

Elon Yarden

Transformation

The One State Plan

Translation from Hebrew: Jenny Grigg

Li'ad Publication

No part of this book may be reproduced or transmitted in any form, or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying or recording, or by any information storage and retrieval system without written permission from the author and the publisher.

All right reserved for the author ©

jarden-e@bezeqint.net

P.O.Box 8070 Nathanya 42504

First addition April 2009

"The Palestinian people do not exist... Only for political and tactical reasons do we speak today about the existence of a Palestinian people, since Arab national interests demand that we posit the existence of a distinct "Palestinian people" to oppose Zionism.. The creation of a Palestinian state is only a means for continuing our struggle against the state of Israel for our Arab unity...For tactical reasons, Jordan, which is a sovereign state with defined borders, cannot raise claims to Haifa and Jaffa, while as a Palestinian, I can undoubtedly demand Haifa, Jaffa, Beer-Sheva and Jerusalem. However, the moment we reclaim our right to all of Palestine, we will not wait even a minute to unite Palestine and Jordan."

PLO executive committee member **Zuheir Muhsein**¹

"To us, the refugee issue is the winning card which means the end of the Israeli state."

Fatah Central Committee member **Sakher Habash**²

"The Arabs foster the separate Palestinian nationalism and the myth of "restoring the rights of the Palestinian nation" within the territory of the State of Israel and in its stead, in order to destroy Israeli nationalism. The Palestinian national demand is designed to abrogate the existence of the State of Israel and not to coexist with it peacefully."

Shimon Peres³

"Secular, democratic Palestine" will rise upon the ruins of the State of Israel...A Palestinian state...will be a time bomb which will draw the Arab world into war."

Yitzhak Rabin⁴

"Any concession whatever, even partial, in 'the Territories' is a certain recipe for national suicide... this state (Palestinian) in any form – or even worse, losing our full and sole control over its territory – means only this: death sentence, in prolong torment or in one blow upon the State of Israel."

Ariel Sharon⁵

"There was no such thing as Palestinians. When was there an independent Palestinian people with a Palestinian state?...It was not as though there was a Palestinian people in Palestine considering itself as a Palestinian people and we came and threw them out and took their country away from them. They did not exist."

Golda Meir⁶

"The principle of national self-determination as proffered by the Israeli Arabs, is nothing other than an ideological cover for the constant, unchanging Arab demand to destroy the State of Israel and establish an Arab state in its place."

Hans J. Morgenthau⁷

Table of Contents

Preface	7
Chapter A: The Media Jihad	9
Chapter B: False Symmetry – Two States for Two Nations	14
Chapter C: The Palestinian Identity is Tactical and False	19
Chapter D: The Oslo Accords – a Trojan Horse for Israel	22
Chapter E: Two Scenarios of Extermination	31
Chapter F: The Propaganda of Deception	35
Chapter G: The Fabrication of Palestine	40
Chapter H: The Lie of Jerusalem	48
Chapter I: The Genetic Fabrication	51
Chapter J: The Great Arab Refugee Scam	55
Chapter K: The Peace Lie	61
Chapter L: Transformation – a Return to the Israeli Identity	68
Chapter M: Unification – The One State Plan	75
Chapter N: True Peace in the Middle-East	92

Preface

The political move aimed at eventually establishing a Palestinian State in the heart of the Land of Israel, must be stopped immediately. Since establishing such a state would be granting a prize to terrorism and the authorization of the “Palestine” fabrication. This state will not lead to peace of “two states for two nations” but to a blood-soaked war. This state can mean only one single thing: a death sentence, under prolonged agony or in one single blow, for the State of Israel.

While preparation are being made in Israel for the establishment of a Palestinian State and the rest of the core subjects are being presented on the public daily agenda (borders, Jerusalem, refugees and so on) – we must resort to reminding ourselves of the truth, otherwise we shall fall into the trap that our enemies are trying to set up for us: the Palestinian identity is a fictive and a tactical identity, which is intended to serve as an instrument in the all-Arab-Muslim struggle against Israel. The purpose of the Palestinian State is not to liberate the Palestinian people but to serve as the spearhead in this struggle.

This little booklet exposes the Palestine fabrication, a fib so successful, that nowadays hardly anyone denies its truth. Likewise it also traces other lies dispersed by the enemies of Israel, in an attempt to make it illegitimate, as a mid stage on route to its final disappearance from the face of the earth.

Exposing the lies of its enemies can provide Israel not only with a first-rate tool of “explanation”, “public diplomacy”, but also with a new political plan – the One State plan – which is radically different from anything that has been suggested so far.

Chapter A: the Media Jihad

Israel is in the midst of an offense, which it is unable to defend itself from, since it finds it hard to identify and define. While Israel manages to defend itself from the physical terrorism, it remains hopeless facing the verbal terrorism. Israel today does not have a public diplomacy system that can provide an answer to all of the lies dispersed by its enemies worldwide, in an attempt to blacken it and to make it illegitimate among the modern international community – and this way to deprive it of the political immunity provided by the international law system.

As the result of a line of defeats and downfalls in the media battlefield, Israel, which knew great victories in the military battlefield, is beginning to lose all of the assets it has acquired. Although the IDF is the most moral army in the world, it is perceived by the worldwide media as a murderous army, compared to the cruelest armies in the world, like the Nazi army. Although the military regime established in Judea and Samaria and the Gaza Strip is the most liberal regime one can possibly imagine, Israel is perceived as an apartheid state of the worst kind, like the regime that ruled over South Africa up until several years ago. Despite the fact that Israel invests a great deal of effort in order to achieve peace with its neighbors, it is perceived as an aggressive and war provoking country. Israel, though it aspires for

nothing more than a little place under the sun and the establishment of a just and democratic society, is presented as a racist and imperialistic country of the heinous kind.

In Israel people are yet to internalize the understanding that the real battlefield is not a military one, but one that lies in the field of the media. The modern means of media created an unprecedented revolution of communication and changed the very foundations of our private and public lives. The direct and immediate result of the media revolution is a rise in the weight of the moral and legal considerations in the international arena. The media not only reports the events, but also judges them and passes sentence. This is where the psychopolitical change created by the media come from, by installing moral values in our consciousness, even if in a latent manner. The thing that is known as the “world public opinion” (which is more western than worldwide), is a product of the worldwide media.

The power of the IDF bears no significance when facing the television cameras. On the contrary – the power is a disadvantage, rather than an advantage. There is nothing more eminent for the helplessness of strength than the encounter between the regular army and a civilian uprising. During the last decades the traditional advantages of guerilla warfare were supplemented by the aspect of the media, which renders the military strength not only ungainly and inefficient, but expressly immoral. The medium of television is characterized by the

normative message concealed within it. A journalistic report to the world is not devoid of values and positions, even when this concerns a far and professional review: all the more so when most means of media are controlled by factors with interests that reflect the positions of their patrons.

In the battlefield of the media the strong side finds itself in a constant position of defending oneself, since according to the psychological rules of the game the strong side is the bad one while the weak side, the underdog, is the good one. The world public opinion operates much like the jury in criminal proceedings: its decisions are fed more by a gut feeling and popular justice than by professional and rational considerations. Therefore, the minute the camera captures a picture of a killed Palestinian boy (even if his death was staged by photographers on behalf of the enemy, like in the case of Mohammed al-Dura) the Israeli side has already lost the media battle and all explanations that may follow won't do any good. In the arena of the media the strength is nearly always a weakness and the weakness is nearly always strength. This can be simple explained by distinguishing between the political realm and the legal-psychological realm: power subdues the first realm, while justice determines the second one.

Nowadays, the shapers of public opinion determine the fate of nations more than generals and politicians. The enemies of Israel, though militarily inferior, were wise enough to realize long before us the possibilities offered

by the modern media as an instrument of war. The media advantage, which they've accumulated can not only be explained by the way they present themselves as the weak side, but also by their immunity from the influence of the interior public opinion, one which only exists in open societies. While they exercise force in a nearly limitless fashion in their own countries, they constantly denounce the use of force as far as their relations with Israel, exploiting the openness and the tolerance of the Israeli society internally, as well as externally. They make sure they conceal their rivers of blood and their tales of oppression well; while the activities of the IDF are seen by people all over the world; they're shocked and they pass sentence and any explanation provided in the aftermath by Israel won't be of any avail.

From day to day, the propaganda campaign against Israel is gaining more and more momentum yet this still does not yield an Israeli response. The forbearance and the policy of restraint in the face of Arab terrorism are not only evident in the military field, but in the field of media, as well. **This condition must change immediately.** If Israel wishes to survive, then it must switch its strategy from a defensive position to an offensive one, in the battlefield of the world media, a mission which is of no less importance than military deterrence. In order to win, Israel must conduct an aggressive propaganda campaign in Israel and worldwide, consecutively delegitimizing the fabrication of Palestine and its political demands, until the point comes when this damned and false identity disappears

from the face of the earth. In order to win, Israel must come to its senses, acquire its sense of justice, the spirit which fed the Zionist enterprise from its early days and which had become lost as the years went by. Israel shall not emerge victorious by power, nor by the force of its army forces, but by developing a spirit of truth and justice, just like the words of poet **Nathan Alterman**:

*Then the devil said: now that he's safe
How can I do him in?
He's got the courage and the arms
And enough good sense to win
So he said: I won't make him weaker,
Or keep him in bonds tied tight
I won't put any fear in him,
Or diminish his will to fight
All I have to do is to make his mind
Forget that he was right
So the devil said and the heavens
Turned pale in consternation
And he went off to give his scheme.⁸*

Chapter B: False Symmetry – Two States for Two Nations

The beginning of the Media Jihad was during the time period after the Six Day War, when the Arabic speaking countries found out that they do not have the power to destroy Israel via regular military means and terrorist guerilla organizations. They then came up with the brilliant idea of transferring the battlegrounds from the military sphere to the field of the media. Since in the battlegrounds of the media, the strong side is necessary the evil side and the weak side is necessary the good one – it was essential to perform a **reversal of images**. Israel, which was perceived until then as just, for being little David facing the Arab Goliath – had suddenly become giant Goliath taking over the land and threatening the life of the Palestinian David. All of a sudden all acts of aggression are forgotten, along with the acts of terrorism and the threats Israel has been subjected to ever since its birth and even beforehand – and Israel was seemed as the aggressor, the conqueror, trying to use force in order to prevent the self-determination of the Palestinian people.

This reversal of images was also accompanied by a **reversal of cause and consequence**: not the Arabic speaking countries started an all-out war to annihilate Israel, but Israel is the one that started a spree of conquests in order to expand its borders from the River of Egypt to the Euphrates River, the borders of the biblical Promised Land. All of the trouble in the Middle-

East derives from the Israeli aggression and these problems would be solved if only a Palestinian State would be established alongside Israel – a state that will grant expression to the Palestinian national identity and the right of self-determination, which derives from it.

The invention of the Palestinian identity and the ethos of its struggle for its national liberation might just be the most brilliant media ploy one could ever come up with. In today's post-Colonial world there is no political narrative with greater appeal than the story of a struggle for national liberation. Israel, which until recently was regarded as a fine example of a national liberation movement, has suddenly become a conquest craving colonialist great power, which brutally plundered the land of the poor Palestinian people and exiled hundreds of thousands of Palestinians from their historical homeland and has brought Holocaust (known as "the Naqba"), upon these people by doing so which is no less of a tragedy than that of the Jewish people.

Just how new the Palestinian identity really was can be seen by the fact that the UN partition resolution from November of 1947 never mentioned the names "Palestinian Nation" or "Palestinians", but just the name "Arabs". Likewise this founding document never mentioned the name "Palestinian State", but just "Arab Country". Even UN resolution 242 from November of 1967, accepted 20 years after the partition decision, doesn't mention any concept such as "the Palestinian people" or "Palestinians". Likewise, in this important

decision there is no mention of any need to establish a “Palestinian State”. Furthermore: this decision explicitly affirms the necessity “*For guaranteeing the territorial inviolability and political independence of every State in the area*”. Meaning, there is no legal justification whatsoever for the establishment of an additional state in the area, a thing which might endanger the territorial wholeness of the existent countries, including the territorial wholeness of the State of Israel. The Arabic speaking residents of the land of Israel were called “Arabs” and nothing else.

The media strategy developed by Israel’s enemies could be the most successful marketing plan ever conceived since the invention of the modern means of media. The Palestinian identity was crafted by them in the image of the Israeli nationality in order to create false symmetry, to get the world public opinion to agree with the feigned formula of “two states for two nations”. The Palestinian nationality was invented as a kind of antithesis of political Zionism. The Palestinian identity was formulated in order to create similarity to the ancient Israeli identity, rooted in the land’s ancient peoples – the Canaanites and the Philistines. The anti-Zionistic ethos of the Palestinian Liberation Front was devised in order to counter-balance the Jewish people’s vision of political liberation. The claim of return of the Palestinian refugees was invented in order to counter-balance the Hebrew nation’s vision of returning to its historical homeland. They’ve even reclaimed the Jewish Holocaust for

themselves, by inventing a Holocaust of their own – known as the “Naqba” of 1948.

The Palestinian identity is a stolen identity, a rude and phony imitation of the Israeli identity. The Palestinian nationality is sort of like the photograph negative of the Israeli nationality. Whatever is positive about the Israeli nationality is negative with the Palestinian nationality. While Zionism was created in order to grant political expression to the national and the universal vision of redemption of the Israeli people, the Palestinian identity was created for no other reason than in order to annihilate Israel. Its goal is not to build a nation of its own but to destroy the Israeli nation. Furthermore: this false identity did not grow from within, among the country’s local inhabitants, but among the neighboring Arabic speaking countries around Israel and among the terror organizations which have located themselves there since 1948.

This strategy was called by its designers by the name “**the Phased Plan**”. According to this plan, the separate Palestinian identity was supposed to serve as a Trojan horse that would penetrate the territories of the Western Land of Israel in cunning ways in order to establish a Palestinian State in temporary borders within territories that Israel would hand over to them and afterwards, when they gain enough political and military strength, they would annex the rest of the country.

In the test of the result this strategy has managed to achieve a significant share of its goals, while the entire

world has adopted this false symmetry, which eventually led to the feigned formula of “two states for two nations”. Something of no less importance is that the justice has changed its course: Israel is no longer the just side in the dispute over the Land of Israel but the “Palestinians”. The stronger their position gets, the weaker Israel’s position becomes, in accordance. The murky tsunami of anti-Semitism and anti-Israeli sentiments which is flooding the world nowadays is nothing more than the logical conclusion of this line of thought.

Chapter C: the Palestinian Identity is Tactical and False

The use of double meaning, so popular in the propaganda of Israel's enemies is what makes the knowledge of their real position so difficult. They can say one thing and it's contrary in the same breath, all in accordance with their target audience. They speak English towards the outside and Arabic towards the inside. They converse in two languages, not only as far as the technical aspect, but also in all that concerns the meaning of values. While they always lie in English, while they usually tell the truth in Arabic (knowing that this language is not understood in the West). This is the general rule, but there are also exceptions. So, for example, on an interview to a Dutch newspaper, **Zuheir Mohsen**, the head of the "al-Sa'iqa" faction and a member of the PLO's active committee:

The Palestinian people do not exist... Only for political and tactical reasons do we speak today about the existence of a Palestinian people, since Arab national interests demand that we posit the existence of a distinct "Palestinian people" to oppose Zionism...The creation of a Palestinian state is only a means for continuing our struggle against the state of Israel for our Arab unity.⁹

Just how false and tactical the Palestinian identity might be we can learn not only from the bond between the

Palestinian identity and the all-Arab identity, but also from the correlation between it and the Jordanian identity. As long as they rested in the shade of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan, they had no need for a Palestinian identity, which was of no meaning whatsoever to them. Only when they found out that the Jordanian identity serves as a barrier, blocking their claims concerning the territories of the western Land of Israel, they began emphasizing their Palestinian identity, as one that is separate from that of the Jordanian identity, as **Zuheir Mohsen** admitted so frankly:

In reality today there is no difference between Jordanians, Palestinians, Syrians and Lebanese ...For tactical reasons, Jordan, which is a sovereign state with defined borders, cannot raise claims concerning Haifa and Jaffa, while as a Palestinian, I can undoubtedly demand Haifa, Jaffa, Beer Sheva and Jerusalem. However, the moment we reclaim our right to all of Palestine, we will not wait even a minute to unite Palestine and Jordan.¹⁰

Take notice: according to their self-definition the Palestinians and the Jordanians are one nation, or more precisely, one peoplehood that is itself part of a greater nation – **the Arab Umma** (the whole Arab world). Nevertheless, since the Jordanian people already got a state; and since a sovereign country is not entitled to claim additional territories beyond its recognized borders; therefore a separate territorial identity must be

presented, one which is yet to be politically recognized and which has the right to make territorial claims of its own.

