

SOVEREIGNTY

A Political Journal / Issue no. 2 / Shevat 5774 / January 2014

Published by Women in Green and the Forum for Sovereignty

The Zionist Alternative

We must not allow international pressure to cause us to neglect the best, most realistic and Zionist political plan for Israel



The Jordan Valley

**Deputy Minister
Tzipi Hotovely:**

The goal - Judea and Samaria under Israeli sovereignty

4 /

**Coalition Head
MK Yariv Levin:**

Prepare the legal ground for application of sovereignty

7 /

Caroline Glick:

The Israeli solution - a One-State plan for peace in the Middle East

8 /

Mayor Gershon Mesika:

The application of sovereignty is a fundamental ideological goal

6 /

Yoram Ettinger:

The Jewish fertility rate is rising impressively, especially among secular people

12 /

Content

7 \ Coalition Chairman Yariv Levin
Prepare the constitutional ground
for the application of sovereignty

8 \ Caroline Glick
Explaining the Right's
alternative to the world

10 \ Ambassador (ret.) Yoram Ettinger
Demography works
in our favor

11 \ Rabbi Dov Berl Wein
Jewish sovereignty
in Eretz Yisrael

12 \ Dani Dayan
The world is beginning
to change direction

14 \ Dr. Martin Sherman
The humanitarian
solution

16 \ Prof. Eugene Kontorovich
Don't try to frighten us
with the "one-state solution"

18 \ Prof. Raphael Israeli
When they say
"peace" what do they mean?

19 \ Prof. Arie Eldad
There already exists
a Palestinian state - in Jordan

20 \ Here and there in Eretz Yisrael
Solomon's Pools by
Yaron Rosenthal

Women in Green
A tribute to Mordechai Aharoni z"l

Deputy Minister Tzipi Hotovely
The gradual plan -
'Annexation-Naturalization'

\ 4

Mayor Gershon Mesika

Blasts of
consciousness

\ 6

A Word from the Editors

The second issue of "Sovereignty" was prepared for publication during John Kerry's frenetic and relentless trips in the area. The pressure on Israel is far from moderate and the goal of this pressure is clear - to arrive at an agreement of "two states for two peoples" or in simpler words - to split the Land of Israel once again.

Should we restrain ourselves? More than this, isn't now the time when we must promote the application of Israeli sovereignty over all parts of the Land of Israel? Are we commanded only to settle the Land of Israel?

In the appendices to his Book of the Commandments, Ramban (Nahmanides) states that the commandment to settle the Land of Israel also includes the prohibition "not to abandon it to the nations of the world or to desolation." The first part of the sentence is simple - we must settle the Land. The next part of the sentence, that the Land of Israel should not be held by any nation other than the People of Israel, is more complicated. As of now, Judea and Samaria are only partially under Israeli control. Unfortunately for us, these areas were not annexed to the State of Israel. We must complete the work in these areas and apply Israeli sovereignty.

Rabbi Israel Yehoshua from Kutno also wrote in this same spirit: "The principle behind the commandment is nothing other than a person's inheriting and settling the land as his own, to conquer the Land of Israel so that it will be part of his inheritance" (Yeshuot Molcho, 10, 66).

Can we bury our heads in the sand (or in the process of building) and continue to claim that "the last furrow of the plowing is what determines the border"? Unfortunately for us, reality and history have proven that this is not enough, and to understand this it is sufficient to recall events of the recent and very painful past with the uprooting of communities from Sinai, Gush Katif and northern Samaria.

Some may argue that even sovereignty does not assure our full possession of the Land. As evidence of this they point to the dismal reality in the Negev and the Galilee. Their point is well taken and indeed sovereignty must also be implemented in practice, in the field. The meaning of the term "to be sovereign" is also to enforce the state's law, its jurisdiction and administration.

It is important to note and to emphasize that there is no intention here to disparage the importance of building and settling. From the pages of this journal we send an enthusiastic tribute of "well done" to all who engage in the holy work of expanding and consolidating the settlement enterprise, but

nevertheless, this is not enough. The building and settling of communities has not and will not prevent retreat, and this is why sovereignty is necessary. Sovereignty will add yet another layer to the layer of communities that together fortify our hold on our Land.

There are many people who well understand the importance of sovereignty, but nevertheless worry about the complexities of world reaction, demographics and the State of Israel's possible loss of Jewish identity. To them we loudly say: enough of the paralyzing anxiety and fear. We must move on from establishing the settlement enterprise to establishing sovereignty, standing upright and fearless.

From the pages of this journal you will be able to become acquainted with the positions of people in the field who are politicians, thinkers and others who deal with these primal fears courageously and with open eyes as they offer solutions and inspire a goal of fortitude in the pursuit of a grand vision.

Several weeks ago we launched the first issue of "Sovereignty" and since then we have been inundated with encouraging responses and congratulations. It seems that very many people in Israel and abroad have been eagerly awaiting a platform that would openly declare our right to the Land of Israel as legitimate and even as our obligation as a people, and the journal "Sovereignty" fulfills this need.

Along with the responses of congratulations and encouragement, many readers have sent us their own articles. We were very pleased to read words attesting to the healthy and strong Jewish spirit that lives within many of us. Nevertheless, limitations of space in printed media prevent us from publishing all that we receive. Therefore we have chosen a small and representative sample such as appears in the section of Letters to the Editor. We welcome every letter we receive in the editor's mailbox but we add that only concise letters of up to 150 words will be published in the newspaper. We will consider including longer articles and letters as posts on the journal's Internet site, which we are working diligently on developing at present.

The journal's editorial staff is open to bringing a wide variety of opinions dealing with the issue of sovereignty and this is our goal - to present, in an orderly way, the teachings and opinions of thinkers, members of Knesset and public opinion shapers, as well as your opinions, from the general public.

We wish you a pleasant reading experience.

Editorial staff of "Sovereignty"

Letters to the Editor

We are Jews – because we came from Judea

To the editor:

It is important to remember and emphasize the source of the name “Jew”. In the Bible, the word “Jew” (“Yehudi” in Hebrew) refers to people who came from the state of Judea (“Yehuda” in Hebrew). Perhaps the most prominent and well known phrase is: “There was a Yehudi in Shushan, the capital, named Mordechai the son of Yair... a Benjamite ... who was exiled from Jerusalem...” meaning – Mordechai is from the tribe of Benjamin but is called “Yehudi” because he came from Judea (“Yehuda”) – a state that included the areas of Judea, Benjamin, and for many years also Samaria.

It should be added that the tribe of Judea settled in the area of Judea, the capital of which was Hebron, the second most important city to the Jewish people after Jerusalem. And located in Hebron is the oldest whole Jewish structure – the building over Me’arat haMachpela – the Cave of the Patriarchs.

**Rami Ofir,
Tel Aviv**

When Did the Arabs come here?

To the editor:

For years, I have been confronting colleagues from Britain with the fact that the Arabs who claim that we dispossessed them from their historic land are actually immigrants who were “imported” by the British in order to implement the policy of divide and conquer.

Here are the pertinent facts: for approximately 600 years of Turkish rule, until 1872, there were a total of about 300,000 residents in Greater Palestine, about 30,000 of whom were Jews. At the beginning of the British Mandate there were about 600,000 Arabs here and about 60,000 Jews. This means that with every Jew who came to Israel, ten Arabs migrated to the area. The ratio of this migration was maintained, more or less, in the days of the Mandate such that, in 1948, there were about 600,000 Jews here and more than two million Arabs.

Another matter that I am dealing with vis a vis my colleagues is the amazing ineffectiveness of Israeli public relations. An obvious example of this is the “Al Dura” libel. I was not able to get official confirmation

from our Office of Foreign Affairs that a complaint was ever registered to Israel regarding this miserable affair. If any piece of shrapnel hits an Arab youth on his great toe, there would be a huge uproar and there would be big trouble for any Israeli who was involved. And if a soldier or an officer so much as pushes any foreign journalist, the matter ends with his dismissal. On the other hand, with the Al-Dura matter, not a peep was heard, there is no complaint, nothing. Our public relations mechanism is silent and on the media stage, only the lies remain.

Avi Adar

People are surprised to discover that we can talk about annexation

To the editor:

I was very pleased to read the first issue of the journal. Thank G-d, it will be a significant platform (we hope) for these simple and forthright truths. It seems to me that because they are so simple, people have gotten used to rejecting them. That’s how it goes when, in a discussion with friends, I say that in my opinion we must present our goal as – “to annex all the territory that we can and take full sovereignty over it and make inroads slowly and steadily, taking advantage of opportunities as they occur” – my friends relate to the idea as if it is the first time they heard that someone actually thinks we should control all of Judea and Samaria. However, they are very familiar with the illogical and impracticable ‘Two-State’ idea, including all of the fantasies.

**Uri Biran,
Alon Shvut**

Occupied Territory? Canard!

Dear Editor,

In the first edition of Sovereignty, the issue of the so-called “occupied territories” was discussed.

I should like to treat another aspect of this issue. Often, Israel is faced with the canard that Israel is an occupier of Arab land in contravention of the Geneva Convention. From a legal point of view, this is incorrect. Moreover, the proponent of this canard is not familiar with the applicable Convention given

that there are Conventions of 1864, 1906, 1926 and 1949. It is the Convention of 1949 which applies. In this Convention, there are four major components. The applicable component is Part IV, “Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War.”

More precisely, the pertinent Sections are Articles 47-78, “Occupied Territories.” A review of these Articles as well as a review of the Commentary by Jean S. Pictet, then Director General for General Affairs of the International Committee of the Red Cross, conclusively shows that the “so-called territories” refers only to the situation where the occupied territories constituted a prior legitimate power and sovereign and not an amorphous entity and situation where there was no clear title to the land in question. The signs of prior legitimate power and sovereign would be an established government and established governmental institutions. Rather, this area was clearly contested after the cessation of the British Mandate.

Moreover, the Armistice between Israel and Jordan clearly stated that the status of these areas were to be decided subsequently. As such, the Geneva Convention of 1949, Part IV does not apply to Judea and Samaria. Page 273 of the Commentary is particularly cogent where it states that the Hague Regulations of 1907 stated the traditional concept whereby “The authority of the legitimate power having in fact passed in to the hands of the occupier.”

There was no such legitimate power.

**I.Gendelman,
Jerusalem, Israel**

Don't forget who Began the War of '48 and why

To the editor:

One of the claims that we hear again and again from the Left is that “we drove the Arabs out” and therefore we must support the establishment of a Palestinian state. In response to this claim, before any discussion on the topic, we should mention time and time again, who it was that began the war of '48 and for what purpose. According to their own statements, the goal was clear – to annihilate us. We must not forget to mention this fact at the start of any discussion.

Cristobal, France

Hotovely Presents: The Gradual Plan - 'Annexation - Naturalization'

What is a step by step approach to turning the vision of Israeli sovereignty in Judea and Samaria into a feasible idea? The Deputy Minister of Transportation has an orderly plan and she is convinced that if they just take the trouble to market it well, it will turn out to be much more feasible than the 'Two-State' vision.

When Deputy Minister of Transportation, MK Tzipi Hotovely is asked what the Right should present as a political goal and an alternative to the 'Two-State' plan she answers simply, "The goal is for Judea and Samaria to be under Israeli sovereignty. It is ours and it was acquired legally in a bloody, defensive war. We must now implement the vision of the Greater Land of Israel and begin to apply sovereignty in all of the territory. This is the vision reflecting belief in the holy precept that the Land of Israel is ours and we have no right to revoke this precept. It is fidelity to the ideology of the Right and the religious public, which believes that this is our land."

