**Why settlers are wrong, and why post-Zionists are also wrong**

**Settler Zionism promotes a policy of evil that could bring an end to Jewish self-determination in the Land of Israel. But it does so under the auspices of the fashionable and misguided noise created by post-Zionist academics**

**[Chaim](https://translate.google.com/translate?hl=en&prev=_t&sl=iw&tl=en&u=https://www.haaretz.co.il/misc/writers/WRITER-1.2294377)**[**Hanz**](https://translate.google.com/translate?hl=en&prev=_t&sl=iw&tl=en&u=https://www.haaretz.co.il/misc/writers/WRITER-1.2294377)

In what country do people argue about whether their country was born right or not? One could easily argue that the United States was created by the unjust killing of indigenous peoples and this was the case throughout North America and South, New Zealand and Canada. In fact, what country was born the right way? ... Is Iraq right? Jordan? United States? Brazil? "This quote was taken from an anonymous opinion on the books" Political Theory for the Jewish People "which I received following its publication in English. In the opinion section of" Haaretz "he joined this reviewer Dror Etkes who stated:" What is required now ... is no more Academic and publicist discussions of descendants of immigrants on the righteousness of the Zionist idea , but healthy indigenous patriotism. "Similar comments were on my other book" Equal Zionism "in the journal published by the Tel Aviv University's Political Science Department and in the delegation section that once held Ben Dror Yemini in" Maariv " .

I have to admit that this is a fairly broad coalition of stages, both academic and journalistic, more prestigious and less prestigious, leftist and right-wing. But the criticism that his friends express is based entirely on error. Mistake of both fact and discernment. As for the mistake: Australia has been engaged in the genocide that has been associated with its establishment as a European country for decades, and there are debates on these questions in both the US and North America as a whole and in South America. Iraq and Jordan are said to have arisen as a result of administrative arbitrariness or colonial intrigue. It is not true that Israel is exceptional in terms of debates within and outside of it regarding its justification. Such debates may not have taken place in Saddam Hussein's Iraq, and may not exist in Jordan, but they are held wherever freedom of opinion and argument are not suppressed.

The factual error of those who think that the question of state justice pales in when they come to think of their own mistakes of distinction. He has two such mistakes. One is practically and politically fatal, another is morally fateful. The practical error is entirely related to the size of the new populations created in countries such as Australia, Brazil and the United States as a result of their modern founding and the size of their original populations - compared to the corresponding ratio of these populations in Israel and its surroundings.

The Cherokee and the Creek and the Inuit of North America can be easily pushed to the margins of the political and practical life of the countries that exist there. They abolish sixty relative to populations of European descent and have been there since the crimes that almost completely eradicated the original nations of these countries . The Arab population of Israel and its surroundings cannot be pushed to the margins of political life in Israel without paying a significant, perhaps fatal, price. All of this makes the practical reverberation of the question of Zionist righteousness and the establishment of Israel deaf relative to the hearing frequencies necessary to attribute practical significance to the arguments in Australia about Aboriginal attitudes.

Anyone who wants to use the elephant cliché in the room to use it. Relative to the native peoples' flies left in America and Australia, the Arabs are far more elephant. You might want to make them a fly in the Land of Israel, as the Israeli government and its concentric circles , Ze'ev Elkin and Yariv Levin and the settlers and the price tags and Rabbi Lior and Baruch Goldstein and Yigal Amir seek; But that is precisely the important reason for talking about Zionism and its destruction by these forces. This corrupt Zionism has been guiding Israel's political actions for 47 years in a way that dictates the lives of everyone who lives here and makes their lives a very sweet life - in my opinion temporarily, as in my case and the settlers - and some very bitter, as in the case of the Palestinians. This corrupt Zionism succeeds because its heads are misleading themselves and the entire public here to think that it can suck legitimacy from the just Zionism in which Sesa has established Israel.

Last Things is a difference distinction other important between cases of righteousness Australia and the United States on the one hand, the righteousness of Israel on the other, that he fateful mainly from the moral: Israel commits on a daily basis over the formation just to the policy of corrupting not only if the justice of its present, And not only the possibility of her being right in the future, but her past righteousness as well. All other countries have made the opposite move - they have gone from being previously criminalized to rehabilitating the present in a way that will allow a just future and a request for penance for the past.

When arguing in Australia about the question of Aboriginal treatment, that power is not about the criminal nature of the acts done to them but about the way to atone for these acts. As part of this debate, there is almost complete agreement on the criminal nature of the acts. Labour's Australian Prime Minister Kevin Rudd thought he should apologize for those acts. The former Conservative prime minister, John Howard, refused, but he also did not pursue a policy that continued these crimes. Israel is in the opposite pole. Israel's founding righteousness had no significant debate before the 1970s, when Australia stopped committing crimes against Aborigines.