And what is the territory claimed by the Palestinians? Not only do they claim the territories captured during the Six Day War and not only the territories of the Land of Israel that were designated for the Arabs according to the United Nations Partition Plan from 1947, but the entire area of the western Land of Israel, meaning the destruction of the State of Israel.

The disdain which is commonplace in Israel concerning its enemies' sayings directed towards inward is one of its main failures. Since the value of the things said inward is undoubtedly more important and higher than the value of things said to the outside. Furthermore: in order to grasp the true nature of their position it is not enough just to trace the things that they say, but one must penetrate the deeper levels of their culture, which is completely different from the western culture.

Internally, the Palestinian identity is always fiction, a linguistic invention directed at the annihilation of Israel – while towards the outside it is always an authentic identity, one that reflects distress, exploitation, oppression and so on. Internally, the goal is the unification of the Arab and/or Islamic nation – while towards the outside the goal is the national liberation of the Palestinian people. Internally, the aspiration is to take over the entire world, while towards the outside - to live in peace with it.

Chapter D: the Oslo Accords – a Trojan Horse for Israel

Thus the Palestinian identity is only tactical and temporary, as Israel's enemies admit during those rare incidents of frankness. In the name of this false identity, which began materializing in Palestinian National Covenant (Charter) and which received Israeli acknowledgement through the Oslo Accords, Israel's enemies are nowadays running a propaganda campaign that combines mental with physical terror in order to become a state in the core territories of the Land of Israel, in the Mountain country, the fatherland country.

On the eve of the signing of the Oslo Accords and even afterwards the leaders of the Tunis gang repeatedly stressed the fact that they aspire not just for Israel's withdrawal to the borders of the Green Line, but for the taking over of the territories of all of the western land of Israel. They compared the Oslo Accords to the **Treaty of Al-Hudaybiyya** ¹¹, signed by the Prophet Muhammad with the Quraysh tribe of Mecca in 628 CE. For two years, as long as Muhammad felt he is weak, the treaty was in effect, and then it was breached, while he felt he is ready. While Muhammad had 1,400 followers when he signed the treaty in Al-Hudaybiyya, he had well over 10,000 for his conquest of Mecca two years later.

So, for instance during a closed meeting with Muslim leaders in South Africa on May 10th, 1994 Yasser Arafat claimed that the Oslo Accords are like the Treaty of

Hudaibiyya and three weeks later he repeated the very same analogy, only this time in public, by telling a group of Palestinian contractors that came to visit him in Tunis:

What we got was not all of what we wanted to get, but the best we could get during the worst time. The Prophet Muhammad reached a similar agreement with the heretics in Al-Hudaibiyya and the treaty was torn into shreds two years later.¹²

The analogy of the Treaty of Hudaibiyya with the Oslo Accords has become an embedded trademark of Arafat's public rhetoric during the nineties of the previous century. In a speech addressing the Palestinian Legislative Assembly on May 15th, 2002, in the midst of his terror campaign against Israel, Arafat reminded his listeners that even the Treaty of Hudaibiyya was an instrument, a means of suspension in the war against the Jewish infidels until the tables are turned, as far as the balance of power.

While Arafat was posing as a pacifist aspiring to establish "peace of the braves" before Israel and the Western world, in front of his own interior Arab-Muslim people he has always said the opposite of this. During many opportunities Arafat explained to his audience, that the line of peace agreements that he had signed with Israel, ever since September of 1993, is nothing more than strategic fraud, aimed at the eventual annihilation of the state of Israel. Arafat usually used a selection of sayings, proverbs and images, secular and religious

altogether, which were crystal clear to the Arabic speaking nations and the Muslims but totally vague for western ears.

Israel's enemies did not give up their "Phased Plan" ever since they've declared it on 1974 until this very day. The Oslo Accords are perceived as another stage in this plan, as we can learn from a list of expressions provided by Arafat and the other members of the Tunis gang, in proximity to the signing of the accords and even afterwards. On the month of September 1993, when the Oslo Accords were signed, Arafat mentioned "the Phased Plan" more than a dozen times in his media appearances all over the Arab world. Especially eminent is his personal announcement to the Palestinian people, which was broadcasted in Arabic on Jordanian television during the signing ceremony as they signed the Declaration of Principles on Interim Self-Government Arrangements on the front lawn of The White House:

My dear brothers, do not forget that our national Palestinian Council has accepted its decision in 1974. This decision called for the establishment of a national entity on any part of the land of Palestine that would be liberated or which the Israelis would withdraw from. This [agreement] is the result of your struggle, of your victims and of your Jihad. This is the moment of return, the moment of achieving a foothold upon liberated Palestinian land. Long live an Arab and liberated Palestine. ¹³

Arafat reached the peak of his hypocrisy on January 30th, 1966, while he had a closed meeting with about forty Arab diplomats at the “Grand Hotel” in Stockholm. The leader of the PLO used this opportunity in order to specify his “peace” vision with brutal clarity as he said:

*We of the PLO will now concentrate all our efforts on splitting Israel psychologically into two camps. Within five years, we will have six to seven million Arabs living on the West Bank and in Jerusalem. All Palestinian Arabs will be welcomed by us.... You understand that we plan to eliminate the State of Israel and establish a purely Palestinian State. We will make life unbearable for Jews by psychological warfare and population explosion; Jews won't want to live among us Arabs.*¹⁴

Referring to the Oslo Accords as an act of deception, intended to lead to the destruction of the state of Israel was not only the property of Arafat but of the entire Tunis gang. In his book, *The Historic Danger and Borders of the National Identity*, published only months after the signing of the Declaration of Principles, **Sakhr Habash**, a Fatah Central Committee Member, and the head of the organization’s ideological department describes the PLO’s decision to join the Oslo process as vested in the PLO’s “Phased Plan”, adopted at the 12th Session of the Palestinian National Council.

Establishing himself on clause 10 of the plan, permitting the revolution's leadership to "determine the tactics allowing the realization of the objectives" the PLO decided to take advantage of the increasing tendency in Israel to sober-up from the dream of Greater Israel in order to gain a foothold on Palestinian soil on the road to its full liberation. The interim agreement was the first stage in this strategy, leading to full Palestinian control over the West Bank and the Gaza Strip. After the completion of this stage the Palestinians were supposed to continue their way until the "final solution" is achieved, meaning the establishment of a Palestinian state over all the area of Palestine and the return of the 1948 refugees to their homes.

Another important PLO ideologist, ***Othman Abu Garbia***, also serves as the head of the Political Guidance Apparatus of the Palestinian Authority and as the editor of its Kuwaiti daily ***Al-Rai***, presented a similar "peace" vision on November of 1999:

Every Palestinian must realize that the independent Palestinian state with Jerusalem as its capital is not the end of the process but only an interim stage on the road to a democratic state in all of the territory of Palestine. All of this shall be accompanied by a third stage, meaning – the complete merger of Palestine into the Arab and the Muslim expanse on a cultural, national, historical and geographic aspect, this is the meaning of a permanent agreement.¹⁵

Even those mistakenly considered “moderate”, such as **Faisal Abdel Qader Al-Husseini**, Palestinian Authority Minister for Jerusalem Affairs, **Ahmed Ali Mohammed Qurei** (or **Qureia**), also known as **Abu Alaa**, a former prime minister of the Palestinian Authority and others, did not hide their opinion that “the peace process” was nothing more than an act of deception, aimed at realizing “the Stages Plan” in order to destroy Israel and to establish Palestine upon its ruins. So, for example, In an appearance on Syrian television on the English language interview program "Focus" at 9:30 PM on Monday September 9th, 1996, Faisal Al- Husseini, who held the Jerusalem portfolio for the Palestinian Authority, was asked what the boundaries of Palestine are.

*All of the Palestinians agree that the just borders of Palestine are the Jordan River and the Mediterranean Sea. Realistically, we must accept whatever we can possibly obtain now [hoping that] the events which shall take place in the future, maybe during the next fifteen or twenty years, will give us the chance to achieve the just borders of Palestine.*¹⁶

Al-Husseini remained committed to this “peace” vision until his last days. For instance, this is how he expressed himself in a speech in Beirut on April 2001:

... there is a difference between the strategic goal of the Palestinian people, which is not willing to

*give up even one grain of Palestinian soil, and the political [tactical] effort that has to do with the [present] balance of power and with the nature of the present international system. The latter is a different effort than the former. We may lose or win [tactically] but our eyes will continue to aspire to the strategic goal, namely, to Palestine from the river to the sea. Whatever we get now cannot make us forget this supreme truth.*¹⁷

On June of 2001, shortly before his death from a heart attack, Husseini clearly stated in his last interview to the Egyptian (Nasserite) daily, 'Al-Arabi':

*When we are asking all the Palestinian forces and factions to look at the Oslo Accords and at other agreements as “temporary” procedures, or phased goals, this means that we are ambushing the Israelis and cheating them... We agree to declare our state over what is now only 22% of Palestine, meaning the West Bank and Gaza – our ultimate goal is [still] the liberation of all historical Palestine from the [Jordan] River to the [Mediterranean] Sea, even if this means that the conflict will last for another thousand years or for many generations.*¹⁸

Husseini even added and explained, that if only the Israelis and the Americans would understand that the Oslo Accords were just a “**Trojan Horse**”, intended to promote the achievement of the final goal of liberating all of Palestine, then “*they wouldn’t open their fortified gates and let us inside their walls.*” Since the Israelis have been deceived and mistakenly got themselves entangled in this stupid strategic mistake, the Palestinians are bound to win, just like the ancient Greeks:

...the people of Troy... rejoiced and were merry at the thought that the Greek soldiers have been defeated and while they were retreating they left war loot in the form of a harmless wooden horse. Therefore they opened their gates up and let the wooden horse in. We all know what happened later. ¹⁹

Other Palestinian leaders have expressed themselves with the same level of frankness. On July 1994 **Yasser Abd-Rabbo (Abu Bashar)** , the Minister of Culture, Art and Propaganda in the Palestinian Authority was quoted declaring that the Palestinians will get “all of Palestine” back into their hands. **Sheikh Hamed Al-Beitawi**, who was appointed as a preacher at the al-Aqsa mosque, on behalf of the Palestinian Authority, said to a crowd of thousands on February 1996 that “Our religion shall liberate all of Palestine from the ocean to the Jordan River.” ²⁰ On that very same month, during Arafat’s taking oath ceremony as the head of the Palestinian

Authority, **Salim al-Zaanoun** is speaker and the active chairman of the Palestinian National Council, of the PLO, declared that “Today we are witnessing the victory of **Salāḥ ad-Dīn** for our Arab and Islamic nation”.²¹

Abu-Alaa, one of the architects of the Oslo Accords, claimed on June 1996 that:

*We didn't sign a peace agreement with Israel but interim agreements that were forced upon us. When we accepted the Oslo Accords, we received territories, but not all of the Palestinian lands. We've achieved rights, but not our full rights. We did not and will not give up a single grain of this land or the right of every Palestinian to live on it with dignity.*²²

Chapter E: Two Scenarios of Extermination

If they hadn't launched a murderous campaign the very next day after signing the Oslo Accords, the Palestinian state would have already fallen into their hands, as easily as taking candy from a baby. But the rivers of bloods that flowed from then until now have slowed down the pace of the events and have made people rethink things, as far as the final objectives of this identity. Now that the country has quieted down a bit, the demand to establish a Palestinian state emerges with further conviction and Israel falls into the honey trap they've set it up with, as if there are no other alternatives to solve "the Palestinian problem".

Even after the failed attempt at evacuating the Gaza Strip, while the peace promises were converted into Scuds and Qassam missiles, people in Israel continue to speak of the urgent need to establish a Palestinian state. Israel's obsession of reaching peace with its neighbors at nearly any cost blinds its eyes from seeing and leads it towards national suicide. Israel is not behaving like a sane state, acting in order to protect its vital interests, but as an insane state, willing to sacrifice all of its assets, just as long as peace is achieved. The Oslo Accords are maybe the best example to prove the thesis asserted by Barbara Tuchman ²³ in "*the March of Folly*" – about politicians and generals choosing to use a strategy which does not serve their own people, but the people of the enemy.

Ever since the signing of the Oslo Accords the circumstances may have changed, but this is in a great deal against Israel, rather than in its benefit. The danger of establishing a Palestinian state is becoming even harsher than in the past. The Islamic radicalization together with the modern weapons, which Israel's enemies are stocking up with are turning this state into a real existential threat. As a result of the strengthening of the Pan-Islamic identity on the expense of the Pan-Arab identity, this state could (just like Lebanon and the Palestinian Authority in the Gaza Strip) fall into the hands of the Pan-Islamic imperialism under Iran's leadership and serve as a spearhead in the struggle against Israel. The Islamic imperialism is gaining momentum nowadays and threatening to overtake the entire Middle-East – and by this to cause a series of earthquakes at a scale we can't even imagine.

According to the Domino Theory, a victory of Islam in the area could threaten not only Israel, but all of the rest of the countries in the Middle-East as well, which could fall into its hands one after the other. Once this happens, heaven forbid, the siege ring around Israel will be tightened by a coalition of Pan-Islamic countries that will recruit all of their power in order to solve the Jewish problem, and this time in a truly final manner.

After the victory of the Hamas in Gaza, only in Israel and in the West do they continue to stick to the option of “two states for two nations”, while the Hamas leaders rejects this possibility on the threshold. The minimum

that they are willing to consider is a united Islamic state from the sea to the Jordan River. The maximum they dream of is an all regional Islamic empire and maybe even a world-encompassing one. Any concession, even a partial one, over the control of a certain part of the land will only reinforce the spirit of Islam, as we've seen after the withdrawal from southern Lebanon and afterwards from the Gaza Strip.

Nowadays two scenarios of extinction threaten Israel, which following the successful propaganda campaign of its enemies has become the most heinous country in the world:

(a) The violent destruction scenario;

(b) The demographic extinction of identity.

The first destruction scenario is clear and apparent and was pinpointed in the past by many Israeli leaders such as Peres, Rabin and Sharon (before they've changed their minds): a Palestinian mountain-state will physically control the Israeli plateau state; all of Israel's cities would then be in its range of fire, most of Israel's water resources would be under its control and even the altitude of the air. A Palestinian mountain-state would provide a world center for Islamic terrorism, which would make the life in the Jewish state unbearable. The minute Israel loses its power of deterrence its enemies shall declare war upon it, with the Palestinian Army serving as a spearhead in this war, to be joined by Arab forces outside and even inside of the Green Line. The end of Israel would then be applied by using a combined tongs movement.

The second scenario of extermination – demographic-identity-wise – is much less obvious and thus hardly gets any attention. The demographic weapon is based on the democratic concept, according to which the majority determines the state’s political identity. Immediately after its establishment, Palestine will annex the rest of the country in the borders of the Green Line and which have an Arabic speaking majority – the Galilee, the Triangle area and the Negev – and it will do so by conducting referendums in the format conducted by Nazi Germany, an act that would cause a cutoff of territorial continuance of the Jewish settlement. In order to complete the mission, Palestine shall call masses of “refugees” to flood the Jewish population centers in the coastal plain. According to this scenario, Israel’s end – Heaven forbid - will come without even firing a single shot.

By the actual establishment of a Palestinian state in the heart of the Land of Israel, we may therefore create a Palestinian nation – **something out of nothing**. Just so it can later turn the Israel nation **into ashes and dust**. If it wishes to survive, Israel must present an alternative to the Palestinian state and to the false formula – “two states for two nations”. As long as Israel rules the de-facto over all of the western land of Israel, it has the power to cope with these dangers. But if, heaven forbid, a Palestinian state is to be established it would no longer possible to stop these disastrous procedures. It would then be only a question of time until Israel collapses from the burden of pressures from within and from the outside.