Although the vision mentioned in the title is a simple concept, Hotovely is well aware of the difficulties that stand in the way of implementing this vision, and the first of them, "the hot potato that everyone has been passing from hand to hand until now" as she defines it, is: what will happen with the Arab population in the territories of Judea and Samaria the day after application of Israeli sovereignty? The deputy minister envisions a solution to the matter in gradual phases. "I start with the assumption that this is a hostile population whose abiding dream is not to be part of the Jewish Zionist state. Therefore we must address several matters simultaneously."

Jewish-Nationalist Legislation

The first matter Hotovely addresses is Jewish immigration to Israel (alayah).

"We need to strengthen the Jewish population demographically. When Ben Gurion established the Jewish state, there were six hundred thousand Jews along with four hundred and fifty thousand Arabs. These are frightening numbers for a small country without strong defenses. The state could have been destroyed within a short time by Arab procreation and nevertheless Ben Gurion did not hesitate; he established the State and opened its doors to the ingathering of the exiles, seeing the 12 million Jews of the Diaspora as a target. If this is what Ben Gurion did when we were a weak country, then when the country is secure and economically strong, a country that is good to live in, should we be ashamed to speak of gathering in the exiles? If, of the nine million Jews in the world, we bring one million, we have already provided a significant demographic answer."

Sovereignty over Area C and the Issue of Citizenship

Hotovely urges a prudent approach to the issue of granting citizenship. "I do not think that it is necessary to give automatic citizenship," she says and clarifies: "We must begin a gradual process of 25 years under the heading of 'annexation-naturalization'. Unfortunately, I must now use the ABC letters used in the Oslo documents. As we know, Area C includes the entire Jewish population and along with it a small number of about one hundred thousand Arabs. This is a number that the State of Israel can manage. I'm not satisfied with just this, and I have no intention to give up ninety percent of the territory or to establish a

hostile entity in the remaining area, like the one in Gaza, and this is in addition to my ideological objection to such a concession."

"That group of one hundred thousand will be a sort of test case for the future," she adds and clarifies: "Laws will be passed to define the State of Israel as a state for the Jewish people, the Law of Return will be anchored as a Basic Law and within the framework of the Jewish laws of the state, it will be stated that all who request equal rights in the State of Israel will have obligations such as taxes and National Service. The Arab population today is free of these obligations and this population will be tested anew within the framework of new obligations. I do not believe in declarations of loyalty but in the test of actions. Whoever

does not take part in National Service and bear part of the economic burden does not deserve to have certain rights. We must abolish the thought that since they are native-born, we cannot apply the naturalization laws to them. We must bear in mind that this is a hostile entity and it is impossible to turn them into citizens overnight.

There is an intermediate phase of residency that can serve as a sort of candidacy period for citizenship. The drastic step of immediate citizenship for a million and a half Palestinians would be irresponsible and to think of doing such a thing is not serious."

Hotovely believes that a phased process such as this, beginning in Area C, would be a significant statement to the world that "the 'Two-State' story is over. We cannot continue on this pointless course that leads nowhere."

The goal is for Judea and Samaria to be under Israeli sovereignty. It is ours and it was acquired legally.



Dep. Min. Hotovely speaks at 2nd Sovereignty Conference in Hebron, organized by Women in Green. Photo: Shlomo Shalmoni



Aliya to Eretz Yisrael

“Which is Preferable - the Gaza Model or the Sakhnin Model?”

Hotovely is also aware of the difficulty of “selling” the strategy she describes to the Israeli public, who, according to her, want to see the Arabs on the other side of the fence – mixing the populations worries and concerns both the Left and the Right. “I ask a simple question. What is better for you, the Gaza model or the Sakhnin model? Sakhnin is indeed not an exemplary model of citizenship but, given the problems the State of Israel has in controlling the Arab population, applying Western thought patterns and developing an understanding that it pays to live with us allows for a vision of future coexistence. This is in addition to an intelligence point of view.”

Marketing Hotovely’s vision will not be easy within Israel or abroad. She knows this but nevertheless declares, surprisingly, that selling the idea abroad will be easier than doing it internally. “I get on with the world easily because this plan is a democratic plan, a plan that says that after you have tried to establish a Palestinian state, (and the leadership in Israel was ready for almost anything including dividing her capital), at the end of the day, you have not succeeded. The other side does not want to end the conflict and there are great disparities between the two sides.

And there is not one Palestinian leader who would agree to any one of the principles to which every Israeli leader has committed himself – regarding Jerusalem, refugees and areas for blocs of Jewish communities. No Arab

leader would agree to Jewish blocs of communities. They will not concede Ariel and Ma’ale Adumim. They will not give up Jerusalem or the right of return. You have been trying since ’47 and you have not succeeded. If you try something six times with six different plans, leading to a partitioning of the Land, you must draw the right conclusions. If you feel sorry for the Palestinians, let them be citizens with equal rights in a democratic state.”

Hotovely denies what is described as the right of Palestinians to self-define. She notes that “they belong to the greater Arab nation and if there is any place where there is a concentration of ethnic Palestinian population, it is the present Kingdom of Jordan and therefore, I do not feel guilty at all for not allowing them to establish another Arab state”.

“This is a democratic suggestion that does not depend on external factors. We suggest to the Palestinians that if they don’t want citizenship, it’s alright, but Palestinian refusal must result in an Israeli counter-reaction.”

“Freedom of Expression Must be Subject to Red Lines. We Must Determine Who Will Represent the Arab Public”

As mentioned, Hotovely believes that persuading Israelis will be more difficult than influencing international opinion. “The Israeli public has a problem because it foresees Arab representatives in Knesset as subversives, as potential Hanin Zoabis. The State of Israel must have red lines on this issue, even with all its aspiration for freedom of expression. The Basic Law

of the Knesset does not permit Balad (an Israeli Arab political party), which collaborates with terrorists and spies, to express its contempt. Yet this occurs anyway because Bagatz (the High Court of Justice) ratifies the presence of these people in our parliament, time after time. We must change the rules of the game and define who is permitted to represent the Arab population. We must not accept a reality in which those who hold hands with Hamas and Hizb’Allah can sit in the Knesset.”

When she is asked about the chances for her plan to be accepted within our political reality, Hotovely is convinced the chances are good. “The vision of two states began in the lunatic fringe of the Left with Uri Avnery and Luba Eliav, who managed to sell a plan that was originally attacked by Golda Meir, Yigal Allon and the VIPs of Mapai (the left-wing precursor to the modern day Labor Party), all of whom thought that a Palestinian state would be a terrible thing, and now this plan has become mainstream as a result of brainwashing to the point that even within the Likud, they speak of it as if it were Jabotinsky’s vision. If a plan based on a false premise was able to win such acceptance, a true plan should be accepted much more easily.”

Towards the end of her address, Deputy Minister Hotovely gives credit for the plan that she presents to Uri Elitsur, who has been promoting this basic outline recently.

“We must restore our confidence that if the Holy One, Blessed Be He, gave us parts of this Land, he also gave us the strength to be its sovereigns,” and with this she seals her words. ■



I do not think that it is necessary to give automatic citizenship, she says and clarifies: We must begin a gradual process of 25 years under the heading of ‘annexation-naturalization.

We must change the rules of the game and define who is permitted to represent the Arab population. We must not accept a reality in which those who hold hands with Hamas and Hizb’Allah can sit in the Knesset.





Gershon Mesika's Blasts of Consciousness

The head of the Samaria Council, **Gershon Mesika**, acts energetically to strengthen the call for Israeli sovereignty in Judea and Samaria.

Despite the pressures, despite the media, despite the politics, the People of Israel has returned to its Land, builds in it and clings to it.



Samaria Local Council head Gershon Mesika with members of the European Parliament
Photo: Samaria Local Council - Foreign Affairs Office

In the European Union we said we are here in Israel not because of security needs or Herzl's declaration but because of our historical right to the Land of Israel. For many, this was the first time they had heard such talk.

Gershon Mesika, head of the Samaria Regional Council, decided to "think out of the municipal box" and break into the field of Public Relations with an operation called "Getting to Know Samaria". Mesika is not satisfied with just bringing hundreds of public opinion shapers and thousands of visitors to Samaria, he has also extended his activities beyond Israel's borders and opened what he calls the "Samaria Office of Foreign Affairs". As part of this effort he meets dozens of European members of parliament and acquaints them with the truth that they had not heard before: that the Land of Israel belongs to the People of Israel. Other regional councils have also adopted his approach. Mesika sees the application of sovereignty as a fundamental ideological goal as well as a practical and necessary solution to the legal and civil issues that he meets with every day.

"Sovereignty is the basic element by which every people and every state is able to express its rule in the field. This is the primary way we express 'this territory belongs to us'. Prime Ministers have been afraid to say that Judea and Samaria belong to us and therefore they choose not to apply Israeli sovereignty. This is the main reason that we, the citizens, must exert ourselves to bring the application of sovereignty, which will be an everlasting statement that the territory belongs to us," he says.

For Mesika, more than for most people, sovereignty is not only a declaration of principle but a matter that he deals with every day. "In every disagreement (with the High Court) about the disputed territory we rely on Ottoman Law or Jordanian Law and therefore all the rulings are distorted. Inability to apply control in the territory results in the proliferation of illegal Arab building and, even in Area C, Arabs pump water without any supervision or permission,

causing a decline in the level of the water table. They steal water with impunity – we can take the community of Migdalim as an example – every summer we transfer water in containers because Arabs steal the water from the pipes that lead to the community."

Mesika continues and elaborates: "The courts view the area as occupied territory, and therefore the Arabs have a basic advantage - their claims are accepted without having to prove them. In every case where both a Jew and an Arab claim ownership to a piece of land, the High Court issues an injunction for the Jew to be removed from the area as a first step. (A recent example: the evacuation of Jews from Migron). When a Jew buys land from an Arab, the Civil Administration prevents him from registering and delays him. Unlike the rest of the country, where immediately after purchase you may transfer ownership in the Tabu (Israel Land Registry) the same day, here the State prevents acquisition by preventing registration. This is added to the fact that the Palestinian Authority prevents Arabs from selling land, and the State of Israel does nothing about it; take, for example, the Arab who sold Beit HaMachpela in Hebron – for that, he is in a Palestinian prison today. When acquiring a building anywhere else in the country, there is no limitation that forbids entry to the building until it is registered in the Tabu, yet here, such differentiation does exist. It is judicial impotence because our sovereignty is not recognized. Why is the Jew's status different from the Arab's? There is discrimination here in the form of regulations the State creates in order to prevent normal Jewish life in Judea and Samaria. Today every expropriation of land for this road or that project must be examined to see if the project is beneficial to Arabs, and if not, there is no approval. The starting point is that the land is theirs. It is a distorted view that has continued since '67."

I Don't Want to Talk "Security". I Want to Speak about Entitlement. And Rights Based on History.

In recent years, Mesika has been conducting non-stop public relations efforts, both inside Israel and internationally. In contrast to others, Mesika does not despair of the European arena. He goes to European parliaments, including that of the European Union in Brussels, and presents his political merchandise. And, according to him, there are those who are willing to listen, even among the Catherine Ashtons.

"In the European Union we said we are here not because of security needs or Herzl's declaration but because of our historical right to the Land. For many, this was the first time they had heard such things. They asked us to 'speak like Israelis', meaning we should speak in the same language they are accustomed to hearing from official Israeli representatives – who speak of security. But we explained that talking about security implies 'the Land is not mine and I am here because I have nowhere else to go'. (And actually, if the Land is not yours why on earth are you building there?) With this approach we would lose every public relations battle."

