

No Peace without Justice: Disarming Hamas Means Disarming the Palestinian Cause

October 21, 2025 Articles, Commentary



Members of the Al-Qassam Brigades in front of the house of Hamas' leader Yahya Sinwar in Khan Yunis. (Photo: via QNN)

Share

Tweet

Pin

Email

By Ranjan Solomon

The colonizers insist on Hamas being disarmed so that peace can be delivered, but peace without justice will only entrench apartheid. Hamas exists as a result of Israeli occupation and exercises its right to resist as laid down in international law.

“Justice first. Then peace. Never the other way around.”

Each time a ceasefire is announced, the same refrain echoes from Washington and Tel Aviv: Hamas must disarm, Hamas must be dismantled.

It is the chorus of the colonizer, now joined by self-styled peacemakers who pretend that laying down arms will deliver peace. But peace without justice is the silence of the grave. To demand Hamas' disarmament before ending the occupation is not to build peace – it is to entrench apartheid under a different name.

The truth that the world refuses to confront is simple: Hamas exists because occupation exists. End the occupation, and armed resistance will lose its rationale. But, until then, asking Palestinians to give up their means of struggle is asking them to accept permanent subjugation.

It is worth holding fast to the conviction that the Occupation is the original Violence. Before a single rocket was ever fired from Gaza, Israel's colonial project had already displaced and dispossessed millions. The Nakba of 1948 created 750,000 refugees and destroyed over 500 villages. The 1967 war extended Israeli control over the West Bank, Gaza, and East Jerusalem. For nearly six decades now, these territories have lived under a brutal military occupation that denies Palestinians their land, water, mobility, and dignity.

Gaza itself has been under blockade since 2007 – an open-air prison where two million people live in ruins, without clean water, electricity, or hope. Israel controls its airspace, coastline, imports, exports, and even the calorie count of food entering the Strip. This is collective punishment at an industrial scale, a slow violence that kills not only people but possibilities. To speak of “terrorism” divorced from this context is intellectual dishonesty. Violence did not begin with Hamas. It began with colonization.

Resistance is a legal and moral Right and International law is unambiguous on this. United Nations General Assembly Resolution 37/43 of 1982 affirms the right of peoples under colonial and foreign domination to resist occupation “by all available means, including armed struggle.” This principle was invoked in support of liberation movements in Algeria, South Africa, and Namibia. Why should Palestine be treated differently?

Every colonized nation has had to resist by force when diplomacy failed. The ANC had Umkhonto we Sizwe, the Algerians had the FLN, and the Vietnamese fought foreign armies for decades. The West glorifies these movements in hindsight but condemns Palestinians for doing precisely the same.

What Israel and its allies call “terrorism” is, in fact, a desperate assertion of existence. Palestinians have learned that international law is only invoked to protect the powerful. The right to resist is the only right they can still exercise without permission.

The same Western powers now demanding Hamas' surrender cheer Ukraine's armed resistance against Russia. European governments rush weapons to Kyiv, hailing Ukrainians as freedom fighters defending sovereignty. But when Palestinians resist, they are branded terrorists. The message is unmistakable: White resistance is legitimate, brown resistance is barbaric. This racial hypocrisy exposes the moral bankruptcy of Western diplomacy. It is not resistance that they object to – it is who resists. And behind this bias lies a deeper complicity: Israel remains the West's military outpost in the Arab world, the guardian of Western interests, and the recipient of unending financial and diplomatic protection.

That is why, when Donald Trump and Benjamin Netanyahu preach “peace” through Hamas' surrender, they must be told to shut up. Their version of peace is the peace of apartheid – an enforced quiet over the ruins of a people's freedom.

Let us be clear: the call to “dismantle Hamas” is not about eliminating violence. The bald truth is that disarming Hamas implies neutralizing the Palestinian cause. It is about eliminating resistance. A disarmed Hamas would pave the way for Israeli control over Gaza, reconstruction under Western contracts, and a new class of Palestinian collaborators. That is why Washington and Tel Aviv are eager for a “post-Hamas Gaza” – one that will obey orders, not demand rights.

Disarming Hamas would mean erasing the political core of Palestinian nationalism in Gaza. It would convert a liberation movement into a humanitarian crisis, to be managed by aid agencies and donors. This is what Israel and its Western backers want: a Palestine reduced to charity, not sovereignty. But resistance cannot be erased by decree. As long as occupation remains, new forms of resistance will arise, with or without Hamas. The colonizer’s problem is not Hamas – it is the existence of a people who refuse to disappear.

The only route to lasting peace is justice. Justice begins with ending the occupation, dismantling all settlements built on stolen Palestinian land, and restoring the 1973 borders. The illegal outposts across the West Bank must be torn down, and Jerusalem restored as the shared capital of a truly free Palestine. These are not radical demands – they are the minimum requirements of international law. The 1973 borders (the pre-1967 lines) were the basis of every credible peace formula ever proposed. Israel has flouted them with impunity, expanding settlements in defiance of countless UN resolutions.

A genuine peace process must, therefore, begin with accountability. The ICC must prosecute war crimes, the ICJ must enforce its rulings, and global sanctions must follow if Israel refuses to comply. Anything less will only perpetuate apartheid under a new vocabulary.

More Oslo-type deceptions can only postpone a settlement and further punish the Palestinians. Palestinians have been deceived before. The Oslo Accords of 1993 were sold as a roadmap to peace. In reality, they entrenched Israeli control through economic dependency and security coordination. Oslo fragmented the Palestinian territories, allowed settlements to multiply, and created a Palestinian Authority more accountable to Israel than to its own people.

There must be no repetition of such half-baked, pro-Israel arrangements. Any new agreement must address the root causes – occupation, dispossession, and apartheid – not merely the symptoms. There must be a complete lifting of the Gaza blockade, the release of political prisoners, the right of return for refugees, and international guarantees for Palestinian sovereignty. Without these, peace will remain a mirage.

Some believe the two-state solution is dead. In reality, it was never alive. The geography of occupation – settlements, walls, checkpoints has shredded the map beyond repair. A truly democratic and just future may now require a different imagination: a unitary state, with equal rights for Jews and Arabs, built on justice rather than segregation. The resistance to such an idea will come from racist-colonialists who are implementing apartheid with a viciousness unheard of before. South Africans have, quite seriously, referred to the apartheid they underwent as a ‘tea party’ compared to the Israeli version!

The transition to a Unitary State will not be immediate. It will demand a transitional process – agreements on demilitarization, restitution, constitutional guarantees, and truth commissions. But the principle must be clear: equality for all, supremacy for none. A shared state cannot be built on



denial. It must begin by acknowledging the crimes of colonization and committing to redress them. Only then can Jews and Arabs co-exist as citizens, not occupiers and occupied.

The international community's mantra of "both sides must stop fighting" obscures the asymmetry of power. Israel is a nuclear-armed state with US backing and an economy built on occupation. Hamas is a movement born out of siege and desperation. To equate the two is to erase history and morality.

The demand for Hamas' disarmament is, in truth, a demand for Palestinian surrender. The demand that colonization end is a demand for justice. Between the two lies the entire moral geography of the conflict. Peace without justice is a lie.

Peace will not come by silencing the oppressed. It will come when occupation ends, when refugees return, when settlements are dismantled, and when every Palestinian child grows up free from siege. Until then, the right to resist remains not only legal, but sacred.