Chapter F: the Propaganda of Deception

The political move aimed at eventually establishing a Palestinian State in the heart of the Land of Israel, must be stopped immediately. For the reason, that establishing such a state would be giving a prize to terrorism and permission to the “Palestine” fabrication. This state will not lead to peace of “two states for two nations” but to a blood-soaked war. This state can mean only one single thing: a death sentence, under prolonged agony or in one single blow, for the State of Israel.

While preparation are being made in Israel for the establishment of a Palestinian State and the rest of the core subjects are being presented on the public daily agenda (borders, Jerusalem, refugees and so on) – we must resort to reminding ourselves of the truth, otherwise we shall fall into the trap that our enemies are trying to set up for us: the Palestinian identity is a fictive and a tactical identity, which was intended to serve as an instrument in the all-Arab-Muslim struggle against Israel. The purpose of the Palestinian State is not to liberate the Palestinian people but to serve as the spearhead in this struggle.

The first step which must be applied before Israel gets on the railway tracks leading to “Auschwitz borders” is not the presentation of a political plan, but the establishment of a media strategy, that would give an appropriate answer to the web of lies distributed by the Arab-Muslim propaganda against the Jewish state. Peace in Israel

should be established upon solid foundations of security, of justice, and above all – of truth. Nevertheless, the truth is not only the first victim of the Arab-Muslim propaganda against Israel, but of most media instruments in Israel and in the West, which have adopted this false propaganda. Using a great deal of talent, Israel's enemies have managed to disperse a collection of lies, which due to the absence of a proper Israeli response, have been engraved into our collective awareness, as if this was the absolute truth.

The first in this list of lies is **the Palestine fib** – the fictive ancient national-territorial Palestinian identity, entitled to break free from the burden of Israeli Colonialism and to establish an independent state in the heart of Israel, which is not perceived as “the land of Israel” but as “the land of Philistia” (“Palestine”). This lie leads to the false formula of “two states for two nations” as well as to the presentation of Israel as a racist, conquering and war warmer country.

The second in this list of lies is **The Jerusalem lie**, according to which ever since the days of Muhammad, Jerusalem has become the capital of Palestine and the center of the Muslim world – thus the justifications to their claims concerning this city.

The third lie is **the Genetic fabrication**, according to which the genetic origin of the Palestinians is in the peoples that dwelled here before the people of Israel – the Canaanites and the Philistines (and according to another version: the Arabs) – therefore their right over the land overpowers that of the people of Israel.

The fourth is the list of lies is **the refugees' scam**, according to which the people of Israel have forcibly dispossessed masses of Palestinians from their homeland, which they've since always lived in. This bluff gave birth to their "in exile" narrative and to their "Naqba" plot, from which the demand for the right of return was derived.

The fifth falsity is their **peace lie**, according to which if Israel only withdraws to the borders of the Green Line, then there shall be peace in the Land of Israel and in all of the Middle-East ("land for peace").

These fibs are supplemented by false descriptions of the horrible atrocities and acts of massacre carried out by Israel against the Palestinian people, the most deprived and oppressed nation in the world, since its establishment until this very day. This is where the lie came from, according to which the main problem is "the Palestinian problem" and if this is only solved then the aspired peace shall reign.

As long as the dispute over the Land of Israel is presented in such a light, there's no escape from the conclusions that the only political solution is dividing the country and establishing "two states for two nations". Yet, this acceptable description is a complete lie which makes the proposed solution a mendacious one as well. The historical truth is completely different and thus the solution must also be different. The historical truth is the reversal of these lies and the truth must be exposed and seen by the whole world.

The truth is that Israel's historical identity was and still is solely Israeli, to go along with the name: **“The Land of Israel”** in the meaning of **“the country of Israel”** and that's it.

The truth is that Jerusalem received its special status in the past only under Israeli sovereignty and that it returned to this status only after the modern state of Israel was established.

The truth is that there never was any “Palestinian people” and the genetic roots of Israel's Arab-speaking residents come from the ancient people of Israel, rather than from the Canaanites and/or the Philistines and/or the Arabs.

The truth is that the people of Israel have returned to their historical homeland, redeemed it from its desolation (one caused by the Arab-Muslim occupation) have made it blossom and become one of the most advanced countries in today's modern world.

The truth is that the people of Israel did not conquer any territory in the Land of Israel, because a nation cannot be a conqueror in its own country.

The truth is that the establishment of the State of Israel has improved absolutely the living conditions of the country's Arabic speaking inhabitants and that their condition is immensely better than the condition of the rest of the Arabic speaking nations in the area.

The truth is that the problem of the refugees is an imaginary problem, as most 1948 immigrants are not at all “refugees” but “returning residents” in their countries of origin. Most of them well-integrated into these

countries and if a deprived minority still remains among them, this is the fault of the hosting countries, which regard them as instruments of war in the struggle against Israel, rather than as human beings entitled to live in welfare and with respect.

The truth is that Israel does not yearn for conquests and wars, yet desires for peace in its whole being, while its enemies do not want peace with it at all, but only wish to destroy it – physically, politically and identity-wise.

The truth is that in the Middle-Eastern conflict Israel was and remains David, while the Arab-Muslim world was and still is Goliath, threatening to destroy it.

Therefore, the real problem is not “the Palestinian problem” but “the Jewish problem”: the desire of the People of Israel to renew their days of past in their historical homeland, to find themselves a little place under the sun in a hostile environment, refusing to let it blend within it.

The presentation of the full historical truth is specified in my previous books; here I shall only assess things briefly.

Chapter G: the Fabrication of Palestine

The first lie is **the fabrication of Palestine** – the fictitious ancient national-territorial Palestinian identity, entitled to liberate itself from the burden of Israeli Colonialism and to establish an independent state in the heart of the land, which is not “the Land of Israel” but “the Land of Philistia” (“Palestine”)²⁴.

The name of the country is crucial in the battle of rights over it. The name determines the identity. The country’s name determines its identity. The identity of the country determines the right over it – thus its importance. If the name is “the Land of Israel”, known in Hebrew as **Eretz Yisrael** (Israeli identity) then the right belongs to the People of Israel. If the name is “the Land of Philistia” (Palestinian identity) then this right belongs to the Palestinians. The decision on this battle of identities is not in the hands of the international court, but in the hands of the court of history, thus the importance of history for the purpose of deciding on the question of the identity and the right altogether.

The historical truth is that the country acquired its national identity only during the time when the Israeli sovereignty was established in it, while during other times it was nothing more than a dark corner, lacking identity, in the fringes of the great empires that ruled upon it. "The Land of Israel" was and remained “the Land of the Israelites” even during their time of its exile away from it, when it would not attain an alternative

national identity. The country was the heart of the world as long as it carried the name “Israel” and during other times it lost its name and became a remote corner.

Israel was named “Philistia” (“Palestine”) by no other than its greatest enemy during the ancient times – the Roman Emperor **Publius Aelius Hadrianus**, emperor of the Roman world (117-138)²⁵ who converted its name from “Judea” into “Palestine” and the name of its capital from “Jerusalem” to “Aelia Capitolina”. The name “Palestine” which was designated in order to eradicate the name “Israel” from the face of the earth, did not stick to it during that time or afterwards. During the Arab-Muslim period the country did not have a name of its own, because it was not perceived as an independent political unit, but was dissected into administrative districts. This name, used today by the Arabic-speaking community in Israel, is impossible to pronounce in the Arabic language due to the fact that the letter “P” does not exist in the Arabic language.

When the Roman emperor changed the name of the country from “Judea” to “Palestine” he was well-aware of what he was doing. He knew that when you change the name of a country you also change its identity and even that of the people living on it. He knew that the most efficient way of erasing the memory of Judea from the maps of the world would be to erase its name and to call it by the name of its enemy. He knew that sovereignty could be reestablished, but it would be harder to revive a name that was already erased from the world

consciousness. This name for Israel was not widely accepted at the time, yet it was revived during the 20th century and now we can well sense the devastating results of his deeds.

As strange as this may sound, the Palestinian identity was conceived not in some Arab or Muslim document, but in the **Balfour Declaration**, which Haim Weizman defined as “*the Magna Carta of the Jewish Freedom*”. The seed of the Palestinian calamity was already vested in this declaration, a calamity that could put an end to the Israeli presence in the country.

This declaration, which was intended to institutionalize the bond between the People of Israel and Land of Israel, was articulated in such a way that when the time comes it might be assume from it that the country does not belong only to the people of Israel, but also to their greatest enemy from the biblical times– the Philistine people. In this declaration, the government of Her Majesty the Queen expressed “*sympathy with the Jewish-Zionist aspirations*” and determined that it “*His Majesty's government views with favour the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people*”.

Note: “**Palestine**” and not “**the Land of Judea**” or in “**the Land of Israel**”. From this moment and onwards the political arena was set for the birth of the false Palestinian identity even if this was not Lord Balfour's original intention.

The Mandate adopted the Balfour Declaration per se and it thus does not mention the biblical names of the land,

but just the name “Palestine”. Though the mandate script does confirm the historical connection between the people of Israel and their land and even its right over the country, in the document it was not called “the Land of Israel” but “the land of Philistia”. It is possible that the formulators of the Balfour Declaration and of the Mandate document were never even aware of the results of their acts, as they attributed no special importance to the name they used for the country. Might be, that they were never even aware of the Pagan identity of this name, the identity of Israel's greatest enemy during the times of old – the Philistine people. The road to the Palestinian hell was probably paved with the good intentions of Zionist Christians, true friends of the people of Israel. Yet, it is not their intention that counts, but the meanings and the interpretations that could be given to the documents formulated by them, when the right time comes.

By calling the land “Palestine”, the British gave modern validity to the ancient curse used for the country by Emperor Hadrianus, when he changed its name from “Judea” to “Palestine”. The Balfour Declaration did prepare the grounds for establishing a national home for the people of Israel in the Land of Israel, but at the same time also prepared the groundwork for the **Palestine fabrication**, as if the country is not just a home for the people of Israel, but to another so called nation, at least as ancient as them – the Palestinian nation, the modern heir of the ancient Philistine nation.

This erroneous phrasing was barely noticed by anyone at the time. Even the founding fathers of Zionism did not object to this name, as they thought that this was just a modern name for the territory of the land of Israel and they even translated this name into Hebrew in all of their official documents. Yet, there were a few people that did notice the significance of this wrong terminology, such as **Prof. John Hazam**, who said in his testimony before the Anglo-American committee in 1945 that:

*Before 1917, when Balfour made his declaration, there was never any Palestine question, not even any Palestine as a political or geographic entity.*²⁶

The country's historic Israeli identity is that which created the right of the people of Israel over it and not any other factor. Modern international law only reconfirmed the existence of this right, yet did not create it. By doing so it has become a clear legal right, rather than an abstract right. The international law system also defined the country's modern borders, applying them over both sides of the Jordan River. The definition of the area of the land of Israel under the British Mandate was carried out while the borders of the entire Middle-East were being drawn. These borders cannot therefore be touched without upsetting all of the territorial arrangements made in the Middle-East from then until today. The fact that the Eastern part of the country was given to strangers is an irreversible one, but this does not render this act legitimacy.

The people of Israel cannot possibly be conquerors in the land of Israel, because a nation cannot be considered a conqueror in its own country.

Indeed, the country has known many occupations and the cruelest one was the Arab-Muslim occupation, which completely erased its Israeli identity and has inflicted a calamity upon it, as far as demographics and settlement.

All the imperialistic peoples that during the history subjugated the land (Assyrians, Babylonians, Persians, Greeks, Romans, Arabs, Mamelukes and Turks) were rightly considered as conquerors, because they subjugated someone else's country – the Land of Israel. Contrary to all these imperialists, the people of Israel considered the country as their homeland, a place to shape their national and religious identity. Thus, upon their return to their ancient birthplace, after a long exile the people of Israel revived the land and made it flourishing again. As stated in the Declaration of Independence:

Jews strove in every successive generation to re-establish themselves in their ancient homeland ... They made deserts bloom, revived the Hebrew language, built villages and towns, and created a thriving community, controlling its own economy and culture, loving peace but knowing how to defend itself.²⁷

None of the area possessed nowadays by Israel can be considered occupied territory, but only as a territory

liberated from the true occupation – the Arab Muslim occupation.

Although the entire country is the land of the People of Israel, it has areas that are more sacred and less sacred. The mountain country – Judea, Samaria and the Galilee – is the truly sacred land and the land of the plateau is only second to it. The historical irony is that in reality the mountain country, the birthplace of the Israeli people, is perceived today as occupied land and the land of the plains, the plateau in which the enemies of Israel once resided, is perceived as liberated land. If we could only use a time machine to go back in time to the days of the Second Temple and ask someone like **Yosef ben-Matityahu** (AKA “Josephus Flavius”) where is his country, he would tell us: *“Our land does not lie on the coastline... our cities are built far away from the sea”* (Flavius Josephus, *“Against Apion”*, p. 22). Meaning, **the real land of Israel is the mountain land**, rather than the coastal plains.

When the Zionist movement was initiated the mountain land was already partially settled, so the Jews couldn’t settle there, but only in the coastal plains. The saying ***“A land without a people for a people without a land”*** was only half the truth or, more precisely, true just in reference to half of the country. The coastal plain was unsettled and the mountain land was settled, though pretty meagerly. Therefore, modern Zionism started mainly with the settlement of the coastal plain and only afterwards did the mountainous terrain follow.

In all of the seventy years that have gone by from 1880 until 1948, Zionism hit roots nearly exclusively in the land of the coastal plains. On the other hand, this tendency was reversed after 1948 and ever since then Israel has been settling the mountain land as well. At first, Israel only settled the land of the Galilee and after 1967 – also the land of Judea, Samaria and the Golan Heights. In every place where Jews took root, not only was a Jewish settlement established but the Israeli identity of the place was reclaimed. The new settlements are now reviving the biblical mountain land and are redeeming it from their long exile by doing so.

Chapter H: the Lie of Jerusalem

Jerusalem's Islamic identity is also a stolen one. Just as they've stolen the identity of the land from the People of Israel, their enemies have also stolen the identity of their capital. Stressing the importance of Jerusalem in modern Islamic rhetoric is merely a tool in the struggle against the revival of Israel in their country. The fact is that in the entire prolonged period of Islamic rule it attributed no importance whatsoever to this city. Only under Israeli sovereignty did Jerusalem gain its supreme importance as a capital city and as a holy city altogether, as written by **Joshua Praver**:

Ever since David, the King of Israel declared Jerusalem as a the King's Temple and as a Kingdom city, all of the nations... which have accepted the Bible as their holy scripture or as part of their spiritual heritage have chosen Jerusalem as their capital city. It was so during the days of the kingdoms of Israel and of Judea, it was so during the time of the Hasmoneans and of the Second Temple, during the days of the British Mandate as well as today's state of Israel. Not the Egyptians nor the Babylonians or the Persians or the Byzantines, Arabs or Turks, all of which ruled over Israel for certain periods of time along Jerusalem's four thousand years of history, have given it a place of honor.

Caesarea, Ramla, Gaza and Zefat were the main cities. Furthermore, Jerusalem had become a capital city only when the Land of Israel enjoyed the status of an independent country. During all times, when it was just a provincial place or a district of the Orient, Jerusalem was denied the honor of being a capital city.²⁸

Ever since becoming the “City of David”, Jerusalem had but one single identity – an Israeli identity. The Arab-Muslim identity of the city is a stolen identity, a fabricated identity, created more for political necessities than for religious needs. There was always a tight correlation between Jerusalem’s status and the status of the country. When Jerusalem’s status went up, so did the status of the country. When Jerusalem’s status was declining, so was the status of the country. Under the Arab-Muslim rule the Land of Israel nearly completely lost the unique status that it enjoyed under Israeli sovereignty. This status was even lower than its status under the Christian rule (during the Byzantine period and during the time of the Crusaders). Furthermore, the attitude of the Arab-Muslim regime towards the Land of Israel was established and determined according to the political circumstances and the changes of regime and was not influenced by ideological or by spiritual considerations. During the whole period when the country was ruled by the Muslims, Jerusalem’s status was only deteriorating – just like the whole country was. In a historical comparison, the way the Muslim nations

treated Jerusalem was even worse than the way the Christian nations treated it. While the city would blossom under periods of Israeli sovereignty and to some extent even during the Christian eras – during the Muslim period the city had become a ghost town, lost its status as a capital city and became a distant provincial town.