"There is something that prevents people from speaking the simple truth, which is that the Land is ours and the Arabs stole it from us. Imagine a person who leaves on a long vacation and when he returns, finds a squatter in his house and it's difficult for him to call him a thief so he tells the squatter that he must leave because of weak reasons such as harm to the environment and so forth. The bible is full of phrases such as 'to your seed I give this Land'. The Christians understand this and the Muslims do also and for some reason, it is only we

→ continued on page 17



Prepare the Constitutional Ground for the Application of Sovereignty

Does the Likud Party have a clear political vision or is it content with minimizing the damage of the Oslo agreements and presenting the party as an ideological supermarket?

Coalition Chairman, MK **Yariv Levin** has a clear answer.

Somewhat surprisingly, despite the fact that it became the ruling party more than three and a half decades ago, it seems that the Likud movement still has not presented the Israeli public with a comprehensive and clear political vision. When the ruling party of the nationalist camp is asked to present a political position, its members are satisfied with refuting and criticizing Oslo in one way or another and with presenting ways to minimize the damage of the plan – a plan which was first considered a lunatic vision, which the Left managed to convert into mainstream Israeli thinking.

If this is the situation, it's no wonder that even from the mouths of the students of Jabotinsky, the father of the vision of "both banks of the River," they speak of partitioning the Land according to this scenario or that – whether around the '67 lines or other borders – it is as if Uri Avnery were a member of the Likud Central Committee. Even now, it seems that the Likud has still not presented the public with a clear political vision beyond that of damage control with regard to the Left's activities. What is lacking is an alternative of at least equal value to that of the opposite side.

Because of this situation the Likud is now defined as a "supermarket of ideas".

Coalition Chairman, MK Yariv Levin, one of the most nationalist figures of the Likud movement, is aware of the complex reality of the party, but nevertheless, states "the Likud's position is support and total commitment to the settlement project."

He continues, "No doubt, there is a great question of how to actualize these things practically and whether it is even correct for the ruling party to present an alternative political plan. This has not yet happened, in my opinion, because of political considerations – imagine the prime minister is conducting and managing a process based

on his declarations while his own party presents an alternative. Israel would be accused of preventing the process and it would be tactically incorrect to do this. On the other hand, if the process is stopped at some point, and this could certainly happen, then it would be correct to present a new position and take much clearer and sharper steps. This position would, of course, also include practical steps to build in the field and to exercise sovereignty."

Before he dives into current politics, Levin stops for a basic recital of the principles to which he holds



Head of coalition MK Yariv Levin speaks at 3rd Sovereignty Conference in Jerusalem, organized by Women in Green. Photo: Gershon Ellinson

fast: "I believe that our right to the Land is absolute and unshakable and it that includes the entire Land. Moreover, I believe that no one has the authority to give up this right because it belongs not only to those who live in this generation but to everyone who preceded us and we are obligated to pass this right on to future generations. No one can surrender this right. This position must remain clear and sharp even if the ability to implement this right fully at any given moment is limited, whether, as in the time of the Diaspora when we

were not here and nevertheless did not give up our right to return to the Land, or as in '48 when we weren't in Judea and Samaria or in our days, when we still do not reside in the entire territory. But first, these things must be clear on the conceptual level."

After stating these principles, MK Levin outlines, even if it is with general lines, the political blueprint according to which, as he sees it, Israel must progress. "The correct policy, from the point of view of Israeli interests regarding our political ability at the moment, is to combine the attempt to hold the maximum amount of territory and apply sovereignty over the maximum amount of territory while keeping the Arab population within it to a minimum. This situation already exists in Area C, which is under our control, there are little more than fifty thousand Arabs.

There is a clear Jewish majority and therefore it is absolutely clear that all ideas of withdrawal and handing the territory over are against Israeli interests. Now we must create the conditions that will prepare for annexation, meaning an increase in building and a deepening of the settlement. We must gradually apply legislation regarding the residents and the territory, for example zoning and building codes. Ultimately we must be ready to take advantage of any political conditions that would allow us to implement the application of sovereignty – even if just in phases – until there is full application of sovereignty."

And how might this happen?

"If we persist and are patient, ultimately such conditions will arise. There are many things that seem impossible from afar. For example, the goal of Zionism seemed like an impossible and futile process. If we work diligently toward creating the necessary conditions, I have no doubt that in the end it will be possible to achieve this goal." ■

I believe that no one has the authority to give up this right because it belongs not only to those who live in this generation but to everyone who preceded us and we are obligated to pass this right on to future generations.

Caroline Glick: Explaining the Right's Alternative to the World

In her new book, journalist **Caroline Glick** lays out a political plan built on application of Israeli sovereignty over Judea and Samaria. Here too, the question of how to deal with the demographic issue is a leading concern, but in this case, Israeli sovereignty becomes a surprising and essential demographic solution.

Journalist Caroline Glick has recently completed her book (in English) about the alternative plan to the 'Two-State' scheme.

Glick directs her book, *The Israeli Solution: A One-State Plan for Peace in the Middle East*, to the American audience, "so that they will understand that the reason the United States' Middle East policy has been such a failure for the past two generations is because it's been based on a failed concept of carving a Palestinian state out of Israeli territory. Whereas in Israel, the conversation has begun about alternatives to the 'Two-State' model, no such conversation is taking place in America. Since George W. Bush officially adopted the idea and made it the centerpiece of US Middle East policymaking, everyone has supported the establishment of a Palestinian state. In truth ever since the Nixon era, the paradigm that the United States has been promoting is the paradigm based on appeasing the PLO at Israel's expense."

Before Richard Nixon decided to treat the PLO as a desirable organization, US policy was not predicated on Israeli land giveaways. "In '67 there was no such concept in the United States. UN Security Council Resolution 242, which set out the terms of an eventual peace between Israel and its Arab neighbors, stipulated clearly that the Arabs must recognize the right of Israel to exist in peace and security within defensible borders and, only afterward, would territorial changes be addressed ..."

In Glick's view, the US's reliance on the 'Two-State' paradigm as the panacea for all the Middle East's political pathologies has been the principal cause of most of its policy failures in the Middle East.

"By viewing the Arab world through the prism of the Palestinian conflict with Israel, US policymakers' perception of Israel and the war against it has become

distorted to the point of debilitation. The Americans are so blinded by their belief that by establishing a Palestinian state on territory Israel controls they will solve all the problems of the region that they cannot understand the region."

On a military level, according to Glick, this has blinded successive American administrations to the strategic significance of Israel's military campaigns and so blocked Washington's capacity to learn from Israel's experience or even understand that it is worth thinking about Israel's experiences.

In her book, Glick considers the US military intervention in Lebanon in 1982 and its intervention in Iraq in 2003. She discusses how the Americans' refusal to learn from Israel's experience in Lebanon, which stemmed from its embrace of the 'Two-State' model, made it impossible for them to understand the nature of the societies they were operating in or to develop strategies that were relevant to their battlefields.

In Lebanon, she explains, the Americans sided with the PLO against the IDF forces and deployed the Marines to force Israel out of Beirut while protecting the PLO from the IDF. "This was the aim of their 'peacekeeping mission,'" she says.

"They were not prepared for the reality. That reality dictated that the parties fighting in Lebanon saw the US forces as an Israeli proxy. When they replaced the IDF positions all of those forces that were fighting against Israel aimed their guns at the Americans. The American misconception stemmed from the fact that they saw themselves as a liberating force, in contrast to the IDF, which they perceived as an occupying force. They were incapable of reaching the right conclusions regarding the PLO, Syria and Lebanon. The United States saved the PLO, and arranged a haven for it in Tunisia because the State Department believed that their generosity to Arafat

would convince him to moderate his position, agree to the 'Two-State' solution and everything would be okay."

In Iraq, she explains, the Americans failed again because of the same misguided approach. "They thought they had nothing to learn from the Israeli experience of 18 years in Lebanon, because again, they were convinced that they were liberators and Israel was the occupier. So they marched blindly into Iraq. Most Israelis who understood Iraq and what happened to us in Lebanon foresaw precisely what happened in Iraq. But the Americans, who failed to notice the demographic similarities between the Lebanese and the Iraqis, didn't understand the relationships between the groups and the Syrians and Iranians – the sponsors of the war in Lebanon – and were blind to it. And again, their blindness owed to their inability to see Israel outside of the 'Two-State' paradigm. For them, Israel is only useful if it is giving land to Arabs. It isn't an ally; it is an obstacle to Arab support for the US."

The 'Two-State' solution, she explains, is the end of analysis and serious thinking about the region, not the beginning of it. "This is a belief that absolves its adherents from considering reality. If all of the problems of the Middle East stem from the fact that there is no Palestinian state in the Land of Israel then you don't need to learn about the Arab world, the various ethnic groups, the contradictory interests. There is no need for strategic thinking because every problem is clearly a result of 'Israeli greed'."

"The undertones of the 'Two-State' model are deeply anti-Semitic. And this makes sense. The eternal characteristic of Jew hatred is its rejection of logic and reason. If the Jews are to blame for everything, then there is no reason to think anymore. Jewish guilt is the catch-all explanation for everything that is happening, has ever happened and will

The Americans are so blinded by their belief that by establishing a Palestinian state on territory Israel controls they will solve all the problems of the region that they cannot understand the region.



ever happen in the world. If the Jews are to blame, then there is no reason to think anymore. There, you have the answer. Punish the Jew and everything will be fine.”

In light of this, Glick sees the ‘Two-State’ model as nothing less than a model based on an anti-Semitic world concept. And Jews are not immune to the anti-Semitic rejection of reason. “The Israeli Left’s belief in the ‘Two-State’ idea, despite innumerable proofs that it is false, is nothing but a part of the world view

state would have control over its immigration policy. And who are the Palestinians in Syria and Lebanon who would immigrate immediately to a Palestinian state in Judea and Samaria? They are the hundreds of thousands of people who live in villages that are called refugee camps and are controlled by al-Qaeda and Ahmed Jibril’s PLO. This would be the implementation of the Palestinians’ so-called ‘right of return.’ Obviously, these people would not live peacefully. They would incite

whatsoever and have stood by powerless as their children have been indoctrinated to become murderers and bigots. The Israeli ‘One-State’ plan offers them true civil rights and corrects a situation that should never have been created to begin with.”

Part Three of *The Israeli Solution* considers the likely responses of the Palestinians, the larger Arab world and the European Union to an Israeli move to apply its sovereignty to Judea and Samaria. The last two chapters analyze how Israeli

State’ solution is a disaster. They are just waiting for someone to tell them that they can abandon it. My book gives them, and the Israeli public as well, the alternative that they are waiting for.”

Glick rejects the voices on the Israeli Right that promote the idea of payment for Arab emigration or defining Jordan as Palestine. In her view, these are irrelevant ideas that no one will accept, especially the Palestinians themselves. “The only thing that should interest us is that Judea and Samaria is Israel,” she says and notes that even though providing the



Caroline Glick lectures at the 3rd Sovereignty Conference organized by Women in Green in Jerusalem Credit: Shlomi Shalmoni

Israel has implemented the Israeli ‘One-Sate’ plan twice - in Jerusalem and the Golan Heights. And both experiences were successful.

that rejects logic and reason.”

Glick divided *The Israeli Solution* into three parts. Part One is a historical survey that lays out the failure of the ‘Two-State’ paradigm from the British Mandatory period to the present day.

