

Volume 6

MAJOR KNESSET DEBATES,
1948-1981

Ninth Knesset 1977-1981

Edited by
Netanel Lorch

UNIVERSITY
PRESS OF
AMERICA



JERUSALEM
CENTER FOR
PUBLIC AFFAIRS



Copyright © 1993 by
The Jerusalem Center for Public Affairs
University Press of America®, Inc.

4720 Boston Way
Lanham, Maryland 20706

3 Henrietta Street
London WC2E 8LU England

All rights reserved
Printed in the United States of America
British Cataloging in Publication Information Available

Co-published by arrangement with
The Jerusalem Center for Public Affairs

Managing Editor: Mark Ami-El
Translation: Dorothea Vanson-Shefer
Typesetting: Macintop, Holon, Israel

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Israel. Knesset.
[Divre ha-Keneset. English. Selections]
Major Knesset debates, 1948-1981 / edited by Netanel Lorch ;
[translation, Dorothea Vanson-Shefer].

p. cm.

Includes index.

Contents: v. 1. People's Council and Provisional Council of
State, 1948-1949 — v. 2. The Constituent Assembly—first
Knesset, 1949-1951 — v. 3. second Knesset (1951-1955)—third
Knesset (1955-1959) — v. 4. fourth Knesset (1959-1961)—sixth
Knesset (1965-1969) — v. 5. seventh Knesset (1969-1973)—
eighth Knesset (1974-1977) — v. 6. ninth Knesset (1977-1981).

1. Israel—Politics and government. I. Lorch, Netanel.

II. Israel. Mo'etsset ha-medinah ha-zemanit. III. Title.

J693.P2H55 1991 328.5694' 02—dc20 91-31344 CIP

ISBN 0-8191-8347-4 (cloth : alk. paper)

*For my grandchildren—Gilad, Ariel, Guy, Shani
and Dafna.*

May they grow up, and understand.



The paper used in this publication meets the minimum requirements of
American National Standard for Information Sciences—Permanence
of Paper for Printed Library Materials, ANSI Z39.48-1984.



THE MILKEN LIBRARY OF
JEWISH PUBLIC AFFAIRS

*The "Unseen" Israelis: The Jews from Turkey in Israel
(1988)*

*Economic and Social Policy in Israel: The First
Generation (1989)*

*Morality and Power: Contemporary Jewish Views
(1989)*

*Maintaining Consensus: The Canadian Jewish Polity
in the Postwar World (1990)*

*Israel's Odd Couple: The 1984 Elections and the
National Unity Government (1990)*

*Authority, Power and Leadership in the Jewish Polity:
Cases and Issues (1991)*

*Two Peoples – One Land: Federal Solutions for Israel,
the Palestinians, and Jordan (1991)*

Major Knesset Debates (1991)

Made possible by a gift from the
Milken Family Foundation

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Except for the Second Knesset, translated by Ms. Adina Ben Horin, the entire work of translation has been undertaken by Ms. Dorothea Vanson-Shefer, who was also helpful in the process of selection of material and its initial commitment to a word processor.

The editor is indebted to the Knesset for formally agreeing to the reproduction of the material. He would also like to thank John Moscato for his unstinting support during the early stages; Yoram Shapira and Rosana Sternlieb (Macintop) and Ilan Poreh (Ilron) for bringing the book in line with the format required by the publisher; and Mark Ami-El for his infinite patience in reading proofs and supervising the tortuous process of interfacing.

Thanks are due to Professor Daniel J. Elazar and to Zvi R. Marom for their invaluable encouragement.

Last, but not least, the author gratefully acknowledges the invaluable assistance of his son, Amnon, particularly at the time of his illness. It is due to him that the project has been brought to a successful conclusion.

CONTENTS — VOLUME 6

	Page
<i>Volume 1:</i>	
Foreword — Daniel J. Elazar	xix
Preface — Netanel Lorch	xxiii
Introduction: The Knesset — Israel's Parliament	1
PEOPLE'S COUNCIL 4-14 May 1948	31
PROVISIONAL COUNCIL OF STATE 14 May 1948-10 February 1949	61
<i>Volume 2:</i>	
THE CONSTITUENT ASSEMBLY — FIRST KNESSET 1949-1951	341
<i>Volume 3:</i>	
SECOND KNESSET 1951-1955	701
THIRD KNESSET 1955-1959	841
<i>Volume 4:</i>	
FOURTH KNESSET 1959-1961	1123
FIFTH KNESSET 1961-1965	1243
SIXTH KNESSET 1965-1969	1465

Volume 5:

SEVENTH KNESSET 1969-1973 1685
EIGHTH KNESSET 1974-1977 1875

Volume 6:

NINTH KNESSET 1977-1981 2081
Presentation of the New Government
 Sitting 3 — 20 June 1977 2083
Problems of Drafting Women into the Army
 Sitting 6 — 29 June 1977 2117
Prime Minister's Statement on His Visit to the U.S.
 Sitting 18 — 27 July 1977 2122
Political Situation in Light of the Joint U.S.-U.S.S.R. Statement
 Sitting 27 — 13 October 1977 2153
Knesset Visit of Egyptian President Sadat
 Sitting 43 — 20 November 1977 2163
Israel's Peace Plan
 Sitting 61 — 28 December 1977 2188
Political Situation and Reply to Sadat's Speech
 Sitting 71 — 23 January 1978 2211
Camp David Accords
 Sitting 145 — 25 September 1978 2231
German Statute of Limitations for Nazi War Crimes
 Sitting 156 — 20 November 1978 2275
Electoral Reform Proposal
 Sitting 178 — 10 January 1979 2291
U.S. President Carter Addresses the Knesset
 Sitting 203 — 12 March 1979 2295
Peace Treaty between Israel and Egypt
 Sitting 206 — 20 March 1979 2318
Proposed Change in the Parliamentary Immunity Law
 Sitting 231 — 6 June 1979 2387

Proposal to Allow the Prime Minister to Dismiss Ministers
 Sitting 231 — 6 June 1979 2396
Basic Law: Jerusalem, the Capital of Israel
 Sitting 360 — 23 July 1980 2406
Proposal for Unilateral Autonomy in the Territories
 Sitting 399 — 24 December 1980 2414
Proposed Basic Law: Declaration of Independence
 Sitting 402 — 31 December 1980 2418
Political and Military Situation
 Sitting 442 — 11 May 1981 2424
Glossary of Political Parties and Personalities 2435
Index 2493

JCPA SERIES IN JEWISH POLITICAL STUDIES

Co-Published by the Jerusalem Center for Public Affairs
and University Press of America

- Kinship and Consent: The Jewish Political Tradition and its Contemporary Uses*, Daniel J. Elazar, ed. (1983)
- Synagogue Havurot: A Comparative Study*, Gerald B. Bubis and Harry Wasserman with Alan Lert (1983)
- The Balkan Jewish Communities: Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, Greece, and Turkey*, Daniel J. Elazar, Harriet Pass Freidenreich, Baruch Hazzan, and Adina Weiss Liberles (1984)
- The Jewish Communities of Scandinavia: Sweden, Denmark, Norway, and Finland*, Daniel J. Elazar, Adina Weiss Liberles, and Simcha Werner (1984)
- Self-Rule/Shared Rule: Federal Solutions to the Middle East Conflict*, Daniel J. Elazar, ed. (1984)
- The Heavenly Kingdom: Aspects of Political Thought in the Talmud and Midrash*, Gordon Freeman (1985)
- Federalism and Political Integration*, Daniel J. Elazar, ed. (1985)
- Partners and Pursestrings: A History of the United Israel Appeal*, Ernest Stock (1987)
- Project Renewal: Urban Revitalization Through Partnership*, Paul King, Orli HaCohen, Hillel Frisch, and Daniel J. Elazar (1987)
- A Classification System for Libraries of Judaica*, 2nd ed., David H. Elazar and Daniel J. Elazar (1987)
- Saving the Jewish Family: Myths and Realities in the Diaspora, Strategies for the Future*, Gerald Bubis (1987)
- The Unseen Israelis: The Jews from Turkey in Israel*, Walter F. Weiker (1988)
- Local Government in Israel*, Daniel J. Elazar and Chaim Kalchheim, eds. (1988)
- The New Jewish Politics*, Daniel J. Elazar, ed. (1988)

- Economic and Social Policy in Israel: The First Generation*, Moshe Sanbar, ed. (1989)
- Morality and Power: Contemporary Jewish Views*, Daniel J. Elazar, ed. (1989)
- Constitutionalism: The Israeli and American Experiences*, Daniel J. Elazar, ed. (1990)
- Maintaining Consensus: The Canadian Jewish Polity in the Postwar World*, Daniel J. Elazar and Harold M. Waller (1990)
- The Politics of Urban Planning Policy in Israel*, Efraim Torgovnik (1990)
- Two Peoples—One Land: Federal Solutions for Israel, the Palestinians and Jordan*, Daniel J. Elazar (1991)
- Authority, Power and Leadership in the Jewish Polity: Cases and Issues*, Daniel J. Elazar, ed. (1991)
- Constitutional Design and Power-Sharing in the Post-Modern Epoch*, Daniel J. Elazar, ed. (1991)
- Urban Revitalization: Israel's Project Renewal and Other Experiences*, Daniel J. Elazar and Zvi R. Marom, eds. (1992)
- Major Knesset Debates, 1948–1981*, 6 vols., Netanel Lorch, ed. (1992)
- A Double Bond: The Constitutional Documents of American Jewry*, Daniel J. Elazar, Jonathan Sarna, and Rela Monson, eds. (1992)
- Ottomans, Turks and the Jewish Polity: A History of the Jews of Turkey*, Walter F. Weiker (1992)
- Resisting Reform: A Policy Analysis of the Israeli Health Care Delivery System*, Gerald Steinberg and Etta Bick (1992)

NINTH KNESSET 1977–1981

Presentation of the New Government

Introduction

The Eighth Knesset decided to dissolve itself and hold early elections once the coalition had lost its majority as a result of what came to be known, sarcastically, as "the brilliant maneuver": forcing the National Religious Party to leave the government because its members had abstained on a vote of no-confidence. Thus, elections took place on 17 May 1977 rather than in the autumn of that year as originally scheduled. This time the Labor Alignment list was headed by Shimon Peres. A judicial proceeding against his wife concerning an alleged illegal bank account abroad, in contravention of currency control regulations, prevailed upon Yitzhak Rabin, the outgoing prime minister, not to compete for the number one slot but to settle for a modest 20th place on the list, the place he had occupied in the previous elections.