The places holy for the Islam were far way from Jerusalem – in the Arabian Peninsula. Jerusalem, which was considered the heart of Israel (and to some extent of Christianity as well) was conceived by Islam, even during latter generations, as never more than a secondary city in reference to the status of Mecca and Medina. In the past, just like today, the tactical and political considerations were the main points among the forces of Islam – undermining Israel's position in the city and erasing its Jewish identity – rather than the religious-spiritual considerations.

The stealing of the Israeli identity for political purposes by the Islam was carried out in several manners, such as: the revising of traditions pertaining to the figures mentioned in the Qur'an, which are mostly biblical figures; the interpretation of certain verses in the Qur'an in a manner which would allow them to be identified with places in the Land of Israel, especially with Jerusalem; the Islamization of Israeli traditions which concern Jerusalem and the Land of Israel, especially of traditions which concern Judgment Day and the advantages of residing in Jerusalem and in the Land of Israel.

Chapter I: the Genetic Fabrication

As the People of Israel returned to their land, they did not enslave the native residents, on the contrary: they began liberating them from the burden of the Arab-Muslim occupation. This cruel occupation was not only a military-political conquest as the previous ones were, but a cultural occupation as well, which has changed their identities to the core. This occupation has succeeded in making them forget not only their original heritage but their genetic origins as well. This cultural conquest continues to design their identity and awareness even today, many years after this political occupation has ceased to exist. This is why it is so hard for them to liberate themselves from it. Therefore they are still under the wrong impression that they belong to “the great Arab nation” – a clearly imperialistic and anti-nationalistic concept.

In order to prove their right over the land they claim that their genetic origin is from the peoples of the land that came before the Israelites – the Canaanites and the Philistines (and according to another version – the Arabs). This claim is a totally mendacious and contradicts the historical facts. Although it is hard to precisely trace the genetic changes which have occurred in the country, due to it being a land of passage, an arena for the movement of many peoples along a history of many years – we can pinpoint a most surprising general finding: the origin of most Arabic speakers in the country

is not from the Philistines (which they are named after), nor do they come from the Canaanites or from the Arabs (whom they most identify themselves with) – all of which have been enemies of Israel for generations over generations – but from the Israelites, from the people of Israel themselves.

Is that so? There's nothing stranger than saying that the Arabic speakers in Israel do not come from the seed of (Arab) Amalek, not even from the Philistines or the Canaanites – but in fact descendents of the people of Israel, their greatest enemy in modern times. Yet, anyone ever daring to touch this delicate subject had to reach this very conclusion, relying upon modern studies in the fields of history, demography, geography, linguistics, culture and lately even genetics. This surprising finding has been apparent and available to all for over a hundred years and even so, this finding is well-concealed, as if it was one of the country's best kept secrets. The conclusion that the origins of most Arabic speakers in the country derive from the Israelites was reached by several Zionist philosophers in the past, the most eminent ones being **David Ben-Gurion** and **Yitzhak Ben-Zvi**. The first person to reach this conclusion was the founder of the Bilu movement, **Israel Belkind** who determined that:

Indeed, by looking at our history we can see that when we meet these “Arabs” residing in our country we're in fact meeting the descendents of the Israelites...Sitting in front of the history

*books, we acknowledge them as our brothers while they cannot acknowledge us as distant brothers and they treat us like foreigners... Our future relations with these people shall be determined on the count of these facts. It is clear that we can only have one type of relationship between us, the relations of brotherhood; not only brothers in a political sense, after the course of history has decreed upon us to live our mutual lives in the same country, but also blood brothers, members of one nation.*²⁹

Towards the end of the First World War a similar conclusion was also reached by Yitzhak Ben-Zvi and David Ben-Gurion, who wrote a book together, in the Yiddish language, under the title “*The Land of Israel in the Past and in the Present*”. Yitzhak Ben-Zvi was particularly fascinated by the subject, dedicated years of study and summarized this in his book “*The Populaces of Our Country*”. The importance that David Ben-Gurion attributed to this finding testifies of the fact that he did not only regard this as a theoretical question, but also as a practical solution from the problem of the Land of Israel. In a treatise written by David Ben-Gurion in 1917, he concluded the subject with the following words:

When we come to examine the origins and the source of livelihood of the Falahin (the Arab peasants) and look into their internal way of life

and review the ancient traditions maintained by them verbally to this very day – we can see that they barely have anything in common with the real Arabs, members of the Arab creed... most of the Muslim Falahin (“Arab” peasants) residing in the western part of the Land of Israel appear to be of a different racial type and comprise an entire ethnic department and therefore I have no doubt that they have a lot of Jewish blood in their veins – the blood of those Jewish peasants, “the People of the Land” who have chosen, during the hardest of times, to denounce their own religion, as long as they won’t be torn away from their land.³⁰

Chapter J: The Great Arab Refugee Scam

Israel's enemies not only stole their genetic and territorial identity from it, but even their historical narrative, vested in concepts such as "Exile" and "Holocaust". According to the Palestinian narrative, the Zionist enterprise has exiled hundreds of thousands of Palestinians from their homeland, which they've lived in for ever and ever and by doing so they've caused a Palestinian catastrophe ("the Naqba"), which is of no less magnitude than the Holocaust of Europe's Jewry.

Israel's enemies have turned the myth of exile and the ethos of "the right of return" into their central narrative. They tend to present the problem of the immigrants of 1948 as if this was a singular event, a cosmic Holocaust which has frequented their people, which is of no less intensity than actual physical destruction. The world of imagery which they use is one of clear mythological nature. Jaffa and Haifa are not cities surrounded by economic immigrants, who lived in density and poverty – but majestic places they long for, whose abandonment is comparable to the banishment of Adam and Eve from the lost Garden of Eden. Here, in Gaza and in Amman, the present is grey and hopeless, while there – in Haifa and in Jaffa – lies a brilliant future paved with gold. A dark exile here and there - a homeland flooded with light. The fact that Gaza and Amman are actually a part of that same country where Jaffa and Haifa are – a land that we call "the Land of Israel" and they call "Palestine" – does

not really bother them to create an irreconcilable gap between these cities.

As the result of intensive Arab propaganda, the fabrication concerning the immigrants of 1948 has been rooted so deeply into Israeli and western consciousness that nobody even doubts this anymore. Despite its vast importance, this issue has never been fundamentally explored by the scientific community and was never placed on the public agenda. The time has therefore come to refute this lie as well by presenting the historical facts as they are.

On the eve of the Zionist enterprise the mountain land was settled by the descendents of the Israelites, most of which have been forced to convert to the religion of Islam and to use the Arabic language – while the coastal plain was barren and desolate. Since the mountain land was settled, though not very crowded, only the coastal plain was available for massive settlement. The result of this was that the Zionist immigration focused mainly on the coastal plain and only few settled the mountain land.

Yet, from the first days of the Zionist movement until 1947, the coastal plain has witnessed not only the apparent immigration of the Jews, but also the latent immigration of Arabic-speaking immigrants from the neighboring countries. This latent immigration was in fact **parasitic immigration**, because it accompanied the Zionist immigration and was feeding off it. The Zionist immigration has created many work places, which attracted foreign workers from the neighboring countries.

While the apparent Zionist immigration was carried out through the ocean, the latent Arab immigration was carried out by land. Since the Ottoman Empire in fact had no borders, anyone living within the limits of this empire could move from place to place, in a nearly uncontrolled manner. This wave of latent immigration went on continuously, even during the time of the British Mandate when the country's inland borders remained open, almost unsupervised – all of this went on while quotas and limitations were imposed upon the apparent Zionist immigration, which minimized it in a great way.

These Arabic-speaking immigrants came to the coastal plains in order to earn their bread, for a short time only and without any kind of national affliction towards it. Therefore, as the first crisis broke out in the country, they left it and immigrated back to their countries of origin. The immigration from the coastal plains outwards was mostly voluntary, only some of it was under compulsion. Furthermore: most of the immigrants of 1948 remained within the borders of the British Mandate over the Land of Israel and only some of them immigrated to neighboring countries such as Lebanon and Syria. Moreover: most residents of the mountain land stayed in their place and only a few of them deserted their land.

The problem of the immigrants of 1948 is therefore not a real problem, but a deception created by Israel's enemies in order to use them as another instrument in their war against Israel. This deception was reflected not only by them inflating the number of immigrants tenfold, but also

by their actual presentation as “refugees”, by framing for them a false identity, in order to pressure Israel into absorbing them within the borders of the Green Line and even in an attempt to grant them extensive financial benefits on the expense of the nations of the world.

The presentation of the immigrants of 1948 as “refugees” is an act of forgery, because **Refugeeness** is an authentic identity only in those cases when people were forced to abandon their land, one which they’ve been living on for ages and which they regard as their homeland. Yet the immigrants of 1948 do not fall into this category due to the fact that most of them lack any kind of historical roots in the country. The country was not perceived by them as a homeland, but only as a hosting country, a land of passage and nothing more. For this reason, there is also no moral and legal foundation to their demand to return to the country after abandoning it, most of them voluntarily and few of them by force. In the best scenario most of them should be treated as residents returning to their countries, after a short stay in the Land of Israel as foreign workers, a stay with a different duration from case to case and which in many cases did not exceed a period of two years.

The identity of the immigrants of 1948 is thus a false and tactical one, a cynical instrument in the all-encompassing struggle against Israel, just like the rest of the tools of propaganda used by Israel’s enemies. As a rule, the fate of Zionism is described by the Arab propaganda as depending, for better and for worse, upon the

demographic factor. The homecoming ethos, as a decree imposed upon all of the Palestinian people in order to purify Palestine from the Israeli scum, was created for no reason other than leading to the annihilation of the state of Israel, while camouflaging this objective by using supposedly clean legal terminology.

It is hard to describe a worse distortion of any kind of humanistic concept, than to make an analogy between the Israeli people's right of return to their ancient homeland, after their sons have been exiled away from it to the four corners of the world – and the demand to return the immigrants of 1948 back to Jaffa and Haifa, cities which they've only temporarily stayed at and which they only went several kilometers away from. Even as far as the intention vested in this claim, this is a horrible kind of castration. While the Zionist claim is rooted in the spirit of Israel's prophets, whom regarded the gathering of Israel from Diaspora as the fulfillment of historical justice, the call to return the immigrants of 1948 to the territory of the state of Israel is intended to lead to the annihilation of this state, by flooding it with masses of people who are hostile to it.

We can see just how false and tactical the identity of the immigrants of 1948 is by studying those frank declarations (unlike the regular current propaganda of lies) which explicitly say that they are merely another instrument in the ongoing struggle for the obliteration of Israel. Although towards the outside the claim for the right of return is presented as a humanitarian act, towards

the inside (internally) the naked truth is presented as it is: receiving international legitimacy to perform a demographic hostile flood within Israel. The Internet site of the **Fatah** organization, which handles the issue of the Palestinian refugees, displays the following things: “***For us, the issue of the refugees is the trump card, which means – the end of Israel***”.³¹

As far as this aspect, the language used by the Palestinians today is no different from the language that has been used by the leaders of Arabic speaking countries for many years. Egypt’s legendary ruler at the time, **Gamal Abdel Nasser** declared, as early as on September of 1961, that ***If the refugees return to Israel, Israel will cease to exist.***³²

Chapter K: the Peace Lie

Among the variety of lies distributed by Israel's enemies in order to delegitimize it; one particularly heinous lie is presenting Israel as a war provoking country, hungry for conquests and aspiring to spread all over. This heinous lie attains various forms such as the claim that during the Six Day War Israel occupied territories of another nation and that this conquest is the main obstacle preventing peace. The solutions offered by Israel's enemies in order to achieve peace are also based on lies, such as the formula of "land for peace" or "peace in return for a Palestinian state" or "peace for returning the refugees" and so on.

These solutions are deceptive for two reasons: (a) according to today's modern peace concept, peace is a **definite legal right**, unconditioned by any reward and therefore **one shouldn't have to pay anything for peace**; (b) according to the Arab-Muslim peace concept, we shall be forced to pay an extortionate price for peace – complete surrender to the Islamic imperialism, aimed at dominating the entire world. Meaning, according to the concept of Islam, peace not only has a price, but the price is much heavier than the price which Israel is openly being asked to pay. The price is political and cultural surrender altogether: the loss of sovereignty and of national identity for the benefit of Islamic identity and sovereignty. Even if Israel positively responds to all of the demands currently addressed to it (territories, a

Palestinian state, Jerusalem, the return of the refugees and so on) - even then there won't be peace in the country. Only once Israel agrees to give up its national identity and its sovereignty - "peace" shall be achieved in the country. Thus, the agenda is not a real peace with Israel, but "peace" without Israel.

The peace, which until the establishment of the modern international law system was guaranteed by the balance of power between political territories and therefore was very fragile, has become a subject of legal duties and rights, just like the duties and rights imposed upon people as individuals. The modern international law system has given the nations of the world three constitutional rights: **(a) the right to live in peace and security; (b) the right of each and every country to maintain its' territorial wholeness; (c) the right for political independence.** By doing so, the international law has incriminated not only the war, but also the threat of using it for the purpose of achieving political purposes. From the moment peace has become a foundational right, the historical concept of "peace agreement" has also become illegitimate, as this basic right cannot be bargained for and agreed upon, but it is given without any kind of return to all nations of the world by the international law system. A state or even any political organization, that is less than a state, breaching the prohibition against using violence and/or threats of violence would be considered to be international criminal performing crimes which are considered "crime against peace" or "a crime against humanity".

In the Islam's political culture the terms "War" and "Peace" are perceived in a totally different manner than the one given to them by the modern international law system. The concept of the Muslim law is somewhat similar to a perception that was commonplace in the West until the 20th century. Much like "the just war" doctrine, which ruled over the Christian world in the past, "**the Jihad doctrine**" rules over today's Muslim world ("Mohammad's law of the sword – Islam is spread by force"). According to which the use of violence in order to compel Islam is not only legitimate, it even bears the meaning of a religious duty.

Islam does not acknowledge the modern concept of incriminating the war, but conditions of ceasefire or of a truce at the very best, which are always temporary and are derived by the balance of power between the Muslims and their enemies. When the Muslims do not have the upper hand, facing an enemy stronger than them, they may put down their weapons and agree to a "**Hudna**" – a concept which could be equated with a "truce" or a "cease-fire". When Muslims have an advantage in power, on the other hand, they may spare their defeated enemies by offering them "**Sulh**" which in Islam is a tool at the disposal of an Islamic commander to be offered to the enemy as a respite from military Jihad.³³

Muslim lawyers have remained bonded, to this very day, to the Caliph's universal and united concept of sovereignty and this is the reason they cannot adopt the principles of the modern international law system. The

question of the relations between the Muslim countries brings up heavy-weighted legal questions, which Islamic law has no answer to. On the other hand the relations with non-Muslim countries are not at all examined in the legal field, but only in the military field: even today these relations are perceived as a ceaseless war between the believers and the heretics (“Jihad”- the Holy War of Islam) which can only be stopped by short armistices (a “Hudna” or a “Sulh”).

Therefore, according to the concept of Islam, real peace cannot take place in this world, which is mostly a *dar al-harb* (house of war) is a term classically referring to those countries where the Muslim law is not in force, and which belongs to the “Nation of Heretics”, By contrast, *dar al-islam* (house of peace)³⁴ is the name for those territories where Islam does dominate, where submission to God is observed, and where peace and tranquility reign. True peace can only be achieved once the Islam will dominate the entire world, a mission that seems impossible in any foreseeable future, yet must not be forgotten.

According to the Islamic peace concept, the price of peace is the loss of national sovereignty for the benefit of Islamic imperialist sovereignty, simultaneously with the loss of national identity for the benefit of the Islamic identity. This peace, which could be named “prison peace” has taken place in the past all over the Islamic empires and more moderately also in other historical empires.

