fundamental way with regard to the occupied territories. Both agree that Israel should effectively control them; both insistently reject any expression of Palestinian national rights west of the Jordan, though the Labor Alignment contains a margin of dissidents» (quoted by The Arab League, op.cit., p.247).

From this brief survey of the Zionists' racist policy, one comes to the conclusion that Zionist allegations about peace are no more than a camouflage for their sinister scheme to Judaize all the occupied territories through the expulsion of the Palestinians and their replacement with the newcomers. Israel's Zionist leaders have their own definition of «peace». For them, peace means Palestinian acceptance of all their terms, including surrendering any right to the land and preferably evacuating it. Anything less than total surrender is unacceptable to them, as Shamir put it saying that, «whoever fights against immigration cannot be for peace with Israel» (Associated Press, January 24th). Shamir wants Palestinians to accept immigration with the dangers it poses to their existence and rights.

This is the true face of Israeli policy-makers who view the West Bank and Gaza Strip as an integral part of Israel and have recently begun suggesting that the need to settle arriving Soviet immigrants is a reason to keep the occupied territories. Israeli planners are, in fact, aware of the impor-