The debate in Israel began mainly in the late 1970s, when Zionism began to lose its just camera. Which allowed both settler art and its post-Zionist critics to blur the difference between its righteousness and its ever-increasing delinquency since the 1970s. The tyranny of Netanyahu's settler, Bennett and Uri Ariel, has since made it possible to blend their policy crimes with the legitimacy that Israel and Zionism had in the first two decades of the country, and the factors that made Israel's establishment just and legitimate. For people like Shlomo Zand, Yehuda Shenhav and Uri Ram, Netanyahu, Bennett and Ariel's policy criminals are able to blacken Israel's founding and what it could have been. The two sides are mutually exclusive in staining Judaism in a historical stain that will be difficult to remove and in Israel's destruction.

But a big mistake would be to compare the strength of these two factors with the stain they impose on Judaism, a stain whose spread is accelerated daily, and the destruction they are expected to bring on Israel, a danger whose danger increases daily. Their power cannot be compared because the Post-Zionists are a negligible group in terms of their political power. Settler and proprietary Zionism, on the other hand, is the ideological foundation of the elements in most Israeli governments of the last 40 years. These determine the practical and political existence of the country on a daily basis. Academic scholars with the post-Zionist stream would not receive the public attention they receive, nor would they provoke the noise they would have generated, had it not been for this noise and the intimidation produced through it to serve the interests of the Israeli governments in advancing their disastrous policies on a daily basis. If the chances of the evil they are promoting - we were the end of Jewish self-determination in the Land of Israel - are not slim, it is not because the errors of post-Zionist criticism of Zionism may motivate the process that will eventually end Jewish self-determination in the Land of Israel; The dominance of settler and proprietary Zionism in the Israeli policy platform over the past 40 years is likely to motivate processes at the end of which this evil will occur.

Zionist-proprietary Zionism is also devastating because its foundations cannot be accepted by decent people, and even more so because its consequences cannot be accepted by such people. The basis of settlement Zionism is, as is well known, related to understanding the historical connection between the Jews and the Land of Israel as a proprietary relationship. Naftali Bennett is carrying ancient coins in his pocket on Earth to prove this property relationship on television shows he appears on. But he won't convince anyone of this. Jean-Jacques Rousseau very clearly stated the reasons for this in his remarks about the customs of a first strong concept in territories: "How can a single person or a whole conquer a vast parcel of land and prevent all mankind from enjoying it, if not by punishing it; By robbing the rest of the people of a place and food that nature has given everyone equally? " Rousseau, it should be noted, negates the very possibility that the first in the territory will buy ownership in the first place. Imagine what he would say about the first argument in territory in retrospect, in relation to the territory abandoned by its first holders and seized many centuries ago by others whose successors today cannot be held responsible for the wrongs committed by their ancestors.

**Between the two poles**

Regardless of ownership, perhaps the first of the territories in history and the identity of nations - not the first of nations in the history of territory - can be the basis for determining the geographical place where nations' equal right to self-determination should be realized if they do not. This was the case of the Jews before Israel was established. But such a premise can only be a basis for determining the place of realization of the peoples definition , not for determining the territorial scope. During the pre-Six-Day War, Zionism knew this well. Even if she had leaders and thinkers and activists who thought like Netanyahu and Bennett, and no doubt she had, in her official documents she always talked about a national home or state for a Jew in Palestine. She did not talk about any drinking, and certainly not all of Israel. This was the case with the Basel program of the First Zionist Congress, the Balfour Declaration, and the plans and partisan decisions. Of course, one could argue that the Zionist leadership drafted or agreed to these documents only for tactics or pretense. But, as is well known, tactics and pretense often express the reality and righteousness of what they are pretending to do. Why else do you pretend to use this thing?

However, the problems that settlement Zionism has with its foundation on the claim of Jewish past ownership of the Land of Israel are nothing and nothing compared to the problems it has with the implications of this foundation for the Jewish future in the Land of Israel. And these are the main things to say in his condemnation. This is an interpretation that discusses Zionism by virtue of its internal logic for a systematic and day-to-day violation of Arab human rights. According to the settlement of Zionism, the Arabs must be regarded as a historical collective to be conquered by the land of the Jews. It is not at all conceivable from the perspective of this interpretation to be granted collective rights to them in this country. Granting them is like granting them the rights to rob them of the object of robbing them just because they were robbed. As for Arab rights as individuals: Settlement Zionism is swinging on this issue between its right-wing pole - the Kahanist pole seeking to remove all Arab details from Israel - and its " left-wing " pole by Moshe Arens, who speaks of the disappearance of Arabs as a collective from Palestine. Civilian as individuals.

And like a pendulum between two poles, settler Zionism is in most of the time in the middle of both. It is deporting the Arabs, violating large property rights floods under private law, giving their political allegiance faithfully to Jews, and such great injustices, some of which are actually perpetrated by Israel and some offered to critics by new political parties . From the perspective of Zionist proprietary and settler interpretation, they are not at all considered wrongs. These are actions that are right for her. Israel is therefore doomed to continue them if this ideology continues to be its policy platform, just as Afrikaners' South Africa was previously condemned to blacks for blacks as racism and apartheid were its policy platform. Although settler Zionism is not really racism and apartheid, it is considered in terms of its practical implications for racism and apartheid. It is an ideology in which the discrimination of the other in Israel, its humiliation and violation of its human rights is inherent.