On the background of this concept we may realize just how deceiving the formula of “two states for two nations” really is, as a way of making peace in the Land of Israel and in the Middle-East. Not only that the Arab-Muslim side does not acknowledge the so-called Palestinians’ separate territorial identity, they don’t believe at all in the possibility of achieving peace. Therefore, it is obvious that peace with the state of Israel is impossible by the fact that it harms the core values of Islam. The war against Israel is perceived not only as normative, but also as a religious command (the holy war of Jihad) – even if it contradicts the commitments of the Arab-Muslim states according to the United Nations Charter. Thus it is also obvious that Israel’s enemies have no intention of attaining real peace with it, but only to achieve a temporary truce (“Hudna”) at the very best, as long as the balance of power is against them, while hoping to change the power relations to their benefit so they can then dictate their own terms of surrender.

On this background we can better understand the motivation for the animosity towards Israel. The hatred towards Israel derives not only from it being a country with a different culture, but also due to this demand to realize its territorial identity, an identity which is yet to be internalized by them and which they do not acknowledge as legitimate. For this reason they regard Zionism as the main enemy, not necessarily the Jews or the Israelis. Zionism is a movement based on territorial identity and as such it threatens their Muslim-Arab identity more than anything else.

In the perspective of the international criminal law system, as it was regulated by the United Nations Charter in the “Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide” as well as in other documents - the fact of the constant threat upon the existence of the State of Israel from its enemies is **a crime against peace and humanity altogether**. The State of Israel was legally established, from the power of the decisions made by the League of Nations in San Remo Convention ³⁵ and by the United Nations Assembly and on the foundations of the international law system ³⁶ and thus its right to exist without any correlation to the willingness of its enemies to acknowledge it. Israel was forced to fight for its existence and since on the day of its establishment and even afterwards, the United Nations did not have the ability to enforce the international law, mainly as a result of the cold war, which began to develop in close proximity to the time when the State of Israel was founded. From a legal point of view the use of violence by Israel's enemies, in order to annihilate it, is an explicit breach of the international law and even provides testimony as to its helplessness.

Zionism is, maybe, the only political movement in the 20th century that tried to establish its existence solely on the principles of the international law, rather than upon the use of violence. Israel's use of violence from its very establishment was just a legitimate protective war in light of the international law system's helplessness in enforcing peace and security upon the region. The Arabic speaking states, on the other hand, despite being

members of the United Nations, ignored then and even today continue to ignore the existence of the international law system, not only in their reference to the state of Israel, but also in their inter-Arab relations. The international law system and its institutions, though they provided the foundations for the establishment of these states, were never acknowledged by them, even though the Arab rhetoric tries to ambiguate this, by using its typical double-meaning.

In theory, these states (and even other Muslim states such as Iran) are subjected to the international law system - but de facto they're subjected to the Islamic law. The international law system is conceived as compelled by the western great nations, while the Muslim law is perceived as structured within their Muslim culture and thus its normative superiority.

The inability of the Arab-Muslim expanse to internalize the norms of the international law system derives first of all from their non-acknowledgement of the legitimacy of the territorial identities, whose inter-relations are regulated by this law system. As long as Israel's enemies do not regard themselves as subjected to the international law system, real peace in the region is impossible, just "peace of a balance of power", "Cold War" and nothing more. Israel must reject out of hand the demand to grant a return in exchange for peace and it doesn't even have to aspire for peace agreements, as these are no longer legal. Only once the international normative peace concept is internalized can a real peace be maintained in the area.

Chapter L: Transformation – a Return to the Israeli Identity

Any attempt to use the old ways is necessarily bound to fail, because it does not give an answer to the root problem of the Land of Israel, which is the refusal of Israel's enemies to allow it to return to its historical homeland and to establish its sovereignty within it. Therefore, we must look for alternatives to the old ways which have failed. The establishment of a Palestinian state will not solve the problem but will only make it worse. Any territory that Israel may withdraw from would become another lever in the struggle to annihilate Israel, as we've seen since the disengagement from the Gaza Strip. As long as the demographic logic rules, then Israel's withdrawal would not stop at the borders of the Green Line but may be at the borders of the UN's plan of division from 1947, which reflect today, as they did in the past, the real demographic division - them on the mountain land and us on the coastal plains, a narrow strip of land by the sea.

The demographic logic is thus a suicidal logic because it eventually leads to the loss of the State of Israel. The borders of the Green Line are not protectable borders, so much the more - the borders of the UN Partition Plan. The essence of the tragedy is that in order to ensure its identity, Israel must convene itself to borders which endanger its existence; in order to ensure its existence, Israel must take in a population which endangers its

identity. Therefore we are caught in a dilemma with a seemingly dead-end: **how can we guarantee our existence without losing our identity? How can we stand on our own without losing our soul?**

The most serious attempt to deal with this dilemma is the idea of **Transfer**. Contrary to what most people think, the Transfer idea was not conceived with the establishment of the “*Moledet*” (Homeland) party, but as early as during the thirties of the previous century, by the Jewish Agency, an idea which was even supported by the Royal British Legion. The Transfer is a logical alternative to the Partition Plan, because it can guarantee the Israeli identity of the state without endangering its existence. During that period of time this idea was performable, since at that time there were plenty of compelled population transfers taking place around the world. While in today's world, in the age of human rights, this possibility is inconceivable.

If the idea of partition is a suicidal idea; and if the transfer is inconceivable - which serious alternative are we left with? As long as we're thinking in physical terms just, our possibilities are limited to dividing the country or transfer and maybe even integrating them together. But if we deviate from these conventional patterns of thought, a third possibility shall be revealed before us, one which I call by the name “**Transformation**”.

Unlike the two commonplace alternatives, the transformation does not deal with geography or with the physical existence of the human beings, but with their

sprits and souls. Transformation, unlike transfer, means that you don't have to banish the country's Arabic-speaking residents, but only their **Arab-Palestinian identity**. Transformation means **a modern revolution of identity**, which is no more than a counter-revolution to that caused by the Arab-Muslim occupation in the country in the past.

A political breakthrough would be impossible unless it follows a breakthrough in terms of thinking. The failure of the acceptable alternatives is due to the fact that they're based upon the erroneous assumption that Arab-Palestinian identity of the country's non-Jewish residents is eternal and unchanging and being such it cannot be influenced. This assumption derives from historical ignorance and from neglecting the psychological aspect of politics.

As long as the Arab-Palestinian identity is perceived as eternal, the hatred of Israel, derived from this identity, is also perceived as eternal. The strategy developed by Israel until now was directed at handling a condition of constant hatred, which brings on never-ending aggression, which can be deterred, at the very best, but not defeated. On the other hand, the transformative concept, suggested here, claims that the hatred of Israel can be eradicated from the core, by performing a change of hearts – by turning the enemy into a friend. When this happens, which is not a simple thing at all, the really big bang will take place, a bang that after-which nothing will ever be the same again.

A collective identity is not a statistical figure, but a dynamic one. Procedures of identity change take place all of the time, even without us ever being aware of it. It has been so during the entire course of history, even more so during the new era, as the pace of historical procedures has been significantly accelerated. Transformation takes place all of the time and the only question is what type of identity shall triumph.

The identity crisis frequenting the nations of the Middle-East derives from the current race after identity, as a result of which the territorial identity is threatened by its rivals – the Pan-Arab identity and the Pan-Islamic identity. This identity race is maybe the most important of all of the factors motivating the Middle-Eastern politics, internal and international altogether.

This race for identity also accounts for the appearance of the political movements among the non-Jewish public in the Land of Israel. The Fatah organization represents Pan-Arab politics, while the Hamas represents Pan-Islamic politics. The parties in the Arabic-speaking sector within the borders of the Green Line also reflect a similar struggle of identities, when each one of them carries a different flag of identity. The real struggle today is not over territories but over identities, as **Aharon Amir** says:

The main point is that we've been withstanding this campaign for years and years, particularly since 1987, this is a battle over the souls of human beings. Indeed it is: not over territories or positions, not over lines and outlines, but over

*the human soul in the countries of the region, in the land of Israel and its frontiers and also over those of our internal camp.*³⁷

Until now, Israel never tried to liberate its Arabic-speaking residents from their Arab identity, because such a move would be perceived as damaging the foundations of liberal democracy. Despite this, aside from the activities it has taken, directly or indirectly, there was an influence on their identity.

Even today many young people among the country's Arabic-speaking population are willing to completely give up their Arab identity, in order to integrate into the Israeli society, which is reflected, among other things by switching their Arab names for Hebrew names. This is what Dr. **Assad Ghanem** head of government and political philosophy department at the University of Haifa's Department of Political, has to say about the implications of this tendency:

Many young Arab people feel that they cannot rely on their leadership and are willing to completely give up their Arab identity, in order to ensure their future. Intentionally changing one's name from an Arab name to an Israeli name testified more than anything of an attempt to get closer and of the willingness to compromise their identity. They believe that the more Israeli they become and the closer they get to the Jews, the more they would be able to become involved in the state life and ensure

*their welfare... The rift in the Arab-Israeli society is deepening between those wishing to integrate themselves into the Israeli society and those wishing to completely disengage themselves from it.*³⁸

The identity of the country's Arabic-speaking population is thus subjected to change and to influence. Using the transformation instrument as a political tool is therefore not something new. The innovation suggested here is upgrading this means and turning it into Israel's official policy. Another innovation is the presentation of the historical findings for the purpose of moral justification for using this instrument: the intention is not to force a new identity, but to retrieve the original identity to these residents, an identity that was lost once the country was conquered by the Arabs.

A true Israeli national identity may thus serve as an appropriate substitute for the Arab identity, being the original identity of the country's residents. The Arab identity was forced upon them by using all kinds of tricks and tactics, and as such it is a forced and false one. This is the historical truth, even if it may hurt many of them.

My claim is, to make things short, that a revolution of identity could take place in the country, one that would grant the country's Arabic-speaking populace an Israeli identity – an identity with which they could integrate into the new Israeli nation and its state. Israeli **unification** based upon the transformation is therefore the only policy that has a standing chance of settling the dispute

over the Land of Israel and maintaining peace in the country that could last for generations.

Today's main struggle is thus not a military or a political one, but a psychological one. The struggle is not only over controlling the territories, but also over the souls of the residents of those territories. Israel rules de-facto over all of the territory of the western land of Israel, but is increasingly loosing its grip due to its inability to preserve its historical identity. The historical irony is, as said, that the mountain land, the birthplace of the Israelite people is perceived as occupied land – while the coastal plains, in which Israel's enemies always resided, is perceived as liberated land. This historical irony could turn into a tragedy if we're not wise enough to keep the whole mountain land. For this purpose, we must develop a new national strategy, a strategy of **unification** by means of the instrument of **transformation**, whose principles I shall now explain.

Chapter M: Unification – The One State Plan

The Israeli unification plan based on the transformation is an Israeli Stages Plan, designated to provide a real counter-balance to the Phased Plan devised by Israel's enemies. The Israeli Stages Plan shall be based not on armed struggle, like the in PLO or the Hamas' Charters, but upon a spiritual struggle of identity, against the identities forced upon the country's residents during the course of the Arab-Muslim occupation. The battle over the country is a struggle over its identity and over that of its residents and this struggle must be conducted in **stages**, according to the various **target publics** and by using the right **instruments**.

The **target publics** can be divided in such a manner: the Arabic-speaking sector within the limits of the Green Line is the first target public of this campaign; the public in East-Jerusalem are the second target public; the public in Judea and Samaria are the third target public; while the public in the Gaza Strip are the last target public, if at all.

The struggle over the soul of Israel's Arabic-speaking residents should be conducted under the framework of the political rules of game of the parties and the media. This type of struggle goes on in the framework of a certain political culture, a culture which essentially differs between both sides of the Land of Israel. Within the borders of the Green Line there's a living and vibrant liberal-democratic society, while beyond them – is a society just making its first steps in this direction.

Two different strategies have been derived from this basic difference in order to apply the identity revolution suggested here. One strategy suits the society within the limits of the Green Line and the other goes along with the society beyond the border of the Green Line. A new movement must be established within the limits of the Green Line, one that would raise the flag of a united Israeli identity and would fight for the souls of the citizens of Israel, Jews and non-Jews altogether. In the territories beyond the Green Line, on the other hand, a liberal democracy must first be established to allow conducting the struggle in democratic ways.

The establishment of this type of democracy is not just a matter of declarations, but of in-depth procedures which have been going on for many years. If the Israeli revolution of identity faces a real obstacle that would be the miserable condition of the Arabic speaking in society Judea, Samaria and the Gaza Strip, lacking any kind of democratic experience. As long as the terrorism infrastructures there in are not disarmed, it would not be possible to establish a democratic society. Elections cannot be administrated under fire and threats of terrorism. The murderous terror rampaging in these territories and even exported out of there into the borders of the Green Line is a threat not just for the state of Israel, but for the local residents themselves. Therefore, a mutual interest exists for both sides in ending terrorism as soon as possible.

The Israeli Stages Plan should be based not only on

addressing different target publics, but on using two different types of **instruments**: the first instrument is a **legal** one – creating a new political framework; the second tool is **psychological-educational** – acquiring a new identity. In the first stage, the political unification of the country shall be completed by annexing Judea and Samaria. In the second stage, a unification of identity shall be added to the political unification, which is that which creates the true unifying glue. Only a solution combining right and identity could provide a real and a full answer to the problem of the Land of Israel.

These two instruments differ from one another not only in nature, but even in their different time durations. Political unity can be achieved only by making a legal declaration, with the swing of the pen of a sovereign regime, by a one-hour Knesset (Parliament) decision. Spiritual unity, on the other hand, is the result of a prolonged and gradual educational process, along the course of many years, inflicting deep change to the heart and spirit altogether, as the saying goes “*and make yourselves a new heart and a new spirit!*” (Ezekiel 18:31).

A total Israeli identity is a charged and complex character. A total identity is much more than just a civil identity. An Israeli identity is, first of all, a sense of belonging to the ancient Israelite people and a deep identification with them. A national Israeli identity is abed upon identifying with **everything** embodied by the name **Israel**: the Land of Israel, the language of Israel,

culture of Israel, religion of Israel, Israeli history and the State of Israel.

Judea and Samaria First

The identity revolution should begin within the borders of the Green Line and only later on can it be exported to the territories of Judea and Samaria and maybe even to the Gaza Strip. If the identity revolution succeeds at home, internally, it would be easier to export it to the outside as well. Yet, a necessary preliminary condition for this is that no foreign political entity should be established in Judea and Samaria, even if this entity would be less than a state, like the condition that was created in the Gaza Strip, after the disengagement from it. For the reason that if this kind of entity is established, heaven forbid, and then Israel would no longer be capable of exporting the revolution to its territory, since it would then reject this possibility out of hand.

Therefore, the first step that the State of Israel must take now is **to immediately annex the territories of Judea and Samaria**, and to openly and explicitly state, that it does not intend to establish a “Palestinian state” at any stage. Not tomorrow and not on the next day. Likewise it must **dismantle the infrastructure of terror** and all that is left from the Palestinian Authority, after it lost most of its assets, anyway. All of the attempts to revive Abu-Mazen and his friends, so they can deal with the Hamas, will not solve any problem, but would just make things worse, because the Fatah movement represents nothing

more than a false and tactical identity, while the Hamas represents a real identity.

Physical-Legal unification first and only afterwards **spiritual unification**, as well. This kind of unification should begin in the opposite direction from the disconnection. Not Gaza first, but Judea and Samaria first and Gaza comes only at the end, if at all. Unification is the opposite of separation. First, one must connect with that which is near and only afterwards to that which is far as well. Those really close to us are the residents of Judea and Samaria, which much like the residents of the Galilee, have clung to the mountain land from the beginning of the Israelite settlement in the country. The mountain dwellers are true people of Israel, from the flesh of the ancient Israelite nation. The residents of the Gaza Strip, on the other hand, are mostly new immigrants which have just arrived in the land. The majority of the Gaza Strip's residents is not of Israeli origin, but is a mix of immigrants, which came to the country from the neighboring countries as takers advantage of the Zionist Enterprise.

Israel must relate to the region of Judea and Samaria today just as it related in the past to the Galilee, the Triangle and the Negev. In fact, nobody can or is entitled to deny it from doing so. The international law system has acknowledged the Israeli people's right over the entire area of the Land of Israel, by a decision accepted by the League of Nations at the end of the First World War, at a time when all of the borders in the Middle-East

were being established. According to those international decisions, the Land of Israel was also supposed to include the area east of the Jordan River, but this area was given to the Hashemite Kingdom, which established the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan upon it shortly after this decision was accepted. In their condition then, the Israeli people did not have enough physical and political power in order to prevent the handing of this territory to a foreign nation. Today, on the other hand, with all of the territory west of the Jordan River being in Israeli hands, while Israel does have enough physical and political power to hold them, it can and even must implement full Israeli sovereignty and afterwards full Israeli identity, over this territory.