Although polls had predicted that Labor's representation would be reduced from the 51 seats it had held at the beginning of the Eighth Knesset, few people on the Labor side were prepared for the extent of the Alignment's defeat, it being awarded only 32 seats. The difference went to the Likud, headed as always by Menahem Begin, which for the first time emerged as the largest party group, with 43 seats, and to the newly-established Democratic Movement for Change, headed by Yigael Yadin, a former general and well-known archaeologist, which obtained 15 seats, an unprecedented feat for a brand new party.

For the first time in Israel's history the President charged an MK who was not from the Labor ranks with the task of forming a government. After twenty-eight years as the perennial leader of the major opposition party, Menahem Begin finally assumed office. His original narrow coalition was based on the Likud and the Orthodox parties; after some weeks had passed the DMC also joined. A striking feature of Begin's first government, one which received world-wide attention, was the fact that Moshe Dayan, who had served as a cabinet minister under successive Labor prime ministers, and had been elected to the Ninth Knesset on the Labor list, was to serve as foreign minister. He abandoned the Alignment party group in the Knesset but did not join the Likud, preferring—for parliamentary purposes—to operate as an independent ("a lone, or lonely") MK.

On 20 June 1977 Menahem Begin presented his first government to the Knesset, asked for, and obtained its confidence.

Sitting 3 of the Ninth Knesset

20 June 1977 (4 Tammuz 5737)

M. Begin (Likud): My dear Mr. President, Mr. Speaker, Knesset Members, by the democratic process of which we are so proud, the nation in Israel decided on May 17 that there should be a change of guard in our government. A party which formed the leadership of the Zionist Organization and the governments of Israel for many years has become the second party in the Knesset, while a political body which has served the nation patiently, remaining faithful to the rules of democracy as the parliamentary opposition, has become the leading party and has been asked to form the new government....

The voters have put their trust in us, but we will not be arrogant. We know that the real tests lie ahead of us, and because the government and its policy is new, I ask the House and the nation to give it moral credit, at least for its first year. We will not be able to amend injustices and advance the country in the social, economic and political spheres overnight. We strongly desire to do so, and we will make a supreme effort and work hard in order to implement our positive plans, to undertake those things for which the nation has given us its confidence. But this takes time. I hope that we will be given moral credit and will be able to begin benefiting all the strata of the nation, with national agreement.

Upon taking office, the President of the U.S., Mr. Carter, quoted the Prophet Micah: "He hath shewed thee, O man, what is good; and what doth the Lord require of thee, but to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God." Those words have been and always will be our guiding light. But Micah the Morasthite also had an apocalyptic vision, one which was remarkably similar to that of Isaiah the son of Amoz. The heart of any man who loves liberty, peace and justice must be stirred by the words: "And they shall beat their swords into plowshares, and their spears into pruninghooks: nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war anymore." We will be guided by that vision too, in the belief and knowledge that that is one of the outstanding contributions of Jewish thought to human culture, and that the day will come when wars between nations will cease, there will be an end to weapons of destruction and all men shall dwell in peace.

After describing his all-encompassing vision, Micah the Morasthite continues: "For all the people will walk every one in the name of his god, and we will walk in the name of the Lord our God forever and ever." By virtue of that ancient heritage of thousands of years I declare that the government of Israel will not ask any nation, whether near or far, great or small, to recognize our right to exist. The right to exist, Mr. Speaker? It would never occur to any Briton or Frenchman, Belgian or

Dutchman, Hungarian or Bulgarian, Russian or American to request recognition of his nation's right to exist. Their existence is their right, and the same applies to Israel. We received the right to exist from the God of our fathers at the dawn of human history, almost four thousand years ago, and for that right, which has been sanctified with the blood of Jews in every generation, we have paid a price which is unprecedented in the annals of mankind. That fact neither decreases nor weakens our right. Quite the contrary. I therefore stress once more that we do not expect anyone to request recognition to dwell in the land of our forefathers on our behalf. A different kind of recognition is required between us and our neighbors, recognition of sovereignty and the mutual need for a life of peace and understanding....For that recognition we will make every effort.

The Land of Israel, the pleasant land of our forefathers, is our only land. Throughout the generations we have adhered to it. We never severed our link with it. We prayed for it, pined for it, loved it with all our hearts and souls. We did not forget it for a single instant while we were in exile, and our sainted forebears bore its name on their lips even as they were being dragged to every manner of strange death by a cruel and murderous enemy. We were exiled from our land and returned to it in faith, by right and with sacrifices, with praiseworthy pioneering endeavor and a glorious war for our independence. No one gave us our liberty. We gained it with the last vestiges of our national strength in the generation in which one-third of our number was killed and no one came to our aid.

More than seventy years ago Ze'ev Jabotinsky wrote of this country:

Indeed, the true nucleus of our national uniqueness is the pure fruit of the Land of Israel. Before coming to the Land of Israel we were not a nation and we did not exist. On the soil of the Land of Israel the Jewish nation was forged from the fragments of various peoples. On the soil of the Land of Israel we grew and became citizens; we harvested the belief in one god, breathing in the winds of the land, and as we struggled for independence and sovereignty we were enveloped by the winds and our bodies were fed by the grain which grew on our soil. The ideas of our prophets developed in the Land of Israel, and it was there that the Song of Songs was penned. Everything that is Jewish in us was given to us by the Land of Israel. Everything else that is in us is not Jewish. The Jewish people and the Land of Israel are one and the same thing.

We have echoed this in our government's guidelines: "The Jewish people has an eternal historic and inalienable right to the Land of Israel, the heritage of our forefathers."

We will try to deepen our friendship with the U.S. That will be one of the basic tenets of our policy. Not only deep-seated emotions and belief

in the values of morals and democracy are shared by America and Israel. We are also linked, in my opinion, by genuine and far-reaching common interests. Israel is an integral part of the free world, but the free, democratic world has shrunk considerably of late. It can be compared to an island upon whose shores crash the stormy waves and murky waters of totalitarianism. A famous nineteenth century slogan should be adapted to our times to say: free men of the world, unite! We must all stand together to repel the danger and preserve human liberty.

We are interested in the normalization of the relations between Israel and the U.S.S.R. There have been three periods in the relations between Zionism in the Land of Israel and the U.S.S.R. From the time of the Bolshevik Revolution, for almost thirty years, there was implacable hostility which originated from Moscow. During the late 1940s came the great turning-point. Under the influence of the War of Independence against British rule, Moscow began to regard the aspiration for the revival of the Jewish state as one for human progress, and we all remember the speeches of Gromyko and Charapkin about the urgent need to establish the Jewish state.

In the 1950s there was a turn for the worse once more, and Moscow supported our enemies, equipping them with destructive weapons, knowing full well that they would be turned against the surviving remnant of the Jewish people, whose annihilation its leaders had seen with their own eyes on the soil of their land and elsewhere.

When the Six Day War broke out the U.S.S.R. severed diplomatic relations with Israel. The renewal of these relations depends, by the nature of things, on Moscow's initiative. If such an initiative comes we will demand that an end be put to the persecution of and incitement against Judaism and Zionism, that all the prisoners of Zion be released and that all the Jews of the U.S.S.R. who so wish will be enabled to immigrate to Israel or, as our brethren in the U.S.S.R. term it, the historic homeland of the Jewish people.

Our overriding concern is to prevent a new war in the Middle East. I hereby call on King Hussein, President Sadat and President Assad to confer with me, whether in one of our capitals or on neutral ground, whether in public or out of the public eye, to discuss making true peace. Much blood, too much blood, both Jewish and Arab, has been shed in this region. Let us put an end to the bloodshed, which we hate. Let us sit down sincerely and seriously at the negotiating table. If this call meets with a refusal, we will take note of Arab intransigence. It will not be something new. Five Prime Ministers who preceded me—David Ben-Gurion, Moshe Sharett, Levi Eshkol, Golda Meir and Yitzhak Rabin—called for meetings of this kind and there was no answer from the other side, or there was a negative reply. But we will not tire of making our appeal, not for propaganda purposes but for the essential needs of our people and our country.

And now we must appeal to ourselves, to our people. I call on those citizens of Israel who have left the country to come home. In the past our enemies said that a Jew's homeland was wherever he prospered. We will take no heed of them, but let us prove to ourselves that with the renewal of our independence and freedom Jews act on the maxim that it is good to live in their homeland, however hard it may be. The government will do what it can to make things easy for returning families. We will not call them names. Insults do not solve any problem. We will simply tell them: it's time to come home.