In the second part of the book Glick examines the various aspects of the application of Israeli sovereignty in Judea and Samaria. She provides an in-depth analysis of Arab and Jewish demography and shows that, far from being an existential threat to Israel, demography is one of our strongest assets.

Glick demonstrates that if Israel were to apply its sovereignty over Judea and Samaria, and offer immediate permanent residency to all its Palestinian residents, as well as the right to apply for citizenship, Israel would still retain a two-thirds Jewish majority. Moreover, there is every reason to believe that the Jewish majority would only rise from there on in.

“The high rate of Arab emigration from Judea and Samaria, and the great potential for Jewish aliyah from Europe are clear indicators that time is on Israel’s side. Moreover, the Jewish fertility rate has outpaced the Arab fertility rate in Judea and Samaria and is closing in on the Israeli Muslim fertility rate,” she explains.

Ironically, she notes, Israeli sovereignty in Judea and Samaria is what will stop Jewish demographic erosion, in total contradiction to the way in which the ‘Two-State’ advocates describe reality.

“Tzipi Livni speaks about a Palestinian state as a demographic solution whereas such a state would turn demographics into a real threat. After all, the Palestinian

the Arabs of the Galilee and the Negev to wage a terror war against Israel. All of the moderate Arabs, who are now well integrated into Israeli society, would be murdered like the collaborators that were killed in great numbers by Arafat when he came here. Only if we have exclusive control of the border can we prevent a demographic disaster. Even if all of the Palestinians become Israeli citizens we would prevent a demographic disaster by restraining Palestinian control in the immigration policy.”

She also considers the record of success of the Israeli sovereignty model – or the Israeli ‘One-State’ plan. “Israel has implemented the Israeli ‘One-State’ plan twice – in Jerusalem and the Golan Heights. And both experiences were successful.”

She devotes a chapter to Israel’s legal rights to sovereignty over Judea and Samaria, and another chapter to its historic rights to sovereignty over the areas.

She spends, as well, two chapters considering the civil rights aspects of the Israeli ‘One-State’ plan and explains, “Israeli democracy and the status of the civil rights of Israelis and Palestinians alike will be massively enhanced if Israel applies its sovereignty over Judea and Samaria. The Palestinians in particular have been the primary victims of the ‘Two-State’ formula. From living in the freest society in the Middle East, outside Israel under military rule, they became subjected to the PLO’s jackboot. For the past 20 years, the Palestinians have lived in a legal jungle, with no protected rights

sovereignty over the areas would impact Israel, and the United States. In general, Glick’s analysis led her to the conclusion that the party that will react most harshly would likely be the Europeans. “Today, the EU’s only foreign policy is hostility towards Israel. This is made clear first and foremost in their aggressive rejection of Israel’s sovereign rights to Jerusalem, Judea and Samaria. The Arabs have other interests. The Palestinians have limited capacities. The Europeans have nothing else going on. But in the end, Israel has the means to mitigate the damage of European anti-Israel actions. And a decision to apply Israeli sovereignty over the areas will give Israel the strategic clarity to meet the challenge in a coherent and constructive way.”

Glick says she got the idea of writing a book after watching the vice-presidential debate ahead of the 2008 presidential elections. The moderator asked Sarah Palin rhetorically whether she supports the establishment of a Palestinian state. Palin looked slightly confused, hesitated and answered positively. From watching this debate Glick understood that in the absence of a clear, cogent alternative from the Right, the world, even those who support Israel, would continue to see the Left’s vision as the only vision on the table for discussion.

“I brief the members of the House of Representatives and the Senate several times every year. Each time I present this plan on Capitol Hill, the response borders on euphoria. In the United States, just as in Israel, there are millions of people who understand that the ‘Two-

There are millions of people who understand that the ‘Two-State’ solution is a disaster. They are just waiting for someone to tell them that they can abandon it.

Palestinians with permanent residency and the right to apply for citizenship is not a perfect solution and will damage Israel on certain levels, “it is absolutely clear that it is better than establishing a Palestinian state. Such a state would be the ruin of Israel.”

Despite the risks, this policy will allow us to exist coherently as a liberal, open and Jewish country with the ability to determine our own fate, she explains.

Although Glick’s book will initially be published in English, she expects that an Israeli publisher will buy the rights to it relatively quickly. “I have no doubt that, just as in the United States, Israelis have been waiting to have this conversation for twenty years. This book starts the conversation in a serious, comprehensive way, and I hope that in the next couple of years, we will see more and more people recognizing that there is a better alternative to the ‘Two-State’ model – *The Israeli Solution*.” ■



Demography is a Factor, but it Works in our Favor

An interview with Ambassador (ret.) **Yoram Ettinger** – Demographer, former Israeli Consul General to the Southwestern US, consultant to members of Israel’s Cabinet and Knesset, expert on the politics of the Middle East.

The Jewish fertility rate, especially among secular Jews, is soaring impressively, while Arab fertility is eroding.



Amb. (ret.) Yoram Ettinger lectures at the 2nd Sovereignty Conference organized by Women in Green, in Hebron
Photo: Gershon Ellinson

The idea of a demographic threat – that Jews would be unable to maintain a demographic majority within the borders of the Jewish state – is one of the main threats brandished against the Israeli Right by those who support partitioning the State. As a counter to these pessimistic warnings about the dangers of a bi-national state, Yoram Ettinger, demographer and former Israeli Ambassador to Washington, optimistic as ever, presents some statistical data.

When he is requested to address the issue of: “What happens the day after Israeli sovereignty is applied in Judea and Samaria?” Ettinger refuses to accept the view that Israel will be threatened. “The present situation is that there is a Jewish majority of sixty six percent in the area, including Judea and Samaria and within the Green Line. This majority will become a demographic tailwind, stemming from the surge in Jewish fertility, especially among secular Jews, compared with the collapse of Muslim fertility, stemming from various aspects of modernization,” he says in his introduction to the topic.

Regarding data relating to fertility trends he notes, “This tailwind is fed by a negative balance of migration of the Arabs of Judea and Samaria for nearly every year since 1950. The negative migration was interrupted only twice: Once during the first three years after the signing of the Oslo Accords, when Israel imported Palestinians; and another, earlier time during a three year period of conflict between the Hashemite monarchy and the Palestinians, when

King Hussein wanted to make it clear ‘who rules the roost’ and therefore stopped allowing Palestinians to cross the bridges into Jordan.”

According to Ettinger, except for these six years, every year, thousands of Arabs from Judea and Samaria cross into Jordan and, from there, into the rest of the world. In recent years there has been a negative migration flow of approximately 18,000 people per year. This holds true even when accounting for the number of those who return from abroad. Ettinger attributes this phenomenon to an analysis Arabs do amongst themselves in light of the polarizing effects of their society – battles between Hamas and Fatah, economic struggles and institutionalized Palestinian corruption. Many have accepted the fact that life will not improve and so they decide to leave.

Ettinger also notes that even 18,000 Arabs emigrating every year is far from the negative migration balance of Judea and Samaria before ’67, when approximately 30,000-40,000 Arabs left every year. Ironically, Israel, who took over the area in the Six Day War, moderated this exodus when it invested in health, transportation, industrial and educational infrastructure as well as other things to improve quality of life. This, together with demarcation of the “Green Line” surrounding Judea and Samaria gave hope to the Arabs of the region and greatly curbed their rate of emigration.

You speak of a 66% Jewish majority between the Sea and the Jordan River. This is indeed a majority but it also means that there is a very large Arab minority. Can we exist as a Jewish state

with such a significant minority?

“As I have noted, not only must the present data be analyzed, but also the trend. The Jewish fertility rate, especially among secular Jews, is soaring impressively while Arab fertility is eroding at a rate unprecedented in the history of humanity. Today the trend for Arab women, age 20-30, is in the direction of less than three births on average while for Jewish women, the trend points to more than three births on average. Another data point to consider in this context is that a tremendous majority of Arabs who go abroad are young, so that Arab emigration further erodes the fertility data and the gap continues to increase.”

In analyzing the reasons for the erosion of Arab fertility, Ettinger points to the exposure of Arab women to Western education and culture. “UNRWA has broadened the infrastructure of local colleges and the Arab woman takes advantage of these educational opportunities. She marries much later and, consistent with the Western attitude, Palestinian women have become the second most frequent users of birth control methods in the Arab world (after Moroccan women).”

“The Tremendous Potential of Aliyah”

To strengthen the validity of his approach, Ettinger reminds us of some historical data that some may prefer to ignore: “Indeed the 34% Arab population within the Green Line and in Judea and Samaria does represent a significant minority, but we must remember that

when Herzl chose to pursue the Zionist ideal, we were only 9% and when the State was declared we were just 39% (in the combined area of Judea, Samaria and the "Green Line"). Moreover, we must remember that when Ben Gurion decided to establish the State, we were a majority of only 55% in the territory of the partition, area which was designated for the Jewish State, yet this fact did not cause Ben Gurion a moment's hesitation and he was not afraid of dual nationality."

In addition to all of this, Ettinger notes another significant piece of data – aliyah (Jewish immigration to Israel). He reminds us that since the establishment of the State, Israel has experienced huge waves of aliyah every twenty years, each wave resulting in economic, social, military and medical strengthening of the nation. Thus it was in the fifties, the seventies, the nineties and it should happen in our period as well. "The potential of this aliyah is tremendous.

would not have had the large aliyot that strengthened us."

More than a Few of the Large Arab Clans of Judea and Samaria Would Leave if They Could

You speak of two important facts – aliyah and Arab emigration, but while to encourage aliyah is considered a Zionist act, the governments of Israel cannot encourage Arab emigration. It's not exactly politically correct, to put it politely...

"Until the year 1977, when Begin was elected prime minister, there were people in the prime minister's office who dealt with moving a number of large Arab families. Not forcefully, of course, but to help them move to South America, Western Europe and other places. When Begin was elected he ordered the dismantling of this unit and

When Ben Gurion decided to establish the State, we were a majority of only 55% in the territory of the partition, designated for the Jewish State, yet this fact did not cause Ben Gurion a moment's hesitation.

In Ettinger's view, if the State of Israel makes a great effort to encourage aliyah, it may lead to at least half a million Jews coming to the Land within the next decade, "numbers that will bring us to a Jewish majority of 80% by the year 2035".

If we compare the economy of Israel to what the world in general is experiencing, if we take into account the strengthening of Islam in the United States, Britain, Argentina and other countries, all of these factors lead many Jews of the world to understand that aliyah to Israel is not only an ideological step but also an economic step, a step of comfort and convenience."

In Ettinger's view, if the State of Israel makes a great effort to encourage aliyah, it may lead to at least half a million Jews coming to the Land within the next decade, "numbers that will bring us to a Jewish majority of 80% by the year 2035." Nevertheless, he emphasizes that such a process cannot happen with the current policy of the Israeli government. "We must return to the policy we had before the Oslo era, when the government was actively involved in aliyah. Since Rabin we do, indeed, welcome immigrants with a red carpet but we do not work actively enough to encourage them to come. If Ben Gurion, Golda Meir and especially Yitzhak Shamir had taken this route we

instructed his office not to deal with the subject further. I am aware that, today, there are a number of clans in Samaria of significant size that would be willing to leave tomorrow morning out of Ben Gurion Airport if only they were allowed to do so."