The Number of Arabic-speakers in Judea and Samaria is much smaller than their Official Number

The annexation of Judea and Samaria may add to the state of Israel a large population with an Arab-Islamic identity, which brings about the fear that we always had from this kind of annexation. This fear has no grounds, because the number of Judea and Samaria's Arabic-speaking residents is much smaller than the acceptable number. For years, the numbers provided by the Palestinian Authority, since the Oslo Accords, were accepted nearly unquestioned. But in recent years it turns out that these numbers have been deliberately inflated, because the demographic demon serves as an additional tool in the struggle against Israel.

From a study recently conducted by The Bar-Ilan University it turns out that there's a gap of over 1.3 million people between the official numbers published by the Palestinian Authority and the real size of Judea and Samaria's population. The total number of this population is, according to this study, about 2.5 million people, rather than the 3.83 million reported as the official numbers. If we deduct from this number the population of the Gaza Strip, which is about 1.08 million people, then we get a population of less than 1.5 million persons in the territories of Judea and Samaria, a number that is not much bigger than that of the Arabic-speaking population within the borders of the Green Line (the State of Israel).³⁹

What is of no less importance is the fact that the birth-rate among this population is a lot lower than what people tend to think. On the other hand, the rate of the outwards immigration is much bigger than the official numbers and therefore the demographic demon is not as bad as Israel's enemies tend to present it. Therefore, the annexation of Judea and Samaria wouldn't significantly change the current demographic balance between Jews and non-Jews in the country, as a solid Jewish majority would continue to exist even after the annexation of these territories. For this reason, as well as for the historical reasons I've mentioned earlier, the Gaza Strip could not be annexed at the first stage, because this would suddenly add 1.08 million people, a number which could negatively change the demographic balance

Basic Law: the Identity of the State and of its Residents

Since obtaining a mutual Israeli identity is a prolonged and lengthy process, in the meantime until it is achieved, procedures of legal protection would be necessary and these could only be established within a legal framework. Therefore, in concordance with the political annexation, Israel would have to legislate a basic law, which shall be called “**Basic Law: the identity of the state and of its residents** (as follows – “**the Basic Law**”). The purpose of this basic law is to protect the united state of Israel from being overtaken by a hostile Arab and/or Muslim identity. Procedures of legal protection would be necessary only as long as the revolution of identity suggested here is not completed; one that would turn the country’s residents with an Arab identity into the owners of an Israeli identity. After the revolution is completed, these arrangements would no longer be necessary, because all of today’s Arabic-speakers or at least most of them would already be Israeli, without any connection to the way they may attain their Israeli identity.

The framework of this basic law shall define those components which are necessary in order to maintain the state’s Israeli identity, without any connection to questions of majority and minority. In order to prevent the possibility that a hostile majority would try to change this identity, the clauses completely determining an identity shall be reserved, by determining a supermajority without which these clauses could not be changed. The

list of the Israeli identity determining clauses must include, inter alia, the following clauses: the name of the state and the country, the state's capital, the allegiance to the state and the country, the state's language, the state's educational system and its foundational contents, the regime in the state and the relations between religion and the state. I shall briefly assess these basic clauses.

The name of the country and the name of the state: the united country shall be named "The United Land of Israel". The united state shall be named "The United State of Israel".

The capital of the state: the capital of the state of Israel shall be Jerusalem. The sovereignty over Jerusalem shall belong only to the United State of Israel, without giving any other factor any political foothold.

Allegiance to the country and the state: a citizen in the United State of Israel can only be someone who has declared allegiance to the Land of Israel and to the State of Israel. Any other resident can only have the status of a resident, without an Israeli citizenship. Anyone wishing to join the Israeli nation as a citizen with full rights and duties would have to pass certain examinations, as they shall be defined by the law.

The state's language: the official language of the United State of Israel shall be the Hebrew language and no other language shall bear an official status.

The education system of the state and its basic contents: the education system of the state shall be all national Israeli. The language of the education system

shall be Hebrew. This educational system shall place an emphasis on contents which consolidate an Israeli identity, with the study of the history and the heritage of the land of Israel at the core. Alongside the state education system there shall also be other schools, but they shall have a lower status and be under the supervision of the central regime. Schools failing to withstand the test of allegiance to the State of Israel and to the Land of Israel shall be outlawed.

The form of the regime: the United State of Israel shall establish a regime of two parties or of three parties, like the regime in England and in the United States. By in fact being culturally branched, it requires a centralized regime that would serve as the melting pot of the Israeli identity. Various cultural trends could be publicly expressed in different frameworks, but not in political frameworks. Only a political party pledging allegiance to the State of Israel and to the Land of Israel could establish itself in the United State of Israel.

The relations between the religion and the state: the United State of Israel shall separate the religion from the state. The right for freedom of religion and even for freedom from religion shall be considered as a basic right. Despite this, the religion of Israel shall gain a preferred status in relations to other religions, due to the fact that this religion provides an important component of the Israeli identity. The reinforcement of the Jewish tradition among the secular public in Israel could also be an important component of the Israeli identity. In this

framework all of the religious institutions shall be placed under public supervision, particularly those of the Islamic community, whose activity would have to be limited to the religious sphere only, without granting it any kind of foothold in the political realm.

Allegiance as a Condition for Citizenship

During the first stage, after annexing Judea and Samaria, its Arabic-speaking residents may only have the status of residents, without full civil rights and duties, because granting political rights (such as the right to vote and the right to be elected) could endanger the identity of the State of Israel as one with an Israeli identity. In the present situation there is a distinction between citizenship and national belonging and therefore an Israeli citizen may hold an Israeli identity card without adopting the Israeli identity. This intolerable condition allows certain citizens to denounce the state's Israeli identity without ever being punished for doing so. Israel must immediately change this condition. Israel, like other progressive states around the world, such as France and the United States, must strive to unify the national and the civil identity (as follows – “**national citizenship**”).

The full integration into the Israeli community on the basis of full equality of rights and duties cannot be automatic, but needs to be conditioned by withstanding acceptance tests that shall be assigned by the citizenship law and which would ensure the allegiance to the Israeli nation and its state. The national naturalization shall be

on an individual basis, when each individual wanting to, would have to go through the acceptance tests defined by the citizenship law. The citizenship law in its new pattern shall allow the State of Israel to expropriate the citizenship status from those people who have recently received this status, yet do not, in fact, withstand the requirements of this law.

In order to permit the naturalization of the Arabic-speaking residents of Judea and Samaria, in addition to the legislation of the aforementioned basic law, the state will need to make amendments to a number of existing laws, with the most important ones being **The Citizenship Law of 1952**, **The Parties' Law of 1992** and **The State Education Law of 1953**. In all of these laws an emphasis shall be placed upon the duty of loyalty and allegiance to the state of Israel and to its Israeli identity as a foundational value.

Of all of the clauses in the basic law and/or the laws mentioned above, I wish to stress the importance of the Hebrew language as the only official language of the State of Israel as well as the language of its education system. As long as the Arabic language enjoys the status of equality with the Hebrew language, one cannot prevent the competition between its Israeli and its Arab identity. Likewise, one cannot prevent the de-facto bi-national nature of the State of Israel, even within the borders of the Green Line and/or the tendency of separation of the Arabic-speakers within the borders of the Green Line, all the more that in this condition it will

be even harder to add the Arabic-speakers from beyond these borders. Language is not only a tool of communication, but is also an identity-establishing means. Anyone speaking the Arabic language as an official language cannot break away from the burden of identities vested in this language. Two official languages in one state is a recipe for maintaining the current condition of a de-facto bi-national state.

Naturalizing the Jews of Diaspora

The establishment of the State of Israel is not just another chapter in the Israeli-Jewish history, but a revolution of this history, which bears farfetched significance and which we shall be required to precisely define.

Until the establishment of the State of Israel, the continuity of the Israeli-Jewish identity was maintained by the traditional religious-communal constraints, which place the Jewish Halacha (Jewish Law) and upholding mitzvahs (Jewish law of moral conduct) at the center. The Emancipation and the Haskalah (Jewish Enlightenment) movements have generated a radical change in this identity and consequently the historical Jewish religion has lost its normative and public position. The Jews, some of which were shaking off the traditional frameworks of keeping the Mitzvahs, have found themselves forced to grant new public significance to their collective identity. The establishment of the State of Israel has brought the Jews back not only their collective pride, but also filled the public void created as a result of the procedures of modernization and of secularization.

Today, the modern State of Israel provides a center of identification and of loyalty as well as allegiance for all Jews of the world, even if some of them choose not to immigrate to Israel. This is not an ideological claim, that things should be this way, but a mere statement of the facts. That fact is that nowadays religion not only does not unify all of those defining themselves as Jews, but it even divides this public in a great way. The Jewish religion has split into different branches, which compete with one another and are even hostile to each other, like the position of the Orthodox Rabbis in regards to conservative and reform communities. Furthermore, the fact is that a large share of the Jewish public in Israel label itself in secular terms and maintains an essentially secular lifestyle, yet despite all of this they define themselves as proud Jews.

This thesis mustn't be comprehended as if the State of Israel has inherited the Jewish religion and canceled the need for it to exist. On the contrary – the Jewish religion is, as aforesaid, a central component of the Israeli identity and nevertheless it does not comprise a total identity, but only a partial one. Even among those people maintaining the traditional Judaism, the religion provides just one of the partial symbols of the identity. Only the State of Israel can serve today as the widest common denominator and as the unifying factor for the variety of multi-cultural factors comprising the Israeli-Jewish essence. Today, the Jews of the world need the State of Israel, no less than it needs them.

The unification plan offers not only a way to connect the different branches of the population of the Land of Israel, but also even a way of reinforcing the correlation between the State of Israel and the Diaspora Jews. The way suggested here strengthens the state of Israel's Israeli identity just as it strengthens the Jewish identity of the Diaspora Jewry.

Until today, immigrating to Israel was perceived as the only way of having the Diaspora Jewry join the State of Israel. Yet, due to different reasons, mainly economic ones, many of them prefer to remain in their countries. In order to overcome this obstacle, the State of Israel must devise new ways of strengthening the connection with the Diaspora, even without conditioning this with physical immigration. Israel should offer an Israeli citizenship to any Jew in Diaspora wishing to get one, without necessarily conditioning this with Aliya (immigration to Israel), but only with the passing of the naturalization tests offered by the Israeli law.

This kind of step could add millions of loyal citizens to Israel, with a solid Jewish-Israeli identity, which would take an active part in its life, even if they choose to continue living abroad and regard Israel only as a second home and the Israeli citizenship – merely as a second citizenship. This kind of step could increase the Jewish majority in the State of Israel and serve as a counter-balance to the annexation of a large non-Jewish public – another dam to protect from the domination of a hostile Muslim-Arab entity during the transitional period, until

the public of Arabic-speakers in the country will complete their assimilation into the Israeli society.

Such a move could not only enforce the United State of Israel's Jewish identity, but also place a barrier that would prevent the disappearance of the Jewish people in Diaspora as a result of assimilation, by the way of mixed marriages, a phenomenon which is getting worse in today's liberal society. An Israel that could hold its weight from a social and a spiritual perspective could serve as a highly intensive source of inspiration for the world Jewry and enforce their national consciousness. The modern media could make a significant contribution to a new relationship between Israel and Diaspora by placing at the disposal of the people of Israel new instruments, which one could only dream of in the past. The modern means of transportation could also contribute to the consolidation of a worldwide Jewish community, with a ramified nerve system and whose heart and brain lie in the Land of Israel. From the abundance of currents, trends and branches characterizing today's Jewry, a new Israeli identity could be created, one that would be richer and more complex than any previous identity. Only an open and flexible Israeli identity can serve as a melting pot for the People of Israel including the Diaspora Jewry from the four corners of earth.

The naturalization of the Diaspora Jewry in Israel, even if only on a special status of non-resident citizens, could generate to the entire world the Israeli people's

determination to better handle the challenges of the third millennium and their desire to get integrated into the new world order as a body holding unique and specific stature.

Chapter N: True Peace in the Middle-East

One language and one norm for all states of the region

True peace in Israel and in the Middle-East must be constructed upon solid foundations of security, of justice and above all - of **truth**. As soon as the enemies of Israel will begin to realize the truth, it would then be possible to seek solutions to the problems of the country and of the entire Middle-East. Creative solutions can be found, as long as both sides use the same language and are subjected to the same norms. Therefore, the first step that should be taken, nowadays, is not the presentation of solutions, but designing one language and one norm, as a basis for solving the conflicts.

The language that must be designed is **the liberal language of nationality**, a language that is completely modern and stands in total opposition to the Imperialist Arabic-Muslim language that dominates the Middle-East nowadays. The norm that must be designed is the **norm of the international law**, which is the basis for peace relations and for a culture of peace. This norm is also completely modern and stands in total opposition to the Imperialist Arabic-Muslim language that dominates the Middle-East nowadays.

Once the enemies of Israel will assimilate the new language, as well as the new norms, it would then the formula for peace will be founded not only for the Land of Israel but for the entire Middle-East.

A strong correlation exists between **national identity** and **liberal democracy** and between these two and **international peace**.

The national identity is the basis for all of the rest. Due to its' weakness in the Middle-East so far, liberal-democratic regimes could not be established in the countries of the region up until now - and the result is the many wars that have been going on in the area. Although the most eminent one is the war between the Muslim countries and the State of Israel, this is not the only one and surely not the bloodiest one. So, for example, over one million human beings have lost their lives during the wars between Shiite Iran and Sunni Iraq. In a similar manner, tens of thousands of people have fallen victims during the course of the various civil wars that have taken place and continue to take place in the area. So, the civil war in Lebanon, for instance, has taken a toll of tens of thousands of victims, so far. The massacres in Syria, which accompanied the oppression of the Muslim Brothers, have also taken tens of thousands of lives. International wars, civil wars and acts of massacre among the countries of the region are the rule, rather than the exception.

Honoring the international accords in the area

The basis for true peace in the Middle-East is the acknowledgment of the legitimacy of the territorial agreements, devised in the region at the end of the First World War, within the established borders and even

under the modern territorial entities that were created as a result of it. These identities, even if at first they seemed artificial in a great extent, as the years went by, turn more and more into real identities. Though these identities must yet become nationally consolidated and established, there is no reason to rule them out. Not only would the Israeli nation benefit from such a move, but the rest of the nations in the Middle-East would benefit from this as well, because the very same countries that used to fight against the Imperialistic doctrine of the Pan-Arab movement (headed by Egypt, Syria and Iraq) - are nowadays fighting to survive against the dark wave of Islamic Imperialism, under the leadership of Iran.

Liberal nationality

The national ethos does not dictate any specific form of regime; and as for the primary definition of nationality: well, it is liberation from the burden of foreigners, with each and every nationality possessing the right to vote and to elect its own political regime. Therefore, at least in theory, even non-democratic territorial identity movements are entitled to call themselves "national movements". Despite all of this, the nationality, from its' earliest ideological consolidation, correlated with liberal-democratic frames of mind, even if this wasn't always expressed by establishing stable democratic institutes. The nationality emerged on the basis of a moral-political doctrine, which regarded the nation/people as its foundational unit - and its values of liberty, equality and rationality as its supreme values.

The main idea in Liberalism is that the human beings, as moral and rational beings, have the right to decide for themselves which type of living pattern they would like to adopt. They are not just under the custody of the church or of the monarchy, like minors requiring supervision. The enlightenment is the freedom to rely upon the wisdom and the moral judgment of the individual, not only as far as personal matters, but in all that concerns public affairs as well. Each and every human being has his or her own uniqueness and has the right - which should not be prevented - to fulfill the potential vested in him/her. The very same human beings that are enslaved to a superior power and which do not have the ability of translating their unique characteristics into a concrete living model, are tragically trailing behind, in all that concerns their human development.