We call on the younger generation, in the homeland and the diaspora, to arise, immigrate and settle the land. Come from the west and the east, from the north and the south, to build the Land of Israel together. There is room for millions of people in the Land of Israel. We do not want to, neither shall we, dispossess a single Arab inhabitant of his land. Jews and Arabs, Druse and Circassians can live together in this country, and they must live together in peace, mutual respect, with equal rights, freedom and social and economic progress.

The government intends to bring before the Knesset bills for universal health insurance, compulsory arbitration in essential services, a minimum wage, pension rights...and housing rights. We will also submit proposals for laws intended to put an end to violent crime. We must all make an effort to return to the sublime tradition of the Jewish people...when crimes against the person were unknown among us. We must build a just Land of Israel, but we must also see to it that our nation is beautiful, honest and pure, imbued with respect for one another, law-abiding and able to set a good example to others.

Not a few people have committed economic crimes, whether because of the severity of our restricting laws or for other reasons. The government will consider striking the sins of the past off the record and making a fresh start in that sphere too. We look to the future. If the state respects the individual, the individual will respect its laws.

We will all educate the younger generation on the basis of the human and Jewish values to which the spirit of the nation has always adhered: love of mankind, love of freedom and justice, and love of the homeland. We have a wonderful, serious, devoted and loyal younger generation. We have seen it at various testing times. It has withstood them all with honor and dedication. All our concern and love is directed to it, and we hope the day will come when, with God's help, we will hand to the younger generation a country and state of which we and all free men can be proud.

In order to attain economy and efficiency, I intend to make changes in the structure of the government. We will cancel some ministries and combine others. For example, we will cancel the Ministry of Police, which has no parallel in any other democratic country, and transfer its activities to the Ministry of the Interior; we will combine the Ministry of

Tourism with the Ministry of Commerce and Industry...; we will establish a new ministry, to be known as the Ministry of Social Welfare, which will combine the activities of the Ministries of Welfare and Labor and also the National Insurance Institute; for the immediate future we will keep the Ministry of Health, but if there is a change in the composition of the government and it is necessary to join this ministry with that of Social Affairs we will consider that possibility favorably; we will transfer to the sphere of responsibility of the Minister of Housing, henceforth to be called the Minister of Construction, areas connected with construction which are currently dealt with by the Ministry of Labor; we will merge the Ministry of Transport with the Ministry of Communications; we will set up a new Ministry of Energy and Infrastructure whose spheres of responsibility will encompass, amongst other things, subjects associated with energy which are currently dealt with by the Treasury and the Ministry of Commerce and Industry, etc....These are just a few examples of the changes we intend making in the structure of the ministries....

The guidelines of the government are: 1. we recognize the unity of fate and joint struggle for existence of the Jewish people in the Land of Israel and the diaspora; 2. the Jewish people has an eternal historic and inalienable right to the Land of Israel, the heritage of our forefathers; 3. the government will plan, establish and encourage rural and urban settlement on the soil of the homeland; 4. the government will place the encouragement of immigration at the forefront of the nation's missions; 5. the government will set the aspiration for peace at the head of its concerns and will endeavor actively and steadfastly to attain permanent peace in the region; 6. the government will invite each and every one of Israel's neighbors, directly or by means of a friendly country, to conduct direct negotiations with the object of signing peace treaties with them, without preconditions on the part of either side and without formulae prepared by outside elements. Each side shall be free to make any proposal, and every subject shall be open to negotiation; 7. the government declares its readiness to participate in the Geneva Conference, when it is invited to do so by the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. on the basis of Resolutions 242 and 338; 8. prior to the Geneva Conference and direct negotiations, the government announces Israel's readiness to conduct negotiations to attain a contractual, practical and genuine peace which will lead to the normalization of life in the region; 9. in the absence of peace treaties, the parties will be bound by the agreements signed by the previous governments; 10. the Knesset has authorized the Government by law to impose the law, jurisdiction and administration of the state on the entire area of the Land of Israel to be determined by an order; this legal and parliamentary authority is at the government's discretion, and will not be implemented while negotiations for a peace treaty are being conducted by Israel and its neighbors. It will be con-

nected with choosing the appropriate time, the government's political considerations, a special debate in the Knesset and its authorization by the latter; 11. there shall be equal rights for all citizens and inhabitants, without distinction of creed, race, national affiliation, sex or ethnic group; 12. the government will ensure individual liberties and freedom, encourage free enterprise and equal opportunities, and promote the possibility of progress and prosperity for the individual; 13. there will be a continual campaign to bring home to Zion from the U.S.S.R. all those Jews who wish to leave, and to rescue the Jews of Syria and the other Arab countries; 14. inflation will be checked, the currency stabilized and a decent standard of living assured to all the inhabitants of the country; 15. action will be taken to eradicate poverty and help large families, particularly in the areas of housing and education.

C. Biton (Democratic Front for Peace and Equality): How? By appointing MK David Levy?

M. Begin (Likud): 16. a continual effort will be made to increase foreign investments and renew economic growth; a particular effort will be made to construct rental accommodation; 17. the government will endeavor to guarantee employment, the joy of production and labor ethics; 18. the government will encourage and stimulate an increase in productivity in an attempt to achieve a rapid growth in the gross national product and to increase exports; 19. the government will act to improve labor relations and reduce disputes, introducing legislation for compulsory arbitration in essential services; 20. the government will act to encourage and expand agriculture and settlement of every kind; 21. steps will be taken to prevent emigration, bring Israeli citizens home and increase immigration from both the West and the East; 22. the government will act to increase respect for the law and eradicate crime and violence; 23. a long school day will be introduced and education will be based on the values of Judaism and Zionism, love of the Jewish people and the homeland; 24. the government will guarantee freedom of conscience and religion for everyone, providing public religious services and religious education for all children whose parents so desire; 25. the status quo will be maintained as regards religion; 26. the government will honor the international agreements signed by the previous governments.

Y. Allon (Alignment): Ha, ha, ha.

(From the floor: Mocking the poor!)

S. Aloni (Citizens' Rights Movement): Have you read the Coalition Agreement?

M. Begin (Likud): Everything will be clarified in the debate.

S. Aloni (Citizens' Rights Movement): With God's help, of course.

M. Begin (Likud): Mr. Speaker, I have presented my government and brought its guidelines before the Knesset for its approval, and I now respectfully request the confidence of the House in the government.

...

S. Peres (Alignment): Distinguished President, Mr. Speaker, distinguished Knesset, representing the opposition is not something I am accustomed to, but that, too, is a weighty and responsible mission to be discharged on behalf of a large part of the nation, a part which has been and is involved in productive labor and the struggle for independence, a part whose future lies before it. If I had been a little longer in opposition I would have reminded Mr. Begin that we are not founding the state anew today but changing the government. We are parting from the government benches after twenty-nine years of bearing responsibility for establishing the State of Israel, making it grow, defending it and developing it. There have not been twenty-nine years like them since the time of the First Temple.

Before the establishment of the state there were years of pioneering endeavor, illegal immigration and struggle, and throughout that period the Labor movement was at the wheel, making decisions and acting. We now number three million Jews, the largest concentration of the Jewish people in its homeland. We established the IDF and prevailed in four wars—defenders against aggressors, few against many. We established an agricultural infrastructure of collective settlements [kibbutzim] and farming communities [moshavim] which is the most advanced and fruitful known to mankind. We developed sophisticated industries which are capable of building planes, developing computers, desalinating seawater and generating solar energy. We established an educational system which is one of the most advanced in the world. We built a judicial system which arouses respect and trust. We developed admirable institutions of mutual aid, changed the landscape and linked past and future in the history of the people and the land.

We built a democratic Jewish state, the state of a working, studying, fighting and peace-loving nation; a state which does not flinch from dangers, but does not glorify them either; a state which does not bow its head before powerful, aggressive enemies but does not ignore international realities either; the most exciting state which has arisen in the twentieth century in terms of human and social change.

In accordance with the wishes expressed by some of the voters in Israel, we vacate our place at the helm today, doing so with our heads held high, proud of what we have achieved and the course we have taken. We are aware of the mistakes which accompany great, continuous and exhausting activity. We will not make excuses for the mistakes, but we are convinced that they are no more than passing lapses. We are very proud of our country. We are imbued with love for its uniqueness and

originality. And wherever we may be, whether at the helm or in opposition, we will continue to serve it to the best of our ability.

We will not put our confidence in the new government, because we think that its course is a mistaken one, one which does not lead to the haven we desire, which does not accord with the needs of the nation and opposes our interests as a Labor movement. We will not rejoice at the government's downfall. We will fight its policy in the Knesset and among the public until the nation withdraws its confidence from it. And even as we fight we will not shrug off our responsibility. I suggest that the new government make a study of national responsibility prior to returning to the opposition. I hope that we will learn the benefits of being in opposition, and that that lesson will stand us in good stead when we return to the helm.

G. Cohen (Likud): You have forgotten nothing and learned nothing.

S. Peres (Alignment): I don't need a Deputy Minister of Education to teach me. I have followed the negotiations for the formation of the government and found that the Prime Minister-designate was ready to pay—and has in fact paid—his associates a high price in the most essential national spheres so that he may be enabled to implement the policy to which...he has adamantly adhered. In the course of this he has rejected association with the Democratic Movement for Change (DMC), which has sought in vain to influence his policy line.

He has found certain coalition partners who have agreed to accept his outlook: the Liberal part of the Likud, which looks primarily to the economic sphere; and the religious partner, which is based on...a rabbinical viewpoint as regards the running of the country. Mr. Begin has responded with alarming generosity to their many demands, whose implications for the life of the country will be very great and grave.