One of the great sins of the post- Zionists is precisely at this point. The time of the post, writes Uri Ram, is a time when one must replace "the dominant ethnic nationalism in Israel, according to which there is an identity between" a people "as an ethnocultural entity and a" state "as a constitutional, territorial nationalism, which can be separated from nationality. And a state in such a way that community affiliation (or cultural, religious, ethnic and so on) will not constitute a constitutional pillar (but will remain voluntarily at the level of civil society). " Shlomo Zand has similar views. Ram and Zand and other post-Zionists claim this because they believe that Israel is unequal to the Arabs. But this inequality can and must be solved by granting collective self-determination rights to the Arabs as well. There is no need to give up on this the main goal of Zionism: the establishment of self-determination for Jews in Israel.

The post-Zionist proposals are bad and unjustified proposals not only because they completely negate Zionism and give Jews much less than they deserve in Israel. These are bad suggestions because they are distracting from what is really severe in Zionism as the State of Israel has fulfilled it in recent decades. It fulfills it not as an ideology that seeks to maintain self-determination for Jews in the Land of Israel, but as an ideology that seeks to exercise Jewish ownership over the entire land of Israel. Although as a historical movement, Zionism committed crimes in its formative years that could not be committed for its fundamental purpose (the realization of the Jewish right to self-determination), it is not a goal that, by definition, has not been given in the past and cannot be equated today with Palestinian self-determination in Palestine. By contrast, Zionist-proprietary Zionism, by definition, causes systematic, constant, principled, and grave infringement of their human rights. This Zionism cannot exist without this vulnerability.

**Delinquent state**

American philosopher John Roll S., perhaps the most important political philosopher of the 20th century, has in his book "The Law of Peoples"A distinction is made between several types of peoples in terms of their moral standards. At the top of his scale are" liberal "peoples - those who maintain democracy and equality among their members. He then ranks peoples whom he calls" fair ".d ecent) - Those who do not maintain democracy and equality and who instead have class hierarchies and rights in relation to different types of groups and communities, but are "well-organized" as Rawls's expression, and at least respect the human rights of those under their control. The third category of Rawls, which is the most important in our case, is that of "delinquent" states - countries that threaten peace in their attempt to expand their spheres of influence and violate the basic human rights of those in their territories.

If what I said about Zionism's proprietary interpretation is true, it would also be right to classify Israel not only as a state which, despite its pretensions, is not liberal and equitable, but also as a "non-fair" state. If constitutive theory of Israeli politics is proprietary Zionism - and because of settlement policy there is no way to interpret the theory underlying this politics except in such a way - Rawls's third category , that of a delinquent state, seems more suited to Israel's characterization than its second category, a non-state one. Equal, hierarchical, but fair. To settle for the claim that the Post-Zionists are content with it and to say that there is a contradiction between Israel's Jewishness and its democracies in a way that makes it an unequal society is to criticize the pale criticism that misses the point.

The Post-Zionists make claims that are at the same time too stringent and too lenient. On the one hand, they demand it too strictly to give up on the goals of Zionism as it was in its formative years: the realization of the Jewish self-determination right in Israel. On the other hand, they too easily avoid highlighting the central crime sufficiently - the realization of Zionism which means a systematic, constant and fundamental violation of non-Jewish human rights. Their sin is twofold. The fact that they are suing Israel for the unjust prosecution of renouncing the Jews' right to self-determination produces, because of its obvious injustice, a noise that obscures what is really needed to be shouted at about Israel. No wonder the dominant Zionism in Israel, the proprietary Zionism, jumps on the post-Zionism as much booty and highlights its publications despite the political neglect and theoretical weakness of their arguments. Under the antagonism of the post-Zionist unjust claims (among other things), proprietary Zionism continues to fulfill its vicious vision, as if it were the only and proper interpretation of Zionism. She does this, noting that if Zionism comes to an end, it is because of her actions, not the weak arguments of post-Zionist academics.

I started this list with a question often asked in my work on Zionism: "In what country do people argue about whether their country was born right?" And claims of the needlessness of the question of Zionist righteousness. I already gave most of the answers to this question at the beginning of the list, but did not feel it: As far as I know in no Western country, the territorial, demographic, historical and ideological realities that led to its establishment continue to exist and nourish its daily life as significantly as it is in Israel. It is about daily life in foreign and security policy, in constitutional and legal arrangements, in economics, in land and immigration arrangements, not to mention the organization of public and symbolic spaces. Zionism shapes all these areas. Without understanding the arguments and justifications of Zionism and arguing over them, the Aura will continue to be simplistic, rude, blind, vicious and disastrous as it has been over the past 40 years. Attempts to offer alternatives that eliminate it altogether, as post-Zionism attempts, are attempts that began in the 1930s with the Canaanites. There was then them and there is intellectual grace and fashion today. It is possible to spice up the debate about the meaning and justification of Zionism. They cannot replace this argument. He is in our souls.