As an analogy to this perspective, the various people or nations, similar to the individuals, are perceived as possessing a unique nature. Each and every one of the world's nations has its own irreplaceable voice within the human choir. In order for a nation to be creative in an authentic way, it must have the freedom to express itself and its most inner sensitivities, using its own language and cultural instruments. Every nation or a people is entitled to design their collective living pattern, according to their own choice. This choice bears positive and negative significance altogether: positive - when it demands that the people decide about their own fate by themselves; negative - when it demands that the collective life of the nation is not to be determined by any

foreign factor. A "foreign factor" can be not only an imperialistic regime but also a forced regime, a dictatorship, one that is not chosen via free elections by the civil public itself. The nationality, in its deeper sense, thus requires liberation from imperialism and from tyranny altogether. The regime must be an agreed-upon self regime, one that is elected and subjected to public scrutiny. This is the democratic and the liberal meaning of nationality.

From this aspect, nationality is a secular-liberal movement that is not willing to comply with any kind of tyrannical regime, justifying its existence through a choice which was not made by the people themselves.

The monarchic idea of dominion under the grace of The Lord is perceived as a legal deception, intended to conceal the fact that the choice in the hands of The Lord is expressed through an advantage of **power**, regarded as a **prerogative**. The monarchy was always involved with a religious concept. The democracy, on the other hand, is secular and rational. The moral nature of the nationality must be vested in the human daily interactions, which are designated by national institutions. Nations or people refrained by sovereign political institutions from fulfilling their desires are disabled collectives.

The modern nationality is, at least as a matter of principle, an expansion of the liberal-democratic principles, aimed at the international community. The democratic slogan "Liberty, Equality, Fraternity" can also be validated in regards to the international relations. Just as the liberal democracy acknowledges the right of

individuals to be freely heard in the framework of the international community - in the same way the international democracy acknowledges the right of the people/nations to be freely heard in the community of the nations. Just, as the liberal democracy acknowledges the right of the people for civil equality, so does the international democracy acknowledge the right of the nations for equality under the international law. Just like the liberal democracy aspires for civil brotherhood - the international democracy aspires for international fraternity.

The International law and peace

The international ethos demands the acknowledgment of the uniqueness of each and every nation and people - a uniqueness which grants it the right to separate and to convene within its national territory. The source of the claim for national uniqueness lies within the psychological structure of the human beings, which demands the recognition not only of their unique private identity, but also of their unique collective identity.

The need for self-identity, private and collective altogether, is so profound that people are often willing to die protecting these identities. In a competition between physical and spiritual survival, we often favor the last over the first, which testifies, more than anything else of the literalism vested in the materialist approach. Man, as a single individual, designs his private identity by comparing himself with others. A person, as a social

being, designs his collective identity by comparing his groups to other groups.

Nationality places the uniqueness and the liberty as its central ideals. The Achilles Heel of nationality is the reinforcement of the uniqueness and of the separatist claims at the expense of the unity and the unification. When the delicate balance between these two fundamental values is breached, the international society may quickly resort to destructive anarchy and to never-ending wars. In order to provide an appropriate response to the fear from anarchy, two limitations were imposed upon the nation countries:

(A) They must establish within themselves a democratic-liberal regime;

(B) They must acknowledge the reign of the international law and its supremacy over the internal law.

The first person to withstand the correlation between liberal democracy and international peace relations was Immanuel Kant in his book "**Perpetual Peace**". His claim was that wars were then adventures of Kings and Princes, spilling the blood of the simple folks, the cannon fodder. If only the cannon fodder would rebel and prevent its rulers from going to wars, that would be when the wars would cease to exist and when an age of perpetual peace would begin.

According to this approach, the democracy is perceived not only as an instrument for the self-expression of the people, but also as a crane for upholding peace relations between the nations. This means that a clear connection

exists between the political structure of the state and its behavior, internally and externally altogether. States, characterized by a constitutional liberal regime, are peace-seeking, externally and internally altogether. On the other hand, states characterized by a despotic regime are essentially aggressive, internally as well as externally. States with a constitutional regime willingly adopt the international law, as an obvious thing, due to the limitations imposed upon the use of violence according to their internal constitution. Therefore, in these states one does not have to exercise external violence in order to ensure that the international peace and security is not breached. Tyrannical regimes, on the other hand, may honor the international law only as the result of sufficient external deterrence, out of fear of the sanctions that might be imposed upon them by an external power.

The accumulated experience of the twentieth century confirmed these assumptions. The wars of the 20th century were always initiated by tyrannical regimes, never once by democratic regimes. The democratic states were always on the defensive side, never on the aggressive one. Likewise, never did a single war take place between democratic countries, although democratic countries did sometimes have harsh conflicts between one another. The great democratic states, the US and England were also the ones that initiated the international organizations and the international law for the institutionalization of the peace. The League of Nations and later the United Nations, correlated between democracy and peace. The final test of every legal

system lies in its enforcement ability. Yet, the key is not in fact its violent enforcement, but **the internalization of its norms** out of **will and consent**. Any legal system is effective only if the majority is ready to willingly obey it. There is a limit to what can be done by force. Hence, the place of the external military deterrence should be taken over by mechanisms of internal brakes. These barriers are provided by the democratic institutions. The democracy is a form of regime in which internal brakes/barriers are used to substitute the external brakes/barriers. The ballot box voting is used as an internal power of deterrence towards the regime, just as military deterrence works on it from the outside.

The human universe, as it is perceived by the international law, does not have just one center of power, but as many power centers exist as do the national territories. Moreover, there is never one supreme sovereign state - but a great number of sovereign states, which the boundary of their sovereignty is the sovereignty of the other. The relativity of the sovereignty is derived from the nature of the international law, in which there is no right that is a total right, but only a relative right, except for the complete right for peace and security (the right to live without fear). Complex and diversified relations exist between the different political centers, on the basis of equality and consent, not of discrimination and subordination, which are imperialist relations. The relations between the various centers are settled by the international law, which is their brainchild. It is the subordination to the reign of the international

law, which is similar to the civil subordination to the regime of the law of the state in a democratic state. The laws rule over us, rather than other human beings or other nations.

Liberating the Middle-East from its' Imperial heritage

The problem stems not from the so-called Israeli occupation over Judea and Samaria and Gaza Strip - but the Arab-Muslim conquest of the country and of the rest of the countries in the Middle-East. This conquest was not only territorial, but also of consciousness and identity. Although the Arab-Muslim empires fell apart long ago, their heritage continues to exist in the political awareness of the people of the region and it devises their political identity - this is where the foundational problems of the entire Middle-East come from, including those of the Land of Israel. This cultural heritage explains not only the economic-technologic-scientific backwardness of the region's nations, but also their social-political retardation, which is the truly important one.

This heritage stops the region's nations from developing their modern territorial identity and by doing so integrating into the modern family of nations. This imperial heritage accounts for the mad **arms race** in the Middle-East, a race which is unprecedented in other arenas around the world. This race is usually excused by the desire to guarantee the balance of power in the struggle against Israel - but it is actually motivated by the

competition over dominating the expanse of the Middle-East, which is headed by the strongest states in the region: Egypt, Syria, Iraq and Iran. Each one of these states aspires to dominate its weaker neighbors (with the most prominent examples being the conquest of Lebanon by Syria and the occupation of Kuwait by Iraq), as a starting point for additional conquests.

This imperial heritage also explains the **despotic** nature of the regimes in the states of the region. Despite all of the differences between them (some are monarchies, some are republics), the common denominator for all of them is having a regime of dictatorship. In all of them, not only is there no separation between the religion and the state - some of them (Iran and Saudi Arabia) are even under the reign of the Islamic Law (the "*Sharia*")⁴⁰ for quite a while, while in the rest of the states the religious movements are on the rise, threatening the continuance of existence of these regimes. As a result, they are not able to develop a free and open civil society, which is the basis of any liberal democracy.

This imperial heritage accounts for the **Culture of Lying** that has developed among the people of the region. Since they find it hard to adapt to the modern reality, they must constantly lie to themselves, making excuses in order to justify their sad existence. Israel's existence is perceived as the ultimate justification for the condition they're in, as the exclusive source of all their troubles and hardships.

The State of Israel does indeed provoke great objection among the peoples of the region, reflecting the low point they've reached during the modern era. The revival of the

People of Israel in its own country undermines to the very core the imperial concept of the Islam and even the claim concerning its supremacy over other religions. Israeli sovereignty over the land in which the Muslims are under Jewish patronage, is perceived as denial and as a contradiction of one of Islam's major principles, which determines that the Jews are doomed to be under the protégé of the Muslims (*Dhimmi*), rather than vice versa. The resurgence of the People of Israel in its country was perceived as turning the wheels of history backwards and by doing so places in doubt the Islam's supremacy over Judaism and Christianity altogether.

Islam's imperial political culture reflected the imperial stage of the human history and as such it was legitimate for its era. Yet, as humanity began designing a new world order, with the modern nation - states at its center, and with the international law settling the relations between them - this political culture had become obsolete and laggard, a burden that must be liberated, if the region's nations wish to integrate into the modern international community. The imperial heritage, left behind by the Arab-Muslim occupation, is hence the problem - therefore liberation from it is also the key to solving this problem.

The Gulf War strengthened the territorial identity in the region

The Gulf War exposed not only Iraq's weakness, but also that of the Pan-Arab ethos, which challenged the "artificial borders, slicing up the body of the great Arab

nation". Kuwait's resistance to the Iraqi occupation proved the power of the territorial identity, even if it lacks historical roots. It turned out, that even political units, which were artificially established, such as Kuwait, may sprout a community established on the basis of territorial connection and willing to sacrifice its sons in order to protect its territorial wholeness. Lebanon's efforts to break free from the hug of the Syrian bear also provide substantiation to the enforcement of the territorial identity in the region, while it must face the Imperialism of its neighbor.

The Pan-Arab Imperialism

For dozens of years, the Pan-Arab imperialism has blacked-out the efforts of the region's states to establish their own territorial identity. According to the Pan-Arab ethos, which was crystallized only during the late 19th century, the linguistic-cultural belonging was supposed to replace the traditional religious belonging to the Muslim community, although in reality it did not succeed in differentiating itself from the Muslim identity. The Qur'an was written in the Arabic language, in Arabic letters and was even distributed in this form among the nations of the Middle-East. Nearly all of the culture created in the Arabic language is religious, when in the framework of the Islamic community it was not possible to create anything other than religious culture. In the absence of separation between the religious community and the political community, a secular culture could not

be created in the Middle-East, like the one that was created in Europe.

Despite the attempt to break free from the burden of the religious meanings, the Arab identity did not succeed in differentiating itself from the Islamic identity and it ended up being absorbed into it. The Pan-Arab ethos is not only a fabricated nationality, from a modern perspective, but also a "fabricated religion", from a fundamentalist point of view and as such it is bound to disappear. All of the attempts to define this identity without its religious components have failed so far. This kind of separation encounters vast psychological barriers. The concept of being Arab cannot absorb within it also the association with the imperial community of the Islam, as we can see from the words of **Sir Hamilton Gibb**:

*Arabs are anyone to whom the main fact in the course of history is Muhammad's emissary and the memory of the Arab empire and anyone whom in addition to this treasures the Arab language and its cultural heritage as a mutual asset.*⁴¹

This definition of the modern Arab identity reflects an entirety of inseparable identities: an **imperial identity** ("the memory of the Arab empire"); **religious – political identity** ("the emissary of Muhammad"); **cultural - linguistic identity** ("the Arabic language and its cultural heritage is treasured as a mutual asset"). This definition can teach us not only of what the modern Arab identity

includes, but also of what it doesn't.

This definition is imperial, political- religious and cultural - linguistic - but not genetic -territorial. This definition is analogous in the modern world, aside from that of the Pan-German genetic - cultural nationalism, whose ethos was clearly imperial. Yet, with a significant difference from the Pan-German model, the Arab model has no claims concerning genetic partnership, but a mutual language and culture, and also implicitly - a mutual religion.

The meaning of the Pan-Arab movement is hence some kind of collective loyalty, which is non-genetic-territorial but cultural - linguistic, sliding without noticing so into loyalty of a cultural - religious nature. The Arab identity and the ethos derived from it have, as said, no precedent in the modern world, except maybe for the Pan-German one, which gave birth to the Nazi monster. The claim for all-Arab collective loyalty is a new kind of imperialism, which draws its inspiration from historical memories that concern the first Muslim Caliphate, whose rulers were of Arab descent. Only few among the Arabic speaking nations are aware of the imperial significance vested in this collective concept, otherwise they wouldn't support it.

The imperial nature of the modern Arab identity is reflected by the fact that the Arab people do not have just one country ("the land of Arabia"), as the rest of the modern nations do, but a large number of countries, as this is expressed by the terms "Arab countries", "Arab States" and "Arab peoples", **in plural** rather than single.

Even the term "the Arab world" reflects an imperial identity which is unprecedented among any other modern nations. The Pan-Arab rhetoric strictly refuses to acknowledge the existence of separate countries, countries with names of their own, which give birth to separate nations. There is only one nation, the Great Arab nation, ("The Great Arab Umma") whose borders are not, in fact, defined and which spans over vast territories, from the Persian Gulf to the Atlantic Ocean.

At first it was Egypt, under the leadership of Nasser, that was the center of the Pan-Arab ethos. Afterwards it was Syria under Hafez al-Assad (which stood for "Greater Syria") and Iraq under Saddam Hussein (which stood for renewing the Babylonian empire or the Abbasid Caliphate) that served as centers of the Pan-Arab ethos. This ethos reached its end during the Gulf War and its death was not even officially announced. Nowadays there is not a single state in the region that has the power to materialize this ethos.

The Pan-Islamic Imperialism

Nowadays, the Islamic imperialism under the leadership of Iran has taken over for the Pan-Arab imperialism. This imperialism is even more dangerous than the previous kind, not only due to the fact that it is spearheaded by a real regional powerful country, but also due to the intensity of the Pan-Islamic ethos. This ethos, unlike the Pan-Arab ethos, draws its inspiration from the many years of history of the Middle-East, in which the Islamic

identity ruled over the Middle-East in a total manner, until the encounter with the West, at the beginning of the 19th century. The Islamic identity is an authentic identity, which is its advantage over any alternative identity.

The Pan-Islamic ethos makes it even more difficult than the Pan-Arab ethos for the states of the region to establish their own territorial identity. Territorial identity is a Western invention, which is unprecedented in the Islamic tradition. This tradition regards each separate identity, whether on a territorial basis, ethnic or genetic basis - as heretic to the essence of the only legitimate collective identity: The Islamic identity of the Islam community ("*Dar al- Islam*"). This community, whose legitimate political expression is the "Caliphates", is a religious - political empire which does not, in fact, have any boundaries, except those placed by powers stronger than it or equal to it, borders, which are always temporary. Hence, at least in principle, the Islam community's territorial claims shall not be satisfied until it conquers the entire world.

Iran is a regional local superpower with real strength and an imperial history of many years. From its early days, Iran was one of the strongest empires in the Middle-East. Iran was the power that dominated the region until the conquests of Alexander the Great. Afterwards, it continued to consistently rule over different parts of the Middle-East, although it went through changes of religions, dynasties and borders. Iran, due to its geopolitical location, the size of its population and its

extreme theocratic regime - presents a threat today to all of the region's countries. The possibility of it acquiring nuclear weapons threatens not only the existence of Israel, but also the existence of other states in the region.

The West must strengthen the territorial identities in the Middle-East

The only way of coping with the Iranian threat is to strengthen the separate, territorial identity of the region's states. The territorial arrangements created in the region, which seemed at first very artificial, have dynamics similar to those in other third world countries. What is, at first perceived as an artificial identity, forced by the western powers, gradually turns into a center of a new loyalty. The territorial division into separate units acquires a new collective, national - territorial identity, whose survival depends upon the spiritual and the political climate existing in the area.

The local interests are getting stronger and stronger, while at the same time also the territorial identities are becoming stronger, even if some of them lack historical and ethnic roots. Just like the rest of the world, in the Middle-East as well, there is no longer a justification for the imperial political movements, even if they do have deep historic roots. The question of to what extent will the states of the region manage to establish their territorial identity depends not only upon what they will do, but also upon the policy that will be used towards them by the countries of the industrialized northern

expanse, headed by the United States. The countries in the region may enforce their national territorial identity, only if they are to gain wide international support - that would encourage these territorial identities, against those imperial factors in the region that are striving to blur these identities. If it wasn't for the intervention of the US in the region, Kuwait and Lebanon would have been long ago absorbed by their stronger neighbors, without leaving a trace after them.