The Minister of Finance-designate, who is the head of the Liberal branch, will be entitled to seek solutions without being deterred by unemployment. I am acquainted with those economic theories and the camouflage of controlled unemployment. I cannot imagine a more anti-Zionist act than causing unemployment. It will harm immigrants and deter immigration, which in any case is gradually being eroded by emigration. It will harm the youngsters who are demobilized from the army, as well as the poorer sections of the population.

We are aware of the tendency to injure the laboring sector and the collective settlements, even though they have proved their viability, not to mention their pioneering contribution in settling the country and creating jobs. This will be done in order to increase the number of capitalists and enlarge the capital in the hands of those who already exist. We, the Labor party, believed that Israel, where there is room for private enterprise—

Y. Hurwitz (Likud): Who made the capitalists if not your party?

S. Peres (Alignment): Yigal, in that sphere I will not compete with your specialized knowledge....We believed that Israel would be built by farmers, not solely or primarily by millionaires. The pioneering concept established agriculture which is ranked among the foremost in the world. Public industries and those of the Federation of Labor and the state have proved what can be done when the motivation is the profit of the nation, not of a few prosperous individuals.

Mr. Begin has granted the National Religious Party the right to block the change in the electoral system, as well as concessions which will bring about a split in the nation, both here and in the diaspora, even though in its election platform the Likud promised a change in the electoral system....We have enjoyed a long partnership with the NRP, going with it, not following it. It went with us, honorably and in its own way. We refrained from harming it, while maintaining the unity of the nation. I regret the fact that the NRP has been caught in a vise between Mr. Begin, who makes concessions, and the Council of Sages, which makes demands....Thus, henceforth it will not be the IDF which decides by law when women may be released from serving in the army, but the women themselves, who will decide according to a vague concept called "family background."

M. Porush (Aguda): That's not correct. Mr. Ben-Gurion decided to use family background.

S. Peres (Alignment): Your retroactive admiration for Ben-Gurion is touching. Mr. Ben-Gurion decided to use family background; he did not say that the women should determine what it is. That's the difference. He said that the IDF should decide what reasons of conscience were. Now that will be determined by a rabbinical court or the women themselves.

S. Lorincz (Aguda): In Ben-Gurion's time there were no exemption committees.

S. Peres (Alignment): Now the choice is in the hands of the women and the rabbinical courts....The IDF was never in greater need of educated and dedicated manpower. Women are an important component of the army's administration and power....What is the point of all this? Couldn't our Orthodox friends have continued with the existing situation, one which brought people closer and prevented conflict? Why did the Prime Minister-designate accede to that request? The answer is simple: he seeks to create a gulf between the Orthodox parties and the Labor movement, and wants to run the country with a free hand, and hence both the Orthodox parties and the Likud have agreed to policies which they oppose so that the Prime Minister-designate can implement his own policy....

Mr. Begin has preferred a government which has a narrow parliamentary base rather than having to form an alliance with elements which seek to moderate his positions, such as the DMC....Mr. Begin was kind enough to suggest that we join his government, as was exemplified by the fact that he expressed his support for the idea of a national unity government when he was in a minority. Mr. Begin apparently prefers to forget the fact that he himself left it—incurring the disapprobation of some of his colleagues—in August 1970, not because the emergency situation had come to an end, but on the contrary, because, he claimed, the situation had deteriorated....He said at the time that...it would not be six months before the government was submitting maps to Dr. Jarring and undertaking a wholesale withdrawal on the basis of Resolution 242....Seven years have passed since then, no maps have been submitted and no withdrawal has been undertaken....

M. Pa'il (Sheli): But you have brought the Likud to power.

S. Peres (Alignment): Today, after a long delay, we have been privileged to hear that the Likud will honor the decisions of the previous governments, and maybe Resolution 242 too. How fortunate Mr. Begin is that previous governments made decisions to which he objected at the time and which he is now utilizing as he embarks on his course.

There is an historic argument between the courses advocated by Herut and Labor....But the seminal problem of our time is the one which embodies the greatest hope of averting war—progress towards peace—as well as the greatest hope of maintaining our friendship with the U.S. and of advancing a society which is Israeli, attracts immigration and enhances the individual. The Labor Party built the highway of the State of Israel, a road which is being paved between a great Jewish vision and a gloomy international and regional reality, a path which distinguishes between what is possible and what is not....

The State of Israel came into existence also because we were prepared to accept a painful territorial compromise....Ben-Gurion realized that the historic moment had come, with all its exigencies, and should not be missed. The truth is that compromise is sometimes the maximum, not the minimum, and opposition to a compromise is sometimes less than the minimum. Compromise is not an ideal in itself, and the argument focuses on real progress, at the appropriate time, towards implementation of the vision, not on maximalism or minimalism in the fulfillment of Zionism. We dared to compromise...in the War of Independence, in the Sinai Campaign, in the Six Day War, in crossing the Suez Canal, in the Entebbe rescue operation, in establishing industries which are among the most advanced in the world. The policy to which we aspire is clear, though it may contain inner discrepancies, because reality contains discrepancies. We seek to give Israel defensible borders; we are committed to preserving the unity of Jerusalem; we support

settlement activities which also have defense value, and do not dispossess Arabs of their land; we desire to preserve the Jewish character of the State of Israel; we reject the establishment of a Palestinian state; we reject returning to the 1967 borders, but we also reject imposing Israeli law on Judea, Samaria and Gaza. To achieve all that we are prepared to go—not merely to be invited—to full peace negotiations in Geneva. We are prepared to conduct negotiations on ending the state of belligerency. We have also expressed our readiness to reach a territorial compromise in return for true peace.

The refusal to compromise, the policy of “not one inch” and the rejection of peace are still the truth on the Arab side, not on ours. We will not let hostile elements place the responsibility for that Arab truth on our shoulders. That policy has enabled us to maintain close relations with the U.S., sustain the approval of world public opinion, preserve our association with labor movements all over the world, including in the U.S., and has justified restraint from war for those Arabs who were prepared to listen. It enabled us to attain agreements with Syria and Egypt, reach an open bridges policy with Jordan and the Good Fence with Lebanon. It enabled us to equip the IDF with the best weapons and establish settlements in the Golan Heights, the West Bank, the Sinai and the Rafah region, without a great fanfare.

We do not endorse everything President Carter has said, just as we have not invariably accepted all the policy positions of the U.S. But we conducted the debate between us from a situation which enabled a large part of the American public to adopt a positive attitude vis-à-vis Israel's point of departure, which was accorded credit by virtue of the word “compromise.”...Like the U.S., we are interested in maintaining the dynamics of peace in the Middle East, in dissuading the Arabs from resorting to war once more, in keeping the Russians out of Egypt, and in enabling the U.S. to deal with the peaceful resolution of the Middle East conflict....

When Mr. Begin told MK Yadin that he rejected any territorial compromise...that resounded throughout the world, as well as in the U.S., of course. What has it achieved, extra territory or loss of support...? For twenty-nine years we represented Israel as a country which aspired to peace, and was even prepared to pay a price for it, provided it did not injure its security and independence....

If the Arabs attack us again obviously the whole nation, government and opposition, will stand shoulder to shoulder to defend the country, and the Arab aggressor will encounter an army which is more ready and better-equipped than ever before. But even if the Arabs are not prepared to make peace, is it necessary to reject every other possibility...? Between war and peace there is a wide range of possible agreements regarding territory and timetables, and Israel's clear interest is to muster every fragment of a chance of moving towards the rejection and

prevention of war, the cessation of the state of belligerency and the attainment of true peace.

Mr. Begin rejected the Armistice Agreements of 1949; the withdrawal from the Gaza Strip and the Sinai in 1957; the semantic flexibility of Resolution 242; the ceasefire of August 1970; the ceasefire of October 1973; the Disengagement Agreement with Egypt in January 1974; the Disengagement Agreement with Syria in May 1974; the Sinai Agreement of September 1975. It is true that those agreements were less than peace, but they rescued the region from additional wars, adding periods of calm and construction, and perhaps even brought peace a fraction closer.

We do not accept a policy whose declarations serve no purpose and harm the aims which we desire, a policy of all or nothing, a policy without diplomacy or any strategy for bringing tranquillity to this strife-torn region....The Alignment will constitute a fighting opposition, and will not change its views because it has changed its position in the House. We will be prepared to implement everything we propose the moment the nation gives us its renewed confidence. We will present plans and a course which will bring in the future, as they have in the past, power to Israel, strength to the Jewish people, the building of the country and the ingathering of the nation.

(From the floor: Begin says it better.)

So what? I see that you are a new Knesset Member and really think that the argument is about the way things are said. You are wrong....Mr. Speaker, distinguished Knesset, we are proud of what we have done and trust in what we propose. We are certain that we will attain the renewed confidence of the nation, because our course is the right one....

Y. Yadin (Democratic Movement for Change): Mr. Speaker, distinguished Knesset...there has been a cataclysmic change in Israel, after many years of the leadership of one party there has been a change of guard. That is the breath of life of democracy, and every citizen of the state should rejoice at this fact, which indicates that Israel is a democratic society where the voter decides who shall sit in government. I congratulate the Likud on emerging from the elections as the largest party and on having been invited to form the government....Naturally, the current electoral system, which we oppose, cannot determine in a clear-cut way who the nation prefers to represent it in the Knesset. I hope that the next Knesset will be elected according to the regional-proportional-personal system, and that we will be able to congratulate a government which is the nation's clear choice to run the country for four years.

This is also a pleasant opportunity to welcome another, very positive phenomenon. For the first time in Israel's history government has been transferred from one party to another, and the smooth way this has been

done—with one or two minor exceptions—is commendable....What happened on May 17 was that the voters chose to change the traditional ruling establishment, which sought today to take the credit for all the state's achievements. The voters chose to put an end to the alienation of the government from the nation which is accentuated by the present electoral system....The voters sought to draw the Alignment's attention to the writing on the wall, at a time when it was blind to the growing corruption in many centers of government and the distortion or abandonment of the principles and ideals which once led the nation. In other words, the voters said "no" to the existing state of affairs and, more than that, wanted a change.

The Prime Minister-designate, MK Menahem Begin, interpreted the election results differently...regarding them as a referendum on foreign affairs and defense, and claiming that the majority of the nation approves a policy of no compromise. Most of the Likud's election propaganda made no mention of this subject....It is true that the nation wants a trustworthy government which will protect Israel's defense interests firmly, but I interpret the election results to mean that the nation wants an internal change in society and the administration, so that we may be strong in the face of external dangers. Firmness in defending the country does not stand in contradiction to flexibility in conducting its foreign policy....

We interpret the election results as indicating that the voters wanted the Democratic Movement for Change...a movement which has only just been formed and is the third largest party in the Knesset. The voters wanted the DMC as the Likud's chief partner in the government. But that is not the course the Likud took, preferring the religious party, which has been the Alignment's traditional coalition partner, and has a share in both the achievements and the blunders of the past, and against which the voters have spoken. Is that the change the voters wanted...?

The concessions made to the religious parties will not bring glory to religion in Israel, in my view....Mr. Begin, who was the commander of the IZL, in whose ranks both men and women fought, has decided to absolve women of the duty of serving in the IDF, simply on the basis of their own declaration, and without obliging them to serve the country in any other way....When we established the IDF I remember that we insisted that all army kitchens should adhere to the dietary laws and that the way of life of religious soldiers should not be adversely affected. We also opposed establishing separate units for Orthodox soldiers, because we are a united nation with one army. Is the IDF inimical to religious people? Why does the Likud government take another step towards alienating certain sections of the public from the IDF? I believe with all my heart and soul that the State of Israel, the Jewish state, must see to the religious needs of those who want them, not for coalitionary purposes but because freedom of conscience works both ways: not merely to prevent

the imposition of the religious way of life on free-thinking persons, but also to provide Orthodox people with decent conditions and enable them to live as they please, without any restriction of their rights. I would like to ask the members of the Liberal Party whether they can live in peace with this coalitionary agreement...?

We have conducted exhaustive discussions regarding the government's guidelines, not wishing to impose our ideology on the Likud. The Likud said the same to us, but it is doubtful whether it acted accordingly. In the negotiations with us no mention was made of going to Geneva on the basis of Resolutions 242 and 338. The current formula refers to an invitation...not the content of the resolution, and is misleading. Why is it impossible to state our intentions clearly? We have always accused certain undemocratic countries of saying one thing for internal purposes and another for external ones. Have we adopted that approach now...?

We proposed that the guidelines include the word "compromise." We also subscribe to the view that there should be no withdrawal without peace, that there should not be a third, separate state west of the River Jordan, and that there should be settlement activity in the Jordan Valley, the Rafah area and anywhere else where defense considerations dictate this....To say, as Mr. Begin has, that a government which is prepared to compromise within the framework of true peace is an anti-Zionist and anti-realistic government is to put a new interpretation on political and practical Zionism.

We had better not compete here as to who is the greater Zionist. Zionism has never said that there was no alternative. It is not true that in the past we won wars because there was no alternative. Our alternative was not to be here. We won and will win because the alternative we chose was to be here, in the land of our fathers, and our object is to build a free and democratic, productive and creative nation here, one which is proud of its heritage and a proud member of the family of nations. But each generation must set its course by the light of contemporary reality.... We must establish new patterns for Judaism now that we have returned to our land, as our sages did in ancient times, after the destruction of the Temple. The challenge of modern Zionism is to build a nation which can live with all its varying streams of opinion, build its country, unite all the tribes and live as a free, liberal and democratic nation.

The new government is smaller than its predecessor—only sixteen ministers. To our regret, the Likud government has missed the opportunity to plan the structure of the government. The Likud's approach was a mechanical one—to reduce the government's size at all costs, regardless of functional needs. But one thing they found necessary to preserve was an independent Ministry of Religion. Thus, for example, no one person is responsible for the economy, a position which could serve as an essential tool for introducing far-reaching changes in the econ-

omy....We must use our limited resources wisely and well, utilizing to the full our advantages in scientific and managerial manpower....

We must plan our scientific, educational and economic policy accordingly. Then we will be able to hold our heads up high and say: we support ourselves by our own endeavors. But in order to do so we must organize ourselves differently....There must be a general Economic Ministry, which will coordinate and supervise the various economic functions currently undertaken by the Ministries of Finance, Commerce and Industry, Labor and Agriculture. Only a general Minister of Economics with authority, power and clearly-defined objectives will be able to achieve this....A similar position should be created to coordinate and supervise policy in the spheres of education, housing, health and of course welfare.

The principal phenomena which have aroused the nation's anger...concern the failure to implement Zionism in the most crucial spheres. Let us not forget that half of the nation in Israel still does not regard itself as being an integral part of one society; we have not yet become a nation which manufactures and works and supports itself by its own endeavors. The failure to fulfill those two objectives...means failure in implementing the Zionist vision, a state without a vision or an objective. In our unique political and military position this represents a very great danger....

Today more than ever we need a government which does not think that the fulfillment of Zionism ended with the establishment of the state, because the state is merely a means of attaining the additional objectives....In the absence of the Zionist vision our presence here becomes meaningless....If our sole consideration is material comfort, there are other countries where that can be achieved more easily...there are even countries where there are more Jews. It is a small distance from that viewpoint to losing faith in the justice of our being here, the security of our future and, primarily, the wonderful, unprecedented challenge which led our fathers and us to undertake an enterprise here which will go down in the annals of our nation as no less wondrous than the undertakings of Joshua the son of Nun, of Ezra and Nehemia, and the heroism of the Maccabees.

The essence of the Zionist vision is that the Jewish nation—which was a light unto the nations and from which went forth the prophets whose moral principles were taken over in one form or another by the majority of mankind—was exiled from its land, persecuted and suppressed, and some of its characteristics were distorted to some extent in the lands of the dispersion....There were, indeed, many great achievements, but our nation is always vulnerable in the period following great achievements, in the period of consolidation. After the stage of wandering in the desert and the conquest of the Land of Israel came the establishment of the monarchy, the founding of the governing establishment,

which forgot with time that its duty was to serve the people, not the reverse, and this led in turn to the protest movement exemplified by the wrathful words and railings against social injustice of the prophets....In the modern return to Zion we can see a similar pattern. The first two periods of wandering, followed by conquest and settlement, were the heroic periods, but after the establishment of the state and the consolidation of the instruments of government, the decline began. The spirit was replaced by the establishment; pioneering was replaced by bureaucracy; volunteering was replaced by orders.

The unification and strengthening of the nation is the principal challenge facing us today, surpassing in importance even the settlement of the entire Land of Israel. If we have to choose between a weak nation in the entire Land of Israel and a strong one in part of it, we opt for the latter, for our ultimate aim is to establish a democratic Jewish state here, one which is free and proud of its achievements, its labors and its moral values....

With all the modesty appropriate to a new party, we will try to do our duty in opposition, criticizing what should be criticized, condemning what should be condemned, welcoming whatever is positive and constructive. We have no interest in forming alliances or a coalition in opposition. This government, whose public base is narrow, whose ideological outlook is in contradiction to the central stream in Israeli society, whose plan of action in certain areas demands inappropriate procedures, does not deserve our confidence today. While voting against it now, we will judge it every day and support it unreservedly on the basis of its work and actions.

In conclusion, because of what I have just said, I would like to tell both our enemies and our friends not to put a mistaken interpretation on Israel's internal democratic competition. When it comes to the test we are united. Our existence here in the Land of Israel is based on belief in the justice of our cause, on the fact that few can prevail over many when they are superior in their moral standards and overall quality to their enemies, when every member of the Jewish nation is responsible for his brother, and when the Jewish genius wherever it may be must be mobilized in the service of the continued survival of the Jewish people. Our enemies must know today that once the Jewish people has established its third kingdom after two thousand years of exile, it cannot be overthrown again, and it will endure, prosper and grow in strength.

J. Burg (National Religious Party): Mr. Speaker, distinguished Knesset, a tradition shared by both coalition and opposition is that when a young, new Knesset Member makes his maiden speech, the veteran speaker who follows him congratulates him. I do so gladly as a veteran Knesset Member, a relic of the First Knesset. I congratulate MK Yadin on his maiden speech and have no doubt that as a result of his concern with Israel's antiquities and past, as we have heard today, he

omy....We n
the full our

We mus
cordingly. I
support our
organize ou
Ministry, v
functions c
merce and
of Economi
be able to s
nate and su
and of cour

The p
anger...con
spheres. Le
regard itse
come a nat
own endea
ure in impl
jective. In
very great

Today
that the fu
because th
tives....In
meaningle
other coun
countries
viewpoint
our futur
which led
go down it
takings of
ism of the

The e
was a lig
whose mc
majority
pressed, s
the lands
ments, br
achievem
ing in the
lishment

will be able to move towards the future. Someone who has written the "War of the Sons of Light" and traced the heroic epic of someone who has dealt voluntarily with war and survival—

S. Aloni (Citizens' Rights Movement): That's irrelevant.

J. Burg (National Religious Party): Madam, I am sure that both on other days I will give you other opportunities to interrupt I therefore propose that you preserve the youthful strength of the restricted party group. (Laughter in the Chamber.)

In the debate on the resignation of the ministers of my party December 1976...I said: "I maintain that it is not because of his that the Prime Minister proposed what he did, but because of his mess. He is running ahead, to early elections." That diagnosis proved correct. No one foresaw the real prognosis, however, I imagined then what the voters' reaction would be....The Representation of the end of the Eighth Knesset is represented by only 10 percent of the Knesset Members of the Ninth Knesset.

I will not compete with my friend Knesset Member Shimon Peres, neither in those passages which were a speech for tomorrow's election for the Federation of Labor—I have no need to compete in that way now—nor with regard to the bitterness of his tone....I assume that the developments of the coming weeks will enable us to see things in their true proportion. In everything in life there is light and shade, and opposition and the coalition in politics must necessarily see things differently....

My party, the National Religious Party, and I personally, have participated in the governments of Sharett, Ben-Gurion, Eshkol, Meir and Rabin, and together we have written shining pages in the history of the nation and the state, and even in this hour of parting I remember the growth of the country, its economy and its defense over the years. But the unrestrained thirst for power and undesirable developments in Israel and its society have led to a decline to which they responded overwhelmingly on election day.

Y. Sarid (Alignment): How can you speak of the unrestrained thirst for power? You are an historical phenomenon in that respect.

Y. Ben-Meir (National Religious Party): MK Sarid, no one can compete with your party's thirst for power, which is what put you out of the country.

J. Burg (National Religious Party): MK Sarid, do not fear, you will appear in my speech....(Laughter in the Chamber.) You probably remember Lord Acton's axiom: "All power corrupts. Absolute power corrupts absolutely." The National Religious Party, for which a majority was predicted by the surveys, emerged from the election coalition united and strengthened. I would like to remind those who accuse me of being a "satellite party" that...our history shows that at those

we thought that basic matters of principle were at stake, we did not want to cause a crisis...whether at the time of the Altalena, regarding anti-religious education of the immigrants in 1951 or the issue of a Jew, as you are well aware.

We are still the same religious Zionist movement with deep roots and broad horizons. Changes in emphasis, differences of opinion and variations are natural, but an important part of our life and outlook is our fierce desire to link the sections of the nation together, to quell hatred and base our political life on something which is common to all.

Aloni (Citizens' Rights Movement): By banning those who do not accept your authority.

J. Burg (National Religious Party): That is why we have always used our desire to establish a national unity government, and that is what we need today, in our opinion, perhaps today more than ever....We are not the ones whose slogan was "keep Maki and Herut out," and eighteen years ago, when grave danger threatened the nation and the government, we exerted tremendous pressure on Eshkol to form a national unity government, as a result of which Menahem Begin and Moshe Dayan joined the government....That is why...we were pleased when Menahem Begin proposed a national unity government to the Government and also to the DMC, and we regret the fact that his offer was not accepted. I am glad to note that a common language has been found with the Government, and this has doubtless been helped by the Prime Minister's positive attitude to the Jewish heritage and values. I hope that twenty-five years of standing on the sidelines have now ended for Aguda, and that joint work will bring people closer to one another.

Aloni (Citizens' Rights Movement): First get them into the Federation of Labor....

J. Burg (National Religious Party): Let it be noted in the public consciousness that a quarter of a million people voted for the religious party, thereby indicating that they regard Jewish religion as the focus of their spiritual, political and social lives, and let that also be noted by the Government to whom the existence of a religious party is anathema. MK Yadin, will not support any change in the electoral system which will remove the representatives of Orthodox Jewry from the political map of the country. The elections proved that it is not a change in the system which is at issue but the change in the voter's opinion. That change has indeed occurred, leading to a change in the parliamentary panorama....

I would like to say to all those who regard changing the electoral system as the penicillin or panacea for all our political and economic ills: let us ask Wilson and Callahan how stable their government is with an electoral system which can give a majority in parliament to a minority in the country. Is that what you want? Religious Jewry will

not accept that....Furthermore, the representation accorded the anti-religious parties has dwindled away to almost nothing....I am well aware of the fact that on matters of religion, conscience and world outlook there are differences of opinion. We know that and live with that, and our problem is how religious and secular Jews can live together. But I would like those Knesset Members who do not share my religious outlook to see things in the right proportion....

Not everything that religious people want is bad, and there are subjects on which the religious people set the tone, as in the case of post mortems....I remember former minister Dov Joseph saying, in the course of coalitionary negotiations, when you cannot take even a chair out of a dead man's apartment, why can you remove his heart from his body...? There have been coalitionary agreements on this subject in the past, but they have not been honored....

I regard the existence of the National Religious Party as a privilege and an obligation, a challenge and a test. Ours is not one of the parties which emerged after the Yom Kippur War or prior to these elections. For generations we have worked and settled the country, establishing facts on the ground, building a great homeland, adhering to our ancient tradition, combining spirit and fulfillment. Despite all our internal disagreements—which indicate a lively movement—our ranks include a splendid younger generation which has demonstrated adherence to its roots and the implementation of its ideals in Israel's wars and in settlement activities on both sides of the Green Line.

From this distinguished podium I protest against the anti-religious psychosis revealed in the newspapers and by the ministers of the departing government, as exemplified by such expressions as "the return of the Middle Ages."...MK Sarid virtually called for civil revolt....But, thank God, there were elections and, thank God, he lost....

M. Pa'il (Sheli): Thank God, you'll always win, because you'll make deals with whoever wins.

J. Burg (National Religious Party): In future too, thank God.

M. Pa'il (Sheli): That's what you look like ideologically. You talk and talk and make deals under the table....

J. Burg (National Religious Party): I would like to make it perfectly clear that our policy is not one of religious coercion, but rather of deepening the Jewish roots of education and society. I am sure that the government which will be formed will prove its administrative ability, understanding, humanism, respect for the rights of every religion and each citizen. I am sure that the new government will advance the cause of peace. Great injustice has been done by those...who spread false rumors in Israel and abroad about the new government and its intentions with regard to peace. I think that in recent weeks world Jewry has begun

to realize that there is light and not only darkness in the change that the elections have brought about.

The Speaker has signalled to me that I should end, and so I am unable to address the internal problems I wished to speak about which we, as national religious Jews, as those who have received encouragement and votes from disadvantaged families and large families, regard it as our task to concern ourselves with resolving....In that, too...we will be faithful to our historic viewpoint of unity, the continuity of the generations and the eternal link between the nation, the land, the Bible and the state.

...

M. Wilner (Democratic Front for Peace and Equality): Mr. Speaker...there has been a cataclysmic change in Israel, and I am astounded by the quiet, cosy debate. I remember the debate before the war of October 1973, and a similar cosy atmosphere between the Alignment government and the Likud opposition....I think that what the government has presented to us today are the guidelines for the next war. That is the main point, that is what remains if we remove the fancy phrases and mysticism from the speech of the Prime Minister-designate. Out of responsibility for the nation and our children, let us speak about how to prevent that war and bring peace....

Mr. Begin said that we will not withdraw from one inch of the West Bank. He says that the entire Land of Israel is ours, in other words, war, barring the path to peace, complete disregard for the existence of two peoples in this country. There are two peoples here. In none of his speeches did Mr. Begin refer to a Palestinian nation alongside the Jewish people, as if there were no such thing, as if he were speaking on Mars, not in Israel. How can one ignore life, reality and what can happen to us, according to Western experts, in the next war...?

Is it possible to speak only of secondary issues and not the main point? Anyone who says "it's all mine," who is not satisfied with defending Israel's sovereign, independent existence and security, anyone who seeks in addition to destroy the national existence of the other nation in this land, depriving it of every right, because Mr. Begin has spoken of the total rejection—

S. Gross (Aguda): Don't you think you're exaggerating?

M. Wilner (Democratic Front for Peace and Equality): He obviously called for war, because anyone who brings a political program like that—

S. Aloni (Citizens' Rights Movement): MK Gross is saying that the Council of Torah Sages won't allow it.

M. Wilner (Democratic Front for Peace and Equality): After submitting a political program like that, what point is there in saying things

like we'll go to Geneva on the basis of Resolutions 242 and 338? One goes to Geneva on the basis of the Security Council resolution, which does not recognize the right of only one nation to this country. I signed Israel's Declaration of Independence which says, amongst other things, that we are establishing the state on the basis of the decision of the General Assembly of the U.N., which decided to establish two states, one Jewish, one Arab, in this country. The details have changed, no one is talking about the details of 1947, but the principle cannot change. One cannot destroy a nation. We will not agree to anyone destroying the rights of the Jewish people, but anyone who talks about negating the rights of the Palestinian Arab people and ignores it is not doing Israel a favor and will bring about a war more terrible than any that has gone before. And anyone who wishes to ignore this, speaking about everything but this, is not serving his nation. This chauvinism, this extremist nationalism, this arrogant militarism, is not a service to the nation.

We know of greater, stronger, larger nations, which were not so dependent on another country, on America, which brought disaster on their people because they were not content with defending their security and their rights, but wanted to establish empires, wanted to rule another nation. In my view, that is the basic division in this Knesset, that is the crucial question regarding our fate. If Mr. Begin comes with that program and at the same time promises that he will raise the standard of living of the poorer classes, provide them with housing and ensure full employment, that is demagoguery. Because if there is a political program of that kind, if they are preparing war, the need for military expenditure—which is already high—will grow.

If there were no funds for that when the Alignment was in power, there certainly will not be under the new government. The whole subject is not a question of election propaganda but of funds. They were not allocated to the poor neighborhoods, the standard of living of the workers declined, the only thing that grew here was capitalism and the local and foreign capitalists. And this government is a government of fanatics, of nationalist mystics, of millionaire capitalists who speak of preparing for war and conquest, and of religious fanatics who do not acknowledge the right of others to freedom of conscience.

That is our government, and it grieves me to see that at the last elections our nation enabled such extremists to form a government, which will bring only disasters upon us. It is bad for Israel and a tragedy for the cause of peace. It brings another war closer...and makes the solution of social and economic problems more remote....We know what the Likud and Mr. Begin are....The key to the solution of our problems is peace, and that can only come on a basis which will guarantee and recognize the rights of all the nations and countries of the region...including the Palestinians' right to self-determination and to establish a Palestinian state alongside Israel. Israel must withdraw to

the borders of 4 June 1967, which will become the borders of peace....Israel's freedom of navigation in the Suez Canal and the Straits of Tiran will be ensured. Peace treaties will be signed at the peace conference in Geneva, with the international guarantees of the U.S.S.R., the U.S. and other countries, under the auspices of the U.N., and appropriate security areas will be determined.

A peace of that kind—with the participation of the PLO as the representative of the Palestinians, as recognized by the U.N. and all the neighboring Arab countries—will be acceptable to all the neighboring Arab countries, and is also supported by most countries in the world, both West and East. Even America—which has played an important role in preventing peace in the Middle East, giving extensive backing to Israel's government in both political terms and weaponry—has been forced by international pressure...to begin talking about a homeland for the Palestinians and the need for a peace based on Israel's withdrawal from all the territories occupied in 1967, apart from minor adjustments.

The Prime Minister-designate, Mr. Begin, has said....that only Rakah accepts President Carter's plan. The truth is that President Carter has had to start talking like us, although in vague terms...because his plan is the only path leading to peace between Israel and the Arab countries. Peace is also the solution to Israel's social and economic problems.

The Likud, which will doubtless act in accordance with its plan, is liable to bring a national disaster on Israel. It will also be a disaster for the workers. It also threatens to introduce new laws which will act against the workers, robbing the pension funds...as well as giving privileges to foreign capitalists, in accordance with the doctrines of Professor Milton Friedman, who has already wreaked havoc with the economies of Chile and other countries....

We warn the country of the increased danger of war and fascism, of heightened danger to the workers, the poor neighborhoods, the Arab population of Israel and all democratic forces. In conclusion, I would like to say that the Likud government is not omnipotent. We have no doubt that the united action of all the sectors of the labor movement and democratic forces in Israel, both Jewish and Arab, over and above ideological differences, can avert the dangers to peace, democracy and the rights of the workers. The Likud government is cut off from the true situation in the world and the region, and peace above all, and so I am convinced that the Likud government will fail. The problem is to prevent it doing Israel grave harm before it falls. In our view, the establishment of the Likud government is a black day for Israel. We will do our utmost to save our nation from the dangers this government brings....

...

A. Eliav (Sheli): Mr. Speaker, distinguished Knesset, the rule of the Alignment left the ship of Israel drifting from one crisis to another in a stormy sea. Between the Six Day War and the Yom Kippur War the captains of the ship were drunk with victory. They let the ship of state drift on what they thought were the calm waters of the status quo and the motto: "time is on our side," which led to the bloody whirlpool of the Yom Kippur War. From then and until the revolution of 17 May 1977 the tiller of the ship was in the helpless hands of confused captains and the vessel of our life was tossed by varying and conflicting policies, being eroded from within by corruption and widening social gaps. Towards the end of their term the leaders of the Alignment lost the drive to survive, some of them being gripped by barren apathy, some falling asleep from exhaustion and others preparing to jump from the sinking ship.

Now new captains are on the bridge: the Likud and its partners from the religious parties. Where will they steer the ship? There is a concept in navigation known as a "collision course," when two ships—unknownst to the captains of each—are both bearing down on the same point and will inevitably collide with one another....Anyone who has seen a collision of that kind knows the great fear that grips the person on the bridge when the shape of another ship looms up through the fog. He makes a desperate, last-minute attempt to avert the collision, turning the wheel sharply left or right, but it is too late. The Likud is now setting our compass on a collision course with everything and everyone. It is a course which contradicts our principles as Jews, Zionists and human beings. It is a course which will eventually bring us into an unpleasant collision with the Arabs, the Americans and the rest of the world....

The unwillingness to reach any compromise on our existential problem, the problem of peace with the Arabs...and the flat refusal to even consider dividing the heritage of our fathers with the neighboring people in return for full peace, contradicts our tradition. It is true that there have been streams in Judaism which admired strength, worshipped rocks and stones and displayed intolerance, but the mainstream in Jewish tradition advocated peace through compromise, whether with individuals, groups or nations....

The path of the Likud and its partners clashes head-on with the mainstream of the Jewish people's liberation movement, namely, Zionism. When, many decades ago, the leaders and philosophers of Zionism noted that the main problem was that of the Arabs, and of the Palestinian Arabs in particular, they made it clear that they were eager to engage in a dialogue with the Arabs, and there were repeated attempts to share our country, which is also theirs, with them. Those attempts, which were unsuccessful because of Arab extremism and unwillingness to accept our existence, were not made out of weakness but out of recognition of the fact that Zionism could not be built on the destruction of another nation. Zionism is unique in that it began without dispossession or plunder. It is

unique in having had to fight for its life in wars in which there was no alternative. That characterized all our wars until the Yom Kippur War, because after the Six Day War there was something on which a compromise could be based....

Now, with the adoption of the principle of the complete and full annexation of the West Bank and the Gaza Strip, Israel may well develop into a country which is a collective "Uncle Ahmed's Cabin." From being a country with a Jewish and Zionist majority, it will become a binational state, with the "Ahmeds" as the hewers of wood and drawers of water for the Jews, working in the Jewish fields and building Jewish houses, and eventually gaining possession of the fields and the houses. And so Zionism will be distorted, assuming a monstrous and unrecognizable form. The principles of the Likud and its associates contradict the great universal theories of social-democracy, humane socialism and liberalism. Those social ideas share an aspiration for maximal social equality, individual liberty, freedom of association, protest and demonstration, of religion and culture, as well as equal rights and justice for the weak and the few. None of those things can exist in a country and society which subjugates the majority by force of arms....

The Likud and its colleagues are setting Israel on a collision course with the Arabs. One of the simplistic slogans which has gained general acceptance among our people is that there is no one to speak to. That was true in the past...but paradoxically and tragically, as soon as there has been a slight thaw in Arab intransigence, and now that there is someone to speak to among the Arabs, there is a freeze in Israel's position. When I say that there is someone to speak to I do so as someone who has spoken with our greatest enemies, and I say so proudly....The Arabs who are prepared to speak to us are still a minority of moderates and realists who are prepared to accept Israel's existence and make peace with it. There is something to talk to them about: about dividing our joint heritage between us, about complete peace....

But the tragedy is that there will be no one to talk to and nothing to talk about on the basis of the Likud's ideas, so that the Arab problem will once again be seen only through the sights of a gun, and we will have to fight to defend ourselves again....We will defeat our assailants one more, and return to the situation of total deadlock and even greater hatred, of the desire for revenge, of plowshares turned into swords, and so on and so forth.

The Likud and its associates will bring us to a head-on clash with the Americans. One may attack President Carter and accuse him of being against Israel. Carter may find formulae which are more comfortable for Israel, he may coat the bitter pill with chocolate or marzipan, but we must realize that American policy in the Middle East is not the private concern of one president or another. Ever since the Six Day War the kernel of that policy has been the desire to help Israel with weapons

and funds, on the one hand, and the wish that Israel should withdraw to the 1967 borders, with minor, mutually-agreed adjustments, in return for full peace, on the other.

That is what Johnson told Eshkol, Nixon told Golda Meir, Ford told Rabin, and that is what Carter will tell Israel's next Prime Minister. The Bible is not the exclusive property of the leader of the Likud, and anyone who comes in the name of the Bible to people who know the Bible should not be surprised to hear verses which completely contradict his thesis. And in addition to the Bible there are American political realism and interests, the energy problem, Arab oil and detente. The Likud's theory will clash with all that, thereby increasing our isolation in the world....I believe that if we were to adopt a different political course now we would reestablish relations with many of the countries which have severed their ties with us. That is what I and my colleagues have been told by presidents and heads of state in Africa and Europe. I believe that by adopting a different policy we could have attained renewed support and sympathy in Europe and might even have been able to reestablish relations with the U.S.S.R. But none of this will happen, and instead we will be even more isolated than before.

These clashes will not occur tomorrow or even the next day. They are long-term processes. The Arab farmers and laborers who live among us will not gain control of Jewish fields and houses tomorrow. We have the strength to prevent that. But over the years they will do it, if not physically then socially....And in time of war—and war is inevitable given the continuation of the current policy—they will doubtless utilize the opportunities presented to them....

American pressure and an imposed solution will not begin tomorrow or the next day. The U.S. Administration may decide to "give us enough rope to hang ourselves with," but given the current course, with or without a military clash with the Arabs, a clash with the Americans is inevitable. Our international isolation will not increase or decrease tomorrow or the next day. Because of their uneasy conscience regarding the terrible past, because of interests, pity and the settling of accounts, a few dozen countries will continue to have relations with us. But Israel led by the Likud and its associates will drive away the remainder of its friends among the socialists, social-democrats and liberals—whether Jewish or not—of the world.

That is a very grim prognosis, and the internal, social issue is the worst of all. Because we can withstand enemies from the outside and the indifference of the world, but if our moral fiber is undermined we will collapse. Our lack of confidence in the Likud and its associates is complete and fundamental. Only if and when the course of the ship of our life is changed will there be peace, life and benefit to all....That will not happen tomorrow or the next day. We know that it is a long and difficult process. But anyone who believes, as we do, in the existence and ad-

vance of Judaism, Zionism and Israel, must believe that that day will surely come.

...

M. Dayan: Madam Speaker, distinguished Knesset, the most important, weighty and complex matter confronting Israel, this Knesset and the next government in the near future is what is known as "Geneva"—

M. Amar (Alignment): Perhaps you'll tell us whether you're going to give your mandate back before you tell us what's important....

M. Dayan:—which may perhaps contain the seeds of peace.

M. Amar (Alignment): I ask you again to tell us whether you're going to give your mandate back....

M. Dayan: That central issue may contain the seeds of peace within it. The current situation undoubtedly contains the possibility of the renewal of war. All those who spoke here indicating that our political problem was due to the fact that the Likud is forming the government—

M. Amar (Alignment): Which war are you talking about? The Yom Kippur War...?

M. Dayan: When Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin returned from his visit to the U.S. and his meeting with President Carter, he said...that the visit had been successful and that the conditions had been created for a dialogue with the U.S., for agreed steps, a timetable and joint objectives. I have no doubt that the former prime minister said that because he believed it. But in the light of Vice President Mondale's speech in San Francisco yesterday...we cannot ignore the essence contained in three points he made: on the subject of the borders—Israel will have to withdraw to the former borders, with minor changes, in return for peace; on the subject of the Palestinians—they must be assured a homeland linked in some way with Jordan; on the subject of Israel's security—in addition to the fact that a peace agreement brings security, special arrangements—such as those currently existing on the Egyptian and Syrian borders—will have to be made.

Anyone who doesn't want to see this, or ignores the significance of this, overlooks the question we must all—except perhaps Sheli and Rakah which anyway accept the principle of withdrawal—ask ourselves...namely, on what points are we all united, so that there is one front in Israel and the Jewish people regarding opposition to the plans which are not acceptable to any of the parties.

A. Eliav (Sheli): ...Sheli is a Zionist party, and you are simply inciting others and slinging mud, as is your wont....

M. Pa'il (Sheli): And lying.

M. Dayan: Sheli is a Zionist party, and if I have cast aspersions on it by saying that it is in favor of withdrawing to the previous borders within the framework of peace—if that isn't your viewpoint, I take my words back. If it is your viewpoint, there is no contradiction between that and what Mondale said....All the parties which do not think that Israel should withdraw to the former borders or that the Palestinians should have a state in the West Bank and the Gaza Strip should consolidate that agreement. There must be a united front of the State of Israel and the Jewish people. That is the first topic on our general agenda....

There are issues which should be clarified. The people who are to participate in the government should make those things clear. The differences between the Likud government and the previous government should be stressed. But there are subjects regarding which there is no difference...and for which we should fight together....The main subject on which the two governments differ is the partition of the West Bank, which the Alignment is prepared to accept and the Likud is prepared to discuss, should the Arabs bring the subject up at a peace conference. The subject on which there is no disagreement is the readiness to go to negotiations without any prior conditions, and the right of either side to make whatever proposals it wants....

M. Pa'il (Sheli): That means that the Arabs determine the policy.... What is Israel proposing?

M. Dayan: I am not proposing that. The Likud government is not proposing that. It is prepared to listen if someone else proposes it—whether the U.S., the Arabs or the Russians....For the moment the latest U.S. proposal was what we heard from Mondale. It was not like the DMC's platform, but proposed minor changes in the former borders. I don't know whether it was a proposal or not, it was mentioned in Mondale's speech....

There is nothing easier or more dangerous for Israel than for all the parties which are not in the Likud government to assume that the reason we are not advancing towards peace is because the Likud is in power....

Y. Sarid (Alignment): One might think you'd been in the Likud for years.

M. Dayan: We are divided as to our perception of a solution between us and the Arabs and the differences between us and the U.S. If we reach a point where there is a practical Arab proposal for partition and we are divided in our views, that will be the time to split up. If we are in the position today of having had all the Israeli proposals for partition rejected by the Arabs, their sole demand being for complete withdrawal, if the U.S. position advocates minor adjustments, and is rejected by both the Alignment and the DMC, we must take care to join forces and say: why

is there no peace, why is there no agreement, why are there differences of opinion with the U.S...?

With regard to Resolution 242 and Geneva, the moment the Likud announced that it accepted the agreements made by the previous governments, that meant going to Geneva, just as the previous government had done, under the same conditions and with the same agreement....

S. Tamir (Democratic Movement for Change): We received very different information from the Likud....

M. Dayan: Gentlemen, I am not negotiating with the DMC, I am speaking as a Knesset Member about the meaning of clause 25 of the government's guidelines regarding its readiness to honor the commitments of the previous governments, not even the clause which mentions Geneva....

Y. Yadin (Democratic Movement for Change): MK Dayan, I suggest that before you take another step you hold negotiations with MK Begin....

M. Dayan: If MK Begin wishes to express reservations about what I have said, he will do so....I am explaining my understanding of the government's guidelines....You may disagree with me, but you can't say that there is nothing in what I'm saying....

S. Tamir (Democratic Movement for Change): MK Dayan, read clause 7 carefully....What it says there refers to being invited and was explained clearly by Mr. Begin. You are putting a different interpretation on it.

M. Dayan: MK Tamir, I said I was talking about clause 25, not about the one which mentions Geneva, and the phrase "all the agreements" means that the agreement to go to Geneva is included....

With regard to the clause in the guidelines which refers to imposing Israeli law, or in other words annexation, on the West Bank and the Gaza Strip, I would like to point out that in order to achieve this a majority will be required in the Knesset. Unless 61 Knesset Members vote for it, it will not come about....I would like to conclude with the subject with which I began. We are currently in a situation of disagreement in two areas: on the one hand with the Arabs on the question of how to attain peace, since they demand a Palestinian state, withdrawal from all the territories and a dubious peace, and on the other with the U.S. If the time comes when there is a peace proposal, whether put forward by the U.S. or the Arabs, and part of this House supports it while the other part does not, we can split then....But until then, in view of the differences between us and both the Arabs and the U.S...we must all stand united in rejecting the current proposal....

Y. Sarid (Alignment): And what about the mandate?

M. Begin (Likud): Mr. Speaker, Knesset Members, on the assumption that this night the Knesset will express confidence in the government, I would like to say that, with the consent of the entire government...my first action as prime minister tomorrow will be to instruct that asylum be granted to the Vietnamese refugees. We all recall the ships of Jewish refugees in the 1930s which wandered the seven seas, seeking entry to a specific country or various countries, and were denied access everywhere. Now there is a Jewish state. We have not forgotten. We will act humanely. We will bring those unfortunate refugees here to our country after our ship has saved them from drowning, and we will grant them a haven....

A. Eliav (Sheli): MK Begin, as the captain of ships which brought illegal immigrants, I congratulate you.

M. Begin (Likud): I thank you....And now to the debate. After having heard the speech given by the leader of the opposition, Mr. Shimon Peres, I would like to say that I think that the former leader of the opposition spoke out better against the government.

Y. Navon (Alignment): One has to undergo vocational retraining.

M. Begin (Likud): But no matter, MK Peres will have plenty time to study his new profession, and we will doubtless hear him speak more convincingly....After all, what has happened? We have sat together with the Alignment in this House for many years, have always been rivals, but have also known personal friendships....The Alignment's election campaign was one of intimidation. Dire consequences were threatened if the Likud were to come to power. That approach did not help you. On the contrary, it did you great harm. I am not at all surprised that MK Peres stood on the podium today and gave the impression of being someone who had not yet recovered. It is hardly surprising. Did you imagine that this change would come about, MK Peres? I am sure that you were perfectly convinced that if you replaced Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin you would be prime minister. There was no doubt in your mind about it. The same applies to all your colleagues. I am sure that MK Allon was certain that he would be the next Minister of Defense, as you had agreed between you, because you were sure that your party would form the new government. It has been accustomed to ruling. For twenty-nine years you have ruled the country, as well as the Zionist Organization....You did not imagine that the nation would bring about this change, and that is why you are thunderstruck. But you'll get used to it.

You are taking a very mistaken approach. You spoke in an aggressive tone today. I accept that. This is a free parliament, and the opposition has every right to take a fighting stance. But I think, and I am saying this as a veteran Knesset Member, that you are making a mistake.

You should be taking stock and examining yourselves, because there has been a cataclysmic change in Israel.

Just take a look. The Likud had a majority in every town in Israel, except for three small townships. The Likud had a majority even in "red" Haifa. You must try to find the reasons. What happened to you? You were so confident of your victory....Why were you taken by surprise? Take note, gentlemen: in the army the Likud received 45 percent and the Alignment only 22 percent, whereas in the last elections we received 41 percent and you got 39.5 percent....What is the army? Who is the army? It is the younger generation. The younger generation turned its back on you in these elections. There has been a cataclysmic change in Israel.

After every election campaign you said: what? Do you have complaints about the results? This nation is wise and intelligent, it knows what it's doing, in which government to place its trust. So, what will you say now about this wise and intelligent nation? I call on you to take stock. If at the next elections the nation gives you preeminence once more we will have no complaints. But I am sure that you must see the error of your ways, examine yourselves thoroughly and ask yourselves why this happened....You are, after all, a great movement, which had twenty Members in the First Knesset....Your slogan should be "we will mend our ways."...

The Alignment continues to claim that if we implement our policy we will be at loggerheads with the world. I hope that you will be a responsible opposition as well as a fighting one...but why should you say something like that, as if you were already calling on the world to rise up against us? Couldn't you at least have given us a chance? You tried a certain policy. I would like to know