Leaving by way of Ben Gurion Airport, explains Ettinger, is important to those families because Ben Gurion presents an unimpeded opening to the world while at the Jordan River crossings they would have to explain, at length, both the reason for their trip and their intentions to Jordanian security personnel who would pass the information on and, in addition, they would have to pay a fair amount of cash that they would get back only upon returning via those crossings. "Unfortunately, we have an illogical policy, and at present they have no security clearance to fly out of Ben Gurion. But anyone who reads public opinion polls and comes into contact with the Arabs of Judea and Samaria knows that there is a very large percentage who would consider leaving." ■

Jewish Sovereignty in Eretz Yisrael

Rabbi Dov Berl Wein

Rabbi of Bet Knesset Hanasi, Jerusalem

I have often felt and even publicly stated that the relationship of Jews to the Land of Israel, just as their relationship to the Torah itself, is the litmus test of being Jewish - not necessarily strict fulfillment of observances per se but being Jewish and faithful to one's people. It is ironic in the extreme that the two noisiest factions within the Jewish world today - the leftist, liberal and completely acculturated section of Jewish society on one hand and some of the rigorously observant section of Orthodoxy on the other - are both in agreement that Jewish sovereignty in the Land of Israel is somehow not a good thing for Jews or the world generally.

Apparently opposition to the State of Israel makes for strange bedfellows. There are many conflicting causes to this state of affairs. But the bottom line is always the bottom line - opposition to the existence of the State of Israel as a Jewish state.

Parshat Shlach with its description of the bitter opposition by the leaders of the tribes of Israel in the desert to the planned entry of the Jewish people into the Land of Israel points out how this attitude of negativism spelled tragedy for the entire people of that generation.

Midrash and Talmud advance compelling arguments as to what these leaders thought and how they justified their error to themselves. But again, righteous self justification is not a valid reason for standing in opposition to Jewish control over the Land of Israel. Lack of faith, lack of judgment, personal conflicts of interest, fear of the unknown, misplaced theology and the inertia of exile all combined to push these previously great leaders of Israel over the brink of rebellion and despair. The parasha of Shlach is one of the saddest in the entire Torah.

The idea of the importance of avoiding slander and not speaking evil about others is expanded in this parsha to include the prohibition of slandering the Land of Israel as well. Just as evil speech is forbidden even if it be true but is of no purposeful or permitted purpose, so too does this injunction against evil speech apply to the Land of Israel.

The Land of Israel is an inanimate object not capable of feeling the hurt that evil speech causes when directed against fellow human beings. Nevertheless, such speech against it is forbidden for it damages the speaker and not only the object about which he or she spoke.

Israeli governmental policies can be scrutinized and criticized. Leadership can be challenged and changed. But the basic right of the Jewish people to live in the Land of Israel under Jewish sovereignty is not given to discussion and argument. I think that this is the clear message to be derived from even a cursory reading of parshat Shlach. ■



The World is Beginning to Change Direction

An interview with **Dani Dayan**, Political Activist, former Chairman, Yesha Council 2007-2013.

Shortly after the end of his term as Chairman of the Council of Judea, Samaria and Gaza (Yesha), Dani Dayan established what came to be called the Yesha Foreign Ministry. Within this capacity, he meets with members of world parliaments, participates in international conferences and publishes articles in leading international journals – all in order to present to the world the ideals and interests of the Jewish residents of Judea and Samaria. Until only recently considered the province of delusional people, the aims and goals of these residents are slowly becoming a legitimate subject for political discussion.

In these meetings, do you find leadership that is receptive to ideas outside the Oslo or the 'Two-State' solution?

“There is a difference between appointed government officials and elected members of parliament. When I meet with foreign ministry appointees, I indeed see that they are locked into the ‘Two-State’ solution. They will listen to other ideas – and perhaps this even arouses certain doubts – but they adhere religiously to the idea of a ‘Two-State’ solution and exchange of territories. Nevertheless, within parliaments throughout the world there is a growing group which understands that the idea of two states for two peoples is either bad or simply not practicable.”

It almost seems like a losing battle from the start...

“After the Bar Ilan speech (in which Netanyahu expressed consent to the

establishment of a Palestinian state), I consulted with a very senior former diplomat and I asked him if it was worthwhile to begin such an activity and perhaps open an office in Washington. He listened and summarized his position with a warm recommendation to save the plane fare. It seemed to him a pointless endeavor that had no chance of success. But now, he also agrees that it is worthwhile. The American political experts also believe that the picture has totally changed and today there are people willing to listen, even if they are mostly Republicans. It is important to bear in mind that there was a candidate for the presidency, Mitt Romney, who won 47 percent of the vote in the United States who understood that a Palestinian state would paralyze



Within parliaments throughout the world there is a growing group that understands that the idea of two states for two peoples is either bad or simply not practicable.

the State of Israel and threaten Ben Gurion International Airport, and he spoke about this. And there have been others in American politics who have said that the idea of a Palestinian people is an invention. For example, Congresswoman Michelle Bachmann eschews the term ‘settlements’, insisting, instead, on the term ‘communities’ to refer the areas where Jewish residents in Judea and Samaria live Jewish residents in Judea and Samaria. In Hebrew there is an expression from Psalms – “Depart from evil, and do good.” If we break it down into parts – abandoning the idea of a ‘Two-State’ solution being the lyrical “departure from evil” – I see this all as progress.”

And what about support from the Government of Israel?

“In that area there is a need for hard work and we must hope that those who agree with our point of view will come to power and that their positions will not change the moment they get there. However, the shift in thinking is both clear and pervasive. As of today, there is no Knesset without a group that supports Jewish habitation in Judea and Samaria.”

If We Do Not Say These Things, Do Not Expect Members of Congress to Say Them

Dayan sees Israelis as the main opponents to his activity, and believes that international opposition is less problematic. By way of explanation he recalls the first interview journalist Yaakov Achimeir held with newly elected

Prime Minister Menachem Begin. “Begin spoke about our rights in Judea and Samaria and Achimeir asked him how he can speak about such rights while there is not even one senator who speaks that way. Begin answered him that one cannot expect a member of Congress to say what the government of Israel does not say.”

Dayan then moves forward three decades to current times: “The Bar Ilan speech caused great damage from this point of view yet, even under these circumstances, we are succeeding.” He points to the visit of 25 politicians from 12 countries throughout the world this past fall during Sukkot, the Feast of Tabernacles, as evidence of this success. There were government officials from the United States, Canada, Poland, Portugal, Argentina and Brazil among other countries. Dayan credits former minister Beni Elon, who coordinated with foreign governments in order to bring about this visit. “Toward the end of their trip, they toured with us in Judea and Samaria. I spoke with them for a long while and afterward, they issued a position paper against both the European boycott of Israel and Catherine Ashton’s statements regarding Israel.”

During his last visit to Washington, Dayan was invited to be the main speaker at a House Republican Conference. Leading members of Congress participated in the event including members of the House Foreign Affairs Committee. “They were willing to meet with me and ultimately, they were receptive to my message,” notes Dayan, with satisfaction, as additional



Photo: Dani Dayan with Congressman Trent Franks Photographer: Goel Griffith

proof of Washington's openness to other points of view.

How do you prepare for these meetings?

"Preparation is different for every meeting and I try to suit the material to my audience. In discussions with Republican members of Congress I focused on damage to the United States' image caused by John Kerry's activities in the Middle East. I explained that these activities lead inevitably to one outcome, and that will be noted as a failure for the United States, especially by regimes hostile to the US, whether Moscow, Teheran, Caracas, Damascus or Pyongyang. Ultimately we are talking about a decline in the prestige of the United States as the leader of the free world. This is an important point to bring out as American strength and interests are top priority for these policymakers.

Recently in Madrid, I met with top Middle East policy makers. I focused on the "Depart from evil" part of the maxim and explained why negotiations are both pointless and come at the expense of missed opportunities to do positive things in the field, things that are indeed not a political solution but may make life more comfortable for Jews and Arabs alike. I then explained a way in which European influence can be used to "do good" in the Middle East. I spoke about Israeli sovereignty – the only sovereignty relevant west of the Jordan River – and of our historical rights to the Land. I presented legal documentation about the illegality of the sanctions that the European Union intends to impose upon the Jewish communities in Judea and Samaria."

They have Heard and Read about Israeli Sovereignty and the Sky has not Fallen...

It's one thing when you talk about the approaching failure of negotiations – this they can digest. But when you

speak about Israeli sovereignty, doesn't it make them throw tomatoes at you (in their polite, European way)?

"I don't know what goes on inside their heads. They listen. In Spain, they liked the fact that they didn't have to break their teeth on English because I spoke to them in fluent Spanish and despite everything, they did not throw me out at any time. I have written about the application of sovereignty in several leading newspapers, including the New York Times and the Los Angeles Times. In every article, I have analyzed the situation and concluded that there must only be Israeli sovereignty west of the Jordan River and – guess what? The sky has not fallen!"

Indeed, but do they consider your words legitimate or are they only accepted out of the required politeness to a visitor?

"Anyone who thinks that it will be a short sprint is mistaken. We are sowing seeds whose harvest we will reap in the future and this future may only be in another twenty or thirty years. Meanwhile, we will have to accept an interim period similar to the current situation until we can bring the world to accept our ideas. It is very unfortunate, but I do not see the current government applying sovereignty over the territory, even partly. But we must not stop sowing the seeds, especially in the international arena. If we do not articulate this vision today, the government of Israel will not hold this vision in another five years, and if the vision does not exist in five years, the world will not recognize the vision in another twenty years."

Contrary to many others, Dayan does not believe that the independent "department of foreign affairs" that he has established has come too late. When he analyzes the political reality surrounding us, he is convinced that, on the contrary, the timing is right. "The chance for success since Oslo until a year or two ago was very small," he explains. "For twenty

years the international community had the feeling that there was no point in talking with us because we were on a super-highway headed straight for the 'Two-State' solution. Twenty years have passed and the world has become skeptical and wonders if, maybe, they are on the wrong path. They have not necessarily abandoned the idea of two states but they have more doubts now and therefore are curious to hear what we have to say."

The World Understands that We Can No Longer be Ignored

Dayan presents examples of changes that are happening now that could not have happened in the past. "There are many European ambassadors whom I have been courting for two or three years, requesting a meeting, and until recently, they have refused. Now they themselves, people with great influence in Europe, call me every month or two in order to meet over lunch and exchange ideas. Sometimes very senior officials will discreetly accompany the ambassadors to these meetings and they too will quietly listen to the position that not long ago was considered to be unrealistic. The world has great doubts about whether they are on the right path and they feel more and more that for a long time they have ignored a central player, the residents of Judea and Samaria, and must now listen to this player as well."

What are the chances that a discussion of this sort can be conducted with Arab groups?

"I don't know about Arab countries. Because of the concern that any discussion with Palestinians may be a discussion with terrorists, we have not tried to speak with them directly, to tell them the truth – which is that we must think about true coexistence without dividing the land – and that they should abandon the idea of statehood. Today I would be pleased to participate in such a dialogue." Dayan tells of one missed opportunity three years ago. At the time, he met in a Jerusalem hotel with a Jewish billionaire who was a supporter of the Left and a great financier of leftist organizations and NGOs. After Dayan presented his position, the billionaire surprisingly suggested, "Do you know what, Dani, come – let's go now to meet with Salam Fayyad." "I told him that I was not interested. This was after Fayyad had burned a huge pile of Israeli products in a large demonstration for the media. Today, I would go. I would tell him my truth. Not so that I could eat kanafeh in Ramallah. But to tell him that Israeli sovereignty would be there eventually and we must talk about the future. I don't believe that they would come to see the light in such a meeting, but nevertheless, there is a sowing of seeds here also that, perhaps, will yield fruit in the future." ■

Begin answered him that one cannot expect a member of Congress to say what the government of Israel does not say.

If we do not articulate this vision today, the government of Israel will not hold this vision in another five years, and if the vision does not exist in five years, the world will not recognize the vision in another twenty years.

Dr. Sherman's Humanitarian Solution

An interview with **Dr. Martin Sherman**, Director, Israel Institute for Strategic Studies

If the Right does not come to its senses, it will allow for the advancement of one of two scenarios – either of which will lead to the end of the State of Israel as we know it.

According to Dr. Martin Sherman, there is no encouraging news for the Israeli Right. In his opinion, if the Right does not come to its senses, it will allow for the advancement of one of two scenarios – either of which will lead to the end of the State of Israel as we know it. Nevertheless, along with the issuance of his apocalyptic warning, Sherman presents a detailed plan – one which he sees as the only feasible political alternative that will lead to the State of Israel's success. He calls it "the humanitarian plan".

"In my opinion the outlook is very bleak. The Right's concept is based on two correct but irrelevant assumptions. One is that there will not be an agreement with the Palestinians, and the second assumption is that there are too many Jewish residents to be able to evict them. But a withdrawal may occur in the future, even without a "successful" completion of negotiations or forcible eviction of the residents."

Sherman believes that Prime Minister Netanyahu has already psychologically resigned himself to the idea of unilateral withdrawal and that "the only thing left for him now is to prepare the choreography of the withdrawal." Sherman expects that sooner or later Netanyahu will offer the residents of Judea and Samaria a modest support package for the transfer from Judea and Samaria and whoever objects to it can remain after the IDF retreats and abandons them to their own devices, and in his (Netanyahu's) opinion, this process will lead to a mass exodus without the need for forcible eviction. "This is the scenario that the Right must be prepared for. This is the negative scenario that might happen," says Sherman.

There will be either Jewish or Arab Sovereignty over Judea and Samaria and whoever has the stronger will - That is who will prevail

Nevertheless Sherman presents another scenario, a positive one, and states that "Anyone who understands anything about the basics of Political Science, international relations and the theory of nationhood and is interested in maintaining the State of Israel as a national state of the Jewish People, knows that we must apply Israeli sovereignty from the sea to the Jordan River," and Sherman says this "not for ideological or biblical reasons but as a political scientist. It is impossible to have a stable government with divided sovereignty in this region. Only full Jewish sovereignty or full Arab sovereignty can prevail in this area and whoever has a stronger national will and a more realistic political vision will prevail."

Dr. Sherman goes on to outline a practical way to implement the scenario which he describes as the only scenario by which Israel can save itself. He admits Palestinians, Americans and other nations will have trouble accepting it but he is undeterred.

Sherman rejects the 'Two-State' vision as something that is not suitable to the demographic reality, which does not lend itself to division. He also refutes the vision of a "state of all its citizens" because it does not solve the demographic issue. "Every place where we have tried the 'land for peace' scheme, a security nightmare was created.

Sherman is aware of the optimistic demographic predictions that various right-leaning demographers present, but in his opinion we must guard ourselves from slavishly believing in such predictions. In his words, these predictions are indeed more accurate than the frightening ones made by the Left but nevertheless, these data are



not enough to allay the fear that giving citizenship to the Arabs in Judea and Samaria will result in a ratio of two Jews to one Arab and the consequent political implication of a total change in society. We would not be able to keep “the Jewish soul yearns” (from Hatikva), or a Shield of David on the flag, or a menorah as the symbol of the State, or the law of Return or Hebrew as the official language.”

Put an End to the World’s Ethnic Discrimination Toward Palestinians

After having rejected the other theories, Sherman presents his “humanitarian paradigm”, as he calls it.

According to him the State of Israel must call on the world to do away with ethnic discrimination against the Palestinians, thus beginning a series of procedures regarding the Arabs of Judea and Samaria and, perhaps in the future, in Gaza, and the Palestinians in the Diaspora as well.

Regarding the Palestinian Diaspora, Sherman believes that the UN and the nations of the world must be called upon to dismantle UNRWA, the special refugee organization that was established for the Palestinian refugees, distinct from the rest of the world’s refugees, for whom there is the United Nations High Commission for Refugees (UNHCR), which deals with their matters. Sherman mentions the essential differences between UNRWA’s mandate and that of UNHCR, differences that allow the situation of Palestinian refugee status to continue for decades while the international definition of refugee status ends much sooner. This reality means that the “refugee” designation is passed down from generation to generation among Palestinians and their numbers continue to grow while the numbers of other refugees continually decline.

Another fact that Dr. Sherman states is that UNHCR has a mandate to find a solution for refugees in third countries while UNRWA must find solutions for Palestinian refugees only in the country of origin, meaning the Land of Israel. “The result is that UNRWA perpetuates the problem that it is supposed to solve.” In Sherman’s opinion, if they would apply the accepted world definition of “refugee” to Palestinian refugees, their numbers would decrease from five million to fifty thousand, mostly octogenarians and older who are left since the war.

To effect the required change in the definition of Palestinian refugees (in order to make them comparable to other refugees in the world), Sherman urges the government of Israel to raise a concerted international call to stop the ethnic discrimination which is the prevailing Arab policy towards Palestinians, and allow them employment, advancement, permanent dwellings and more – everything that has not been allowed

them for decades by Arab governments in order to perpetuate their condition so that it can be used as a battering ram against Israel.

Sherman continues and recommends using the great sums of money that will be saved by closing UNRWA to support countries that take in the Palestinians. “Research and surveys that were done in the past have taught us that this is what the Palestinians really want,” he says and states that eliminating UNRWA will improve the situation for the rest of the refugees of the world because the sum of money that the world allocates to the refugees the world over will be divided equally and not be focused disproportionately on Palestinians, who get a budget several times larger than any other refugee in the world.

Offer Emigration Grants to Allow for a Better Life in Another Location

Continuing the explanation of the humanitarian plan that Dr. Sherman describes, he suggests to the government of Israel “to award emigration allowances to the Arabs of Judea and Samaria, thus allowing them a better life in another place without the corrupt leadership that has been bullying them for over a century.” Sherman emphasizes that his suggestion does not depend on any collective Arab agreement and for that reason it is important to assure that the procedure is de-politicized, meaning that the process should be defined as humanitarian and not political, and to address Arab families in Judea and Samaria directly and with a detailed plan. “No Arab collective would support an agreement that would allow the State of Israel to be a Jewish national state,” he says and adds the historical fact that the Arab leaders have stated more than once, which is that the entire Palestinian matter is only intended to lead the battle against the State of Israel. “Every Palestinian organization that we speak to would tend to sabotage the process and therefore it is necessary to speak to the heads of families and offer generous compensation, in my opinion about a million shekels per family, and to enable the family to choose for itself the place where it wants to live.”

And what if they don’t agree?

I have done joint research with a very well known company in collaboration with a Palestinian group and it seems that only fifteen percent of Palestinians would object to such an offer. Seventy percent of them said that some sort of compensation, meaning monetary, employment, housing, education etc., could convince them to leave permanently. Perhaps this is not etched in stone but it is preferable to the idea that they surely would not leave. There is also Palestinian research that supports such data.

“If, instead of supporting the Palestinian Authority, the government of

Israel would allow it to collapse without allowing the individual Palestinian to collapse along with it, and enable them to escape to another place, what could be the objection to such a humanitarian solution? This perhaps would not solve the problem but it would minimize it. Such a process would keep the land in our hands, would turn the Palestinians from desperately poor to fairly substantial emigrants and would also benefit the countries that absorb them. I don’t see anyone who would lose from this process other than the Palestinian leadership.”

Sherman believes that the right thing to do would be to spread his suggested process out over a decade and, in his opinion, its cost would be about two hundred billion dollars, which perhaps sounds like a large sum but actually, “it is a fraction compared to what the United States has spent in two not so successful wars against terror in Afghanistan and Iraq. If we spread it out, it is a burden that the State of Israel can carry almost by itself.”

Sherman knows the solution he suggests will not be easily accepted or implemented but nevertheless, he is convinced that “there is no other non-aggressive ultimate solution that can answer the demographic imperative and the geographic imperative, and if there is such a thing I will be happy to hear about it.”

How do you answer those who tell you that it’s all well and good, but the plan is not practical?

“Who decides what is practical and what is not? Is the ‘Two-State’ plan practical? It has been almost a quarter of a century that people have been trying to promote such a process with international support, with huge investments and the willingness of the State of Israel to accept it and despite all this, this idea is still not realized. When will they say that it is not practical? If, after the great victory of the Six Day War, someone would have spoken about dividing Jerusalem, the deployment of armed militias within mortar range of the Knesset and a willingness to expose the entire coastal plain to an Arab threat, it would have been considered insane, yet the Palestinians, with determination and eloquence have succeeded in promoting this idea – one which would have been considered totally delusional in the past – to a point of near universal acceptance. In the elections of ’88 there was a discussion within the Labor party about their platform. The left branch suggested recognizing a Palestinian state. Shimon Peres told them angrily ‘You are crazy. No one will vote for us.’ It was an illegitimate, even illegal, position. Anyone who would have promoted this position, which, today is voiced even within the Likud party, would have been sent to prison as a traitor. You don’t judge the feasibility of a plan according to the conventional wisdom of the day. We must initiate and stimulate a genuine discussion.” ■

UNRWA perpetuates the problem. If they would apply the accepted world definition of “refugee” to Palestinian refugees, their numbers would decrease from five million to fifty thousand, mostly octogenarians.



Dr. Martin Sherman lectures at the 3rd Sovereignty Conference organized by Women in Green, Jerusalem 2013

The UN and the nations of the world must be called upon to dismantle UNRWA, the special refugee organization that was established for the Palestinian refugees, distinct from the rest of the world’s refugees.

Don't Try to Frighten Us with the 'One-State' Solution

Prof. Kontorovich from the Northwestern University of Law in Chicago during his lecture at Shdema in Gush Etzion: "They threaten that if we don't accept the 'Two-State' concept we will have to implement the 'One-State' concept, but this idea should only frighten the Palestinians themselves, and they know it well."

On Friday, December 6, Prof. Eugene Kontorovich spoke in Shdema, eastern Gush Etzion, to an audience of more than 150 people from all over Israel. He addressed, head-on, the viability of a 'One-State' solution, refuting commonly held fears and misperceptions about Palestinian threats to the demographic balance of the Jewish state.

At the beginning of his lecture Prof. Kontorovich, who made aliyah in recent months and now lives in the community of Alon Shvut, noted that for those who support partitioning the country, demographic fear functions as a proverbial gun to Israel's head – both strengthening Palestinian demands and, at the same time, spurring Israel to make ever-increasing concessions and compromises.

Regarding the Palestinian threat of a 'One-State' solution – the idea that Palestinians would demand citizenship, voting rights and thus overwhelm Israel demographically – Prof. Kontorovich states that it is an empty threat, aimed at extracting concessions from Israel in the arena of negotiations. He astutely points out that if one is truly fearful of this possibility, there is no end to the concessions one would be willing to make. As Prof. Kontorovich points out, however, Israelis need not feel that the "threat" of a 'One-State' solution is in fact a gun to their heads. The 'One-State' concept would harm the Palestinians themselves first and foremost while for Israel it could provide a long-term and desirable political solution, even if implementation would be expensive and difficult. "For the Palestinians it would

be a disaster and that is precisely the reason that they have not yet done it. They say that they have at their disposal a course of action that will be a disaster for us but why have they not used it until now? Only because they want to be nice to Israel? Perhaps because they know that it would be a terrible resolution for them!"

Kontorovich exposes as a myth the idea that the 'One-State' concept poses a threat to Israel. He notes that over the past twenty years, the Palestinians have achieved many elements of self-government they are unlikely to be willing to forego in order to live under Israeli rule. "They have their own government. They have an elected council and a seat at the UN – they have been recognized! I, myself, thought that people would stop worrying about the political threat of having one state when the UN granted them diplomatic recognition. They have embassies. They are regarded as a state. They have diplomatic immunity, a flag, a central bank, even their own television stations that produce their own programs. They have their own culture and they have a system of employment and security services of their own. They get huge sums of money for support from the Europeans. They have an Internet suffix and their own area code".

In light of all this Kontorovich says that if a 'One-State' solution is decided upon, the Palestinian leadership, which currently enjoys significant status, will become no more than a group of heads of local councils, not to mention the forty thousand salaried employees who hold jobs within the Palestinian Authority security system. It is doubtful the Palestinian leadership and its employees would like to give up all of this. "The

status quo is better for them," states Kontorovich.

"When we pay heed to threats about the 'One-State' solution, we allow them to threaten us with something that would be much worse for them. It is like Mahmoud Abbas's repeated threats to resign. Why, the Palestinians saw the day that they were recognized in the UN as a holiday. It was the high point of Mahmoud Abbas's career. And now they threaten to give it all up? Are they serious?"

To those who worry about the political difficulties inherent in the application of sovereignty and accepting the concept of one state, Prof. Kontorovich notes that despite the political difficulties of the 'One-State' concept, two states would be a disaster for the State of Israel. He adds that as far as Palestinians voting for the Knesset, we must not forget the Israeli vote, the majority vote, because the policy regarding Judea and Samaria would be as in any other area in the State of Israel. "Israelis will also vote on what happens in Palestinian areas. And the majority will vote for what happens within the minority. The Palestinians don't want this at all. Not the culture and the education and not the security matters."

In order to illustrate the range of possibilities, Kontorovich points to recent events in other Western countries where there exist different forms of self-determination. As it turns out, there are many countries where autonomy is given to areas that govern their own affairs but do not vote for the national parliament. In this context, he notes Britain, which has various territories in places such as Gibraltar, the Falkland Islands, the



Palestinian policemen. It is doubtful the Palestinian leadership would like to give this up.



Prof. Eugene Kontorovich lectures in Shdema. Photo: Women in Green

Despite the political difficulties of the 'One-State' concept, 'Two States' would be a disaster for Israel.

→ Continued from page 6

who do not understand. Most of the names of the Arab villages and towns have Biblical sources. Yet all of this is not enough for us to say that we have returned to our Land simply because it is ours. In discussions with members of the American Congress it is absolutely clear to them and they ask us why our government does not say these simple things.”

Along with his activity abroad, Mesika has promoted bringing public opinion shapers for ‘field visits’ as one of his flagships of public relations. These visits have won prominent headlines in the Israeli media. Many of the visitors have reported that something has changed in their world view regarding Jewish settlement in Judea and Samaria, especially regarding its future.

What is there, in these visits that causes such a change?

“The truth is that with Jews it is more difficult than with Christians,” Mesika is forced to admit and he explains: “Christians accept things easily. There are many cities in the United States with the names Shiloh, Bethlehem and other biblical locations. On the other hand, it is more difficult with Israeli leftists who are detached from the bible. For some reason, with them we speak about security and the strength of the Jewish communities and how the process is irreversible.”

The End of the Idea of a “Settlement” as Two House Trailers and a Goat on a Hilltop

As one of the most significant testimonies to the success of these public relations journeys, Mesika notes the words of the editor of the Kibbutzim journal after his visit in Samaria under the title “We have missed the Train” regarding the chances of uprooting the flourishing communities of Judea and Samaria.

Mesika calls what happens to visitors on the tours of Samaria “blasts of consciousness”: “The first blast is when they discover the proximity to the center of the country. I set up a meeting with

someone for eight o’clock and he calls at seven saying that he has already arrived because he was sure that it would be an hour’s trip. After twenty minutes he finds himself in Barkan. When he is in Tel Aviv, the mountains in the East seem to him as if they are at the end of the Earth, and when he comes, he understands that within a few minutes he is in the center of the territory. The second blast is when, from Barkan, he sees the whole area of the entire coastal plain spread out before him – the houses, the chimneys, the Azrieli Towers in Tel Aviv, the sea – and he understands that if there are enemies here, we are in real danger. When he arrives in the community of Peduel and he sees all the jets taking off and landing –from Ben

Gurion airport- he understands that there is real danger here too. Every jet above and every vehicle below would be within shooting range.”

Mesika goes on to explain the matter of the blasts this way: “When he pictures a ‘settlement’ he imagines two house trailers with a nutty guy and a goat and when he arrives in the field and he sees 140 factories in Barkan with thousands of Jewish and Arab workers who work together in coexistence he understands that something in the theory that he developed for himself doesn’t match up with reality. Afterwards, in the mountain range of Tapuach-Yitzhar, he sees the Jordan River in the east and the sea in the west. He sees what Abba Eban called the ‘Auschwitz Borders’. It is impossible to establish a state within the width of 15 kilometers.”

Mesika sees the momentum of development in Judea and Samaria as practical proof of the existence of the Creator of the Universe. According to him there is no other explanation for the fact that “despite the limitations, despite the Civil Administration, despite the landlord from America, the development in Judea and Samaria is something that logic cannot explain. In Samaria the growth is the largest in the country, between eight and ten percent every year while in the rest of the country it is approximately 1.8 percent. Thousands come to visit Joseph’s Grave. Despite the media and despite the politics the People of Israel has returned to its Land, builds in it and clings to it.” ■



Mayor Gershon Mesika addresses the European Parliament photo: Samaria Local Council- Foreign Affairs Office

Bermuda Islands and other places where residents live a life of internal autonomy, to a greater or lesser extent. He also brings up the American example of Puerto Rico. “Puerto Rico is part of the United States. People who live there are citizens of the United States but Puerto Rico is not one of the United States, but rather, a territory of the United States. It is a very vague structure, which was intended to be temporary, but became permanent. As a result of this, Puerto Ricans do not vote for Congress. The federal government created a special reality for them that grants them a comfortable tax status and they know that if they became a state they will lose it.” It is interesting to note, as Kontorovich points out, every few years a survey is taken in Puerto Rico to clarify the position of the public regarding diplomatic and political status. Last year 54% of the residents of Puerto Rico voted that they would like to change their voting rights, yet the White House responded with a “big yawn” stating that they weren’t the initiators of the survey, and so, they have no intention to relate to it.

Kontorovich notes that in Western democratic countries there are only a few



As it turns out, there are many countries where autonomy is given to areas that govern their own affairs but do not vote for the national parliament.

such examples, while there are very many examples in countries where there is not democracy. Nevertheless he emphasizes that if Israel were to emulate the familiar scenario in these countries, the world would claim that it is not the same since Israel is always treated differently than other countries. Therefore, we must clarify to the world, and especially amongst ourselves, that Israel does not fear the ‘One-State’ scenario and that the only ones who might lose from such a scenario are the Palestinians.

In order to prove Israel's seriousness, Kontorovich believes a number of legislative changes should be made, such as enabling Israeli émigrés to vote for ten years after they leave Israel, and changing the system of government to an American-style district representation system that promotes the emergence of centrist parties. These changes would reduce the price Israel would pay from a ‘One-State’ solution, and thus, demonstrate to the world that it is not intimidated by such a threat. Moreover, all these reforms would be independently worthwhile, aside from any diplomatic considerations.

Prof. Kontorovich’s presentation was

organized by the Women In Green and the Committee for a Jewish Shdema. It was hosted in the Land-of-Israel Cultural Center in Shdema, between Har Choma in Jerusalem and Tekoa in Gush Etzion. The heads of Women in Green, Yehudit Katsover and Nadia Matar, spoke before Prof. Kontorovich.

Matar told those present about the continuing struggle for a Jewish stronghold in Shdema and the importance of this locality to safeguard Jewish territorial contiguity between Jerusalem and the communities of eastern Gush Etzion. Katsover related the political reality to the weekly Torah portion in which Judah stands in front of the vizier of the greatest empire of those days, Egypt, and demands his requirements forcefully and fearlessly. With this inspiration, she urges the leaders of Israel to also stand erect when facing world powers and state their position clearly and firmly.

Katsover and Matar announced plans to establish new events in Shdema where noted leaders will lay out their plans for implementation of the application of Israeli sovereignty over Judea and Samaria. ■



When They Say "Peace" What do they Mean?



An interview with **Raphael Israeli**, Professor of Islamic, Middle Eastern and Chinese History

“Of all the Arab groups in the area, Hamas is the only one that is on the level,” states the senior Arabist, Prof. Rafi Israeli. His complaint lies with Israeli statesmen who, time and again, interpret their Arab interlocutors according to the European dictionary and neglect the Muslim dictionary, which would lead them to understand correctly the true intentions of the “peace partner”.

Prof. Israeli describes Hamas as straight talking because they state clearly and directly that they will never recognize Israel and that they are willing to accept, at best, a hudna with Israel but nothing more than that.

“We have had Israeli leaders say that if the Arabs offer a hudna we should go with it, as long as there will be quiet. What these leaders do not understand is that hudna is not peace, but rather, a historical precedent set by the prophet Muhammad when he signed with his enemies, the tribe of Quraysh, on a hudna – literally, a quieting – for a period of ten years. But when, after two years, he had built up enough strength to overcome them, Muhammad was not ashamed to fight and conquer them – despite the agreement of quiet for ten years.”

And if anyone thinks that stories about Muhammad were valid only 1,600 years ago, Prof. Israeli reminds us that even today “Hamas openly and clearly states that the hudna will exist only when it is beneficial for the Muslim side. During ‘Cast Lead’ we would have completely

crushed them had they not been willing to enter into a ceasefire. This was why they agreed to it and this is how they justified it to themselves. And it was borne out because when they thought they had strength, they continued shelling us and bombing us. This is why I say they are straight. They don’t speak about recognizing Israel or about peace, but only of a hudna, which can be extended but can also be violated within six months. This is the main thing we have to remember.”

Israeli says “this is the concept that guided Mohamed Morsi, deposed president of Egypt, when he said that the right thing to do is to talk about a hudna with Israel, and he believed that the peace agreement with Israel should be revised according to this thought process.”

We must pay attention to the concepts that they use. Peace for them is only a word. The Islamic world has never adopted the concepts of Roman law that were accepted by the West and by us as well. When they talk about ‘making peace’ it doesn’t refer to a contractual process but only to the enemy’s obligations, while the Muslim can violate it whenever it’s convenient for him,” Israeli emphasizes.

Is this the reason that Arafat refused to sign an agreement on that embarrassing occasion when Mubarak was furious with him and demanded him to ‘sign, you dog’?

“Exactly. Arafat knew that if he signed the agreement he would have no right to exist. His entire existence had been

dedicated to war with Israel for forty years. If he had agreed to an end to the conflict, there would be no justification for the continuation of terror and killing on the roads. They demand that we leave Judea and Samaria but if we do leave they will continue the shelling and the bombings because they believe that the rest of the Land of Israel belongs to them too. There is no value to a mutual agreement with them. Just as with Hamas, who got every last meter of Gaza and continues to shoot at us from there, they would do the same in Judea and Samaria as long as they have weapons to use against us.”

Can there be Muslim acceptance of any Israeli sovereignty in the Middle East?

“Of course not. Every place that was once a Muslim area must immediately return to the possession of Islam from their point of view. The Land of Israel, Andalusia in Spain, southern France and Kashmir in India are all in this category because these areas were part of the Islamic caliphate. Indeed, ideally their goal is for the entire world to be Muslim, but the United States is a less urgent case than our area because it was never in their hands.”

The “Oslo” believers, and especially the president of the state, Peres, say that our partner is secular, and therefore not bound by religious Muslim terms.

“Peres doesn’t understand anything at all. We mustn’t listen to him. He has already gotten us mixed up once with Oslo. Fortunately the government

has changed since then. He was ready to withdraw from the entire territory including Jerusalem, and afterward to see how they shoot at Talbiya and Romema from Sheikh Jarrah.”

And besides the issue of Shimon Peres, what about the possibility that Abu Mazen might present a secular position independent of Islamic history?

Abu Mazen would not dare say it, but even if he did, we must see how he would conduct himself. Take the suicide bombings (which I call Islamikazi, because there is no element of suicide, rather they result in others losing their lives), which started with Hamas and were adopted by al-Aqsa Brigades, which is a Fatah movement. They may not claim to be strict adherents of Islam, but they adopt anything they think will help in their struggle. Therefore, there are streams within Fatah that support Hamas. We are talking about the same people. Within the same family one brother will belong to Hamas and another brother to Fatah. The difference is only in tactics. Abu Mazen certainly does not renounce terror. He praises and encourages the bombers and describes them as heroes and as a model for his people. This is a man who seeks peace? He advocates continuing the conflict as long as it is not a direct clash because he understands that in every direct clash they are harmed more than they harm us.” ■



Abu Mazen does not renounce terror. He praises and encourages the bombers and describes them as heroes and as a model for his people. This is a man who seeks peace?

There Already Exists a Palestinian State - in Jordan

Former **MK Prof. Arie Eldad**, M.D., Chairman of the
Professors for a Strong Israel

Anyone who has ever suffered with a sore throat and fever, and doesn't recover within two days, goes to the doctor, of course. The doctor, using a flashlight and tongue depressor, sees a pair of red, swollen tonsils with white dots and concludes that the patient is suffering from a throat infection. And even though an infection is usually viral and not bacterial – he prescribes antibiotics to be on the safe side. The patient takes whatever he takes and in most cases, recovers within a few days.

If he does not recover – the doctor can try a second antibiotic, a third, and then a fourth until the patient is “gathered unto his fathers”. But you would expect a reasonable doctor to stop and ask himself: What is going on? Why doesn't the patient recover despite such wonderful treatment?

The logical answer: the lack of response to treatment and the resulting frustration might signal a mistake in diagnosis.

I would not have bothered you with an introduction about microbial throat infections if we weren't in a similar situation politically.

The war between Jews and Arabs in the Land of Israel has been going on for more than a hundred years and most observers, commentators and intermediaries are convinced that it is a territorial conflict: Jews and Arabs are fighting over one tract of land so the logical solution is to partition the land. This is a logical assumption and therefore (and for other colonialist reasons as well) Churchill came to Palestine – Israel in 1922 – and partitioned the Land. He gave three quarters of the area east of the Jordan to the Arabs and the rest remained as the British Mandate for the purpose of the establishment of a Jewish national home. The Arabs were not happy, and their reaction, “The Riots of 1929”, is recorded in history. Afterwards, the British launched more committees that suggested additional partitions and various maps, and every attempt ended in a bloodbath, waves of terror, “events”, wars, intifadas. Twenty three thousand Jews were killed and more than a hundred thousand Arabs but no statesman stopped to ask himself why all the attempts at partition only ended in more wars and increased bloodletting.

The reason, of course: a faulty diagnosis. The conflict is not a territorial war (even though there are many territorial symptoms and we do fight over every acre and every building) but a religious war, an ideological clash. It cannot be solved by drawing a line on a map. For the Muslims, the Land of Israel will forever be Wakf Land, and on the other hand, even Ben Gurion, who was not “religious”, waved the Bible as the source of our absolute right to the Land of Israel when he went to the Peel Commission in 1937. Nevertheless every “peace maker” in our midst writes the prescription of “partitioning the land” for the wrong illness.

Still the only political solution on the negotiating table between Israel and the Palestinian Authority is that which has failed again and again.

With many chronic illnesses, although we do not know how to cure them, we do know how to treat them. Similarly, we must find a formula that, even if it does not lead to peace, will at least reduce the danger of bloodshed to a minimum and will not pose an existential threat to the State of Israel, from a political, security or demographic point of view. Such is the plan of “two states for two peoples on each side of the Jordan”.

The plan is not new. But it is more relevant today than ever, in light of the “Arab Spring”. Between 70% and 80% of the citizens of Jordan are “Palestinians” according to their own definition or the definition of UNRWA. Jordan is located on 75% of the area of the Mandatory Palestine-Israel, and therefore it was King Hussein who said “Jordan is Palestine and Palestine is Jordan and anyone who claims otherwise is a traitor”. When the “Arab Spring” comes to Jordan the majority of its citizens will depose the Hashemite regime. Even fans of the Hashemite regime among us know that we will not be able to rescue Abdullah when the “Arab Spring” arrives there. It could be that a civil war will break out – Bedouins against Palestinians – but in the end, a Palestinian state will lie east of the Jordan River. This state must be defined and recognized as the national state of the Palestinian people. It will not bring peace. The conflict, as we said, is religious. The Arabs will not give up the dream of returning to Jaffa and to stake their claims, and on our side we will not give up the patrimony of Gad, Reuben and the half tribe of Manasseh, but in the eyes of the world, at least the Palestinians will have lost the status that they so cherish, of “a people without a country”. They will have something.

Of course, Israel must annex Judea and Samaria and define her border as the Jordan River. And to anyone who fears the loss of a Jewish majority and Jewish character – we mention UNSCOP – the UN special committee, which submitted the Resolution of November 29, 1947 to the General Assembly.

They saw that the future Jewish state was expected to comprise 600,000 Jews and 450,000 Arabs and they suggested that the Arabs in the Jewish state would be residents of the Jewish state and citizens of an Arab state. A similar distribution exists today regarding the Arabs of East Jerusalem. Israel could offer the Palestinian state in Jordan natural gas from the Mediterranean Sea and desalinated water and in exchange they would pay with dinars and citizenship for the residents of Judea and Samaria. We don't know when the Hashemite regime will fall, but fall it will. And until then there is certainly no need to rush into establishing a Palestinian state in Judea and Samaria. There is another way. ■

The conflict is not a territorial war, but a religious war, an ideological clash. It cannot be solved by drawing a line on a map.

Of course, Israel must annex Judea and Samaria and define her border as the Jordan River.

We don't know when the Hashemite regime will fall, but fall it will. And until then there is certainly no need to rush into establishing a Palestinian state in Judea and Samaria. There is another way.



Prof. Arie Eldad speaks at the 3rd Sovereignty Conference organized by Women in Green, Jerusalem 2013

Photo: Gershon Ellinson

Women in Green Mourn the Loss of Mordechai Aharoni, Z"l

Gush Etzion lost a rare and fascinating individual this past November, a person to whom we owe, in large part, our possession of the Jewish stronghold in the Gush. Mordechai Aharoni, of blessed memory, passed away at the age of 83.

Mordechai first came to Gush Etzion as a youth, when he and his friends were called upon to establish Kibbutz Ein Tzurim, in the days of the British Mandate.

His love for the Land and a drive to establish communities remained with him even decades afterward. For many years Mordechai supported the ongoing struggle to cling to the land of Gush Etzion. Despite his age, Mordechai came to these hills always, whether in the blazing sun or pouring rain or raging winds or freezing cold, to encourage the Jewish pioneers and fortify them.

Mordechai was young in spirit. His soul was full of love for the Land of Israel. He

documented and lovingly photographed the Land in its hour of need, whenever the renewed Jewish community needed his skills and his phenomenal memory. That is how it was when he came to testify in court about the sale of land in Givat Eitam, in Efrat, which he witnessed as a lad of 17. It was by the merit of this testimony that Givat Eitam is still ours; this hill is slated for continuing development in the city of Efrat, the capital of Gush Etzion.

For a long time, community leaders of Gush Etzion availed themselves of Mordechai's longstanding familiarity with the Land and his skill in analyzing aerial photographs, thereby proving the Jewish claim to many tracts of land.

Mordechai used his sense of humor as an important tool to win over his listeners, adults and youth alike. He was always in good spirits. Always willing to help and he would say to us again and again, "Come to me, ask me, and

I will search it out for you, I will check and I will find what you are looking for." Unfortunately, we were not able to ask him everything, so we did not get all the answers, not even a small amount of the vast knowledge that he had accumulated

about the history of the land of Gush Etzion. We did not hasten to request the information, perhaps because, in our eyes, Mordechai would be young forever, and that is how we will remember him always. ■



Mordechai Aharoni z"l (with map in hands) guides a Women in Green tour on Givat Eitam in Efrat Photo: Women in Green

Here and there in Eretz Yisrael

Yaron Rosenthal,
Director, Kfar Etzion Field School

Solomon's Pools

In the days of the Second Temple, the Mishna and the Talmud, there was a system of aqueducts, pipes, tunnels and pools that brought water from Mount Hebron to Jerusalem. This system was in use until the War of Independence and even afterward, continued to supply water to the Eastern part of the city until the Six Day War.

The water sources within the City of Jerusalem – the Gihon Spring, the public pools of water and the water cisterns in homes – did not meet the city's needs in the time of the Second Temple. In the days of the Hasmoneans, especially in Herod's time and in the first century CE, the city grew and expanded and great quantities of water were required for the holy service on the Temple Mount, especially on the three pilgrimage festivals.

In Jerusalem, the problem of water supply was solved by means of aqueducts through which water flowed by gravity from sources that were distant from the city itself, as was the case with many other cities in the Hellenic and Roman world.

The system of aqueducts leading to Jerusalem, which we know about from biblical sources as well as from archeological findings, are the most complex

and longest in Israel. ■

In the 19th century a system of aqueducts with multiple branches leading to Jerusalem was discovered, in the center of which were the three Pools of Solomon, which could hold approximately three hundred thousand cubic meters.

Two aqueducts led to Solomon's Pools: the Lower Aqueduct, whose source was in the springs of Wadi al-Arroub, and, about 30 meters higher, the Upper Aqueduct, which brought water from Nahal HaPirim, in Arabic Wadi al-Bir (cisterns).

The water flowed from the pools via three aqueducts to three main destinations: the first aqueduct - which had its source in Eitam Spring - leads to the Temple Mount with the Temple in the center, the second leads to the Citadel and Herod's Palace in upper Jerusalem and the third aqueduct went out from the Pools of Solomon eastward, passed the village of Artas, and brought water to the large pool that was built at

the foot of Herod's Citadel in the desert, in the center of the lower city that King Herod established here.

In a recent trip held Thursday, 2 Tevet (December 12), about 35 adventurous left from Givat HaDagan, north of Efrat, and descended to the Pools of Solomon where we discussed the connection between the lower pool and Eitam Spring to the era of the kingdom of the Hasmoneans in Judea. From the pools we continued on to biblical Eitam and saw the impressive remains of one of the cities of the tribe of Judea. We finished with a climb back up Givat HaDagan by way of the Dir al-Bant Monastery.

I would like to note that the Kfar Etzion Field School continues to guide tourists all over the country - in Judea, in Samaria, in the Negev, in the Galilee and the Golan and east of the Jordan River - regardless of changes in policy it does everything in its power so that the People of Israel will not forget any part of the Land of Israel. ■



Solomon's Pools, today in area A Photo: Mordechai Saied