The only real Arabs are the residents of Arabia

The enforcement of the territorial identity in the Middle-East is hence the most important step not just for the establishment of peace relations, but also for devising a **culture of peace** in the region. The strengthening of the territorial identity is conditioned by the acknowledgment of the entirety of the differences that exist between the nations of the region, including the linguistic differences and by emphasizing these differences. In this context, we might be surprised to find out that although towards the outside, the nations of the region declare the unity of their all-Arab identity, in the continuous inner dialogue, they are well aware of the differences between them. Although the Arab media tries to blur these differences (because it itself is conditioned by the unity of the language and the culture) - we can notice them only if we manage to penetrate through the iron curtain established by this media, in order to prevent the rest of the world from withstanding the true relations, between the various nations of the region.

In the real land of Arabia ("Saudi Arabia") the original Arab territorial - genetic identity is merged with the religious – cultural – linguistic Arab-Muslim identity that was acquired later down the road. Total merger of the different identities into one collective persona, is the thing that grants the inhabitants of Arabia a feeling of superiority, concerning the rest of the nations in the region. While they perceive themselves as "the authentic Arabs", as the chosen people, they regard their "brothers" in language, culture and religion as a faded replica of the true Arabism. They are the source - while all of the rest are but counterfeit copies. They don't even acknowledge the Arabism of the Palestinians, just as they don't acknowledge the Arabism of the Egyptians, the Syrians, the Iraqis, the Lebanese and the rest of the Arabic speaking nations in the region.

The real Arabs, which in the Arabic language are called "Bedouins" (from the word "Badiya", which means "the land of the desert"), strictly maintain their identity to this very day by wearing the traditional Arab attire and to a certain extent by maintaining their traditional lifestyle - and by doing so they differentiate themselves from the rest of the Arabic-speaking nations, who adopted the Western culture, in their clothing and their lifestyle.

Differentiating between "Arabs" and "Arabic-speaking nations"

Differentiating between the different identities, vested in the modern Arab identity is the key to understanding the

failure of the common concept which regards all nations of the Middle-East as one nation - the Great Arab nation - rather than many nations. If we wish to enforce the territorial identity of the region's nations, we must, first of all, make a clear distinction between "**Arabs**" and "**Arabic speaking people or nations**".

From now on "**Arabs**" are only considered as such if their genetic - territorial identity is Arab - just like the English, the French, the Germans and all other nations of the world. "**Arabic speaking nations**", on the other hand, would be all of the rest of the residents of the Middle-East, whose countries are not Arab and who are not Arabs genetically, although they are a part of the culture circle of the Arabic language, much like the culture circle of the "Spanish speaking nations" in Latin America, or the "English speaking nations" in North America, South Africa and Australia.

Arabism in its genetic-territorial sense is an ancient identity, which can be traced to the beginning of the first millennium BC. The cultural-linguistic Arabism, on the other hand, is much younger. It emerges only during the 7th century AD, as the Arabs conquered the entire Middle-East.

The territorial - genetic Arabism is hence a true national identity and as such it can also serve as a modern national identity. On the other hand, the cultural - linguistic Arabism in the rest of the nations of the Middle-East is a coerced and anti-national identity and as such they are required to liberate themselves from it, in order to acquire a modern territorial identity. This is, indeed, the

revolution of identity that the nations of the region are required to undergo (except for the inhabitants of Saudi Arabia). Each and every the non-Arab nation of the region must decide for itself in regards to the weight it is willing to give to the Muslim-Arab identity in the entirety of its national identity. Arabism and Islamism are supposed to become merely **cultural identities**, without being vested in the political identity.

Without any doubt, crystallizing separate national script - languages is the most important step that the region's nations must take. A national script-language is the key not only to acquiring a separate political identity, but also to social, scientific and technological development, as we can learn from the European precedent. Only once they internalize the distinction between "the Arab nation" and "the Arabic-speaking nations", will the nations of the region manage to make the transition from a society of the Middle-Ages, which is where they are at, to a modern society, in which the rest of the world's nations dwell. This transition would even allow the region's nations to gradually minimize not only the political gap, but also the economic - technological gap created between them and the rest of the world. It may be very possible that establishing national script language in the region would create a condition in which the top-language of literary Arabic would no longer be a spoken language, but merely a historic language such as Latin nowadays.

Establishing separate territorial identities is also the key to devising a new relationship, not only between the region's nations themselves, but also between them and

the Israeli nation and even the rest of the world. Acknowledging only the cultural nature of the Arab-Muslim identity among the Arabic-speaking nations - would allow us, the Israelis, to break free from the erroneous concept engraved in our awareness, according to which a "Great Arab nation" does exist and Israel presents a foreign element within it.

At the beginning of the era of the Islam, a "Great Arab nation" existed indeed (the Caliphates) but fell apart long ago and all the attempts of the Pan-Arab movement to revive it have failed. Today, as the Middle-East is disintegrating into its various components, into many nations with a unique separate identity, even Israel may no longer be considered a foreign element, but rather another unique voice in the Middle-Eastern choir.

The Middle-Eastern Big Bang

Reinforcing the territorial identity of the Middle-Eastern nations may, therefore, not only severely damage the Pan-Arab ethos, but could also place a barrier that would block the spreading of Iran's Islamic imperialism, which is nowadays not just Israel's top enemy, but that of the other states in the region as well.

A true national awakening in the region, a kind of Middle-Eastern "Spring of Nations" may put an end to one of the last dinosaurs still left in the world, in order to make it possible for smaller and less impressive nations, though nations with an extreme and diversified adaptation ability, to take its place. Eventually, the Middle-Eastern map may look a bit more like a map of

Europe nowadays - pluralistic, liberal, democratic and striving for peace.

As the result of a general Middle-Eastern transformation, all of the foundational assumptions, feeding the conflicts in the area could be changed to the core, including and particularly the conflict between Israel and the Arab-Muslim world. Only if the modern language and norm are internalized, will the truly big bang take place in the Middle-Eastern arena, a bang that could create a new world. If this does happen, then the map of concepts, which had turned into our second nature, would suddenly change at once. Instead of imperial concepts such as "the Arab-Muslim world", "the Great Arab nation", "Arab countries", "Arab states", "Arab peoples" and so on - there would be territorial concepts, such as "the land of Egypt", "the Egyptian state", "the Egyptian people", "the Egyptian language" and so on. What was just said about Egypt also applies for the rest of the nations in the region. Egypt, which has the most established territorial identity, could lead this move. The rest of the region's nations may follow after, since the establishment of their own national identity is more problematic. Anyway, we shall no longer have to paint the Middle-Eastern map using a faded and uniform Arab-Muslim shade, yet we may detect many strong colors, just like in other parts of the world - every nation has its unique color. No longer one monotonous and uniform Arab voice - but each nation and their own unique voice.

In this new political climate it could even be possible to establish democratic regimes in the region, regimes

which are a condition for establishing the national identity of the region's peoples. The region's states would then deal with their internal problems and the stronger ones would no longer aspire to dominate their weaker neighbors. This crazy arms race would gradually cease to exist and greater resources would then be available for civil use. The international law system would then regulate not only the relations between Israel and the rest of the states in the region, but also the relations between one another. And most important of all - the place of the culture of lying shall be taken by **a culture of truth**, which is the basis for a **culture of peace**. When this happens, peace accords (agreements which are, as said, irrelevant and even illegal according to the international law) would no longer be required - but merely culture and trade agreements, at the very best, as is the custom in regards to the international relations in other parts of the world. Israel would then be perceived not as a burden, but as an asset - as the engine of "the new Middle-East". In this kind of political climate, the Land of Israel could even finally establish its national identity without any disturbance. Israel would then no longer be perceived as "a foreign element in the heart of the Arab and/or the Muslim nation", but as another one of the trees in the forest of the Middle-East, as another voice in the choir of the Middle-East. The voice of Israel would probably be the richest one of these voices, being an addition of many voices, including that of the Israeli Arabic speaking community.

A revolution of identity is hence the key to a total change

of relations in the entire region - not just in the arena of the Land of Israel. As the result of a revolution of identity the entire political, economic, social, cultural and ideological system may shed off its old form and try on a new form. A revolution of this magnitude does not occur as a result of wars or of diplomatic arrangements that follow them, but only as the result of a mental transformation, which is the result of a change of the collective sentiment and awareness.

If we wish to promote a genuine peace initiative, we have to cease thinking in terms of existent alternatives and instead adopt revolutionary and more radical thinking patterns.

Establishing a peace culture requires a process of creating a new society; regional, democratic and pacifistic, which will gradually replace the present one; imperialistic, authoritarian and combative. Peace accords and bilateral, even multilateral, arrangements, as best legally formulated as they could be, will not endure as long as they are not anchored in revolutionary and far-reaching political-social-economical processes, such as those that are occurring in the northern industrial region since the end of World War II.

There are no short-cuts from the old Middle-East - a furious, unstable, illiberal and saturated with exceedingly deep enmities - to the new Middle East, the peace loving. Therefore, any genuine peace plan must include not only a vague political vision, but a strong element of gradation and meticulousness. Only with the completion of a long

and laborious process, full of crises and frustrations, will it be possible to establish “a true and viable peace in the Middle East”. For that, a mental revolution is needed, even before we shall proceed with its implementation in the real, material world.

Yet, if, Heaven forbid, this revolution does not take place, then the Islamic imperialism might continue spreading through the Middle-East and inflicting a line of earthquakes at a magnitude that we can't even imagine. According to the domino theory, the victory of the Islam in the region could threaten not just Israel, but the rest of the states in the Middle-East, which may fall into its hands one after the other. When this happens, Heaven forbid, the siege ring around Israel would be tightened by a coalition of Pan-Islamic states, which would recruit all of their power in order to solve, this time in a truly final manner, the Jewish problem.

Endnotes:

¹ In March 31, 1977, the Dutch newspaper *Trouw* published an interview with a Palestinian leader of the Syria-controlled *as-Sa'iqa* faction of the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO)

² Senior Fatah Central Committee member **Sakher Habash** during a 1998 lecture at Shechem's An-Najah University, succinctly explaining the reason for the calculated refusal of the Arab rulers including the Palestinian rulers to help the Palestinian refugees to return to normal lives

³ **Shimon Peres**, *Tomorrow Is Now*, Tel Aviv, 1978

⁴ **Yitzhak Rabin** Pinkas Sherut February 10, 1989

⁵ **Ariel Sharon**

⁶ **Golda Meir**, Sunday Times, June 6, 1969, The Washington Post, June 6, 1969

⁷ **Hans J. Morgenthau** *Politics Among Nations*, New York, 1949

⁸ Alterman Notebooks, ed. Menahem Dorman, Tel. Aviv, 1981, p. 60

⁹ In March 31, 1977, the Dutch newspaper *Trouw* published an interview with a Palestinian leader of the Syria-controlled *as-Sa'iqa* faction of the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO)

¹⁰ Ibid

¹¹ http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Treaty_of_Hudaybiyyah

¹² **Karsh, Efraim**, *Arafat – the Man and his War with Israel* (in Hebrew), *Ma'ariv Library*, 2004, pp. 71 – 72

¹³ Ibid., p. 73

¹⁴ Arafat's Stockholm speech - *Norwegian daily newspaper Dagen*, February 1st, 1996

¹⁵ *Al-Ra'i*, Kuwaiti daily, May-June 2000.

¹⁶ **Faysal al-Husseini** In an appearance on Syrian television on the English language interview program "*Focus*" at 9:30 PM on Monday September 9th, 1996

¹⁷ **Husseini** in a speech in Beirut in April 2001

¹⁸

<http://memri.org/bin/articles.cgi?Page=archives&Area=sd&ID=SP23601>

¹⁹ **Husseini** in a speech in Beirut in April 2001

²⁰ A sermon carried by **Sheikh Hamed Al-Beitawi**, at Al- Aqsa Mosque

²¹ Ceremony on 20 January 1996, Arafat was elected president of the PNA

²² <http://www.mefacts.com>

²³ http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Barbara_Tuchman

²⁴ [Note: The etymology of the word into English is from Old French *Philistin*, from Late Latin *Philistinus*, from Late Greek *Philistinoi* (*Phylistiim* in the Septuagint), from Hebrew *P'lishitim*, (See, e.g., 1 Samuel 17:26, 17:36; 2 Samuel 1:20; Judges 14:3), "people of P'lesheth" ("Philistia"); cf. Akkadian *Palastu*, Egyptian *Palusata*; the word probably is the people's name for itself – J.G.]

²⁵ **Michael Meckler**, "The Beginning of the Historia Augusta," *Historia* 45 (1993) 364-75.

See also: <http://www.livius.org/ha-hd/hadrian/hadrian.html>

²⁶ **Haetzni, Elyakim**, "The Palestine Bluff" , (Internet article in Hebrew) <http://www.inn.co.il/Articles/Article.aspx/6940>

²⁷ <http://www.mfa.gov.il/MFA/Peace+Process/Guide+to+the+Peace+Process/Declaration+of+Establishment+of+State+of+Israel.htm>

²⁸ **Sharon, Moshe**, “The Destruction Process and Nomadization in the Land of Israel Under the Muslim Rule”, p. 7 (in Hebrew)

²⁹ **Belkind, Israel**, “The Arabs Who Are In The Land Of Israel ? ”, “Where are the Ten Tribes?” Hermon, 1969

³⁰ **Ben Gurion, David**, “To Clarify The Origins Of The Peasants”, Hermon 1969

³¹ **Habash, Sakher** Senior Fatah Central Committee member: "To us, the refugee issue is the winning card which means the end of the Israeli state." During a lecture at Shechem's An-Najah University, 1998

³² <http://www.mideastweb.org/refugees1.htm>

³³ **Phares, Walid** , *Future Jihad: Terrorist Strategies Against America*, pp. 34-36. *Intriguingly, the rulers of Dar al-Islam offered treaties and peace agreements to both past and future enemies. It was called "sulh", which can be translated as "a momentary peace"; from it came the word "musalaha", or act of reconciliation. The concept of peace had its own words and logic. "Salaam", which means "permanent peace", was a state of plenitude reached via the rule of the Islamic state. "Sakiam", or "true peace", was to happen within the caliphate or when it decided so. Sulh, or interim peace, was a diplomatic tool at the disposal of the supreme commander, to be employed until the political balance again became favorable to the state. Thus, the logic of jihad — a statistic logic par excellence— was to wage Fattah when possible, conclude sulk when needed, and go back to jihad when conditions were right again. Implacably, methodically, and relentlessly, the doctrine of jihad fueled the Fattah for centuries*

³⁴ http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Divisions_of_the_world_in_Islam

³⁵ The San Remo Resolution:

http://wwi.lib.byu.edu/index.php/San_Remotion_Convention

³⁶ **Grief, Howard:** Legal Rights and Title of Sovereignty of the Jewish People to the Land of Israel and Palestine under International Law, see: <http://www.acpr.org.il/English-Nativ/02-issue/grief-2.htm>

³⁷ **Aharon Amir,** Hebrew Peace in the Land of Battles, Reality and Imagination in the Land of Israel, Aheret: Iyunim Be-Nose Avar, Hoveh, Atid (Different –a review of the past, the present and the future), Carmel, p. 23

³⁸ **Yediot Aharanot,** Daily (in Hebrew) May 22, 2005

³⁹ **Zimmerman, Bennett, Seid, Roberta and Wise, Michael L.** The Million Person Gap, The Arab Population in the West Bank and Gaza. *Mideast Security and Policy Studies No. 65*, Begin Saadat Center for Strategic Studies Bar-Ilan University (BIU), February 2006, <http://www.biu.ac.il/Besa/MSPS65.pdf>

⁴⁰ **Sharia** (Arabic: شريعة transliteration: Šarī'ah) is the body of Islamic religious law. The term means "way" or "path to the water source"; it is the legal framework within which the public and private aspects of life are regulated for those living in a legal system based on *fiqh* (Islamic principles of jurisprudence) and for Muslims living outside the domain. *Sharia* deals with many aspects of day-to-day life, including politics, economics, banking, business, contracts, family, sexuality, hygiene, and social issues.

⁴¹ Bernard Lewis THE ARABS IN HISTORY (in Hebrew)1995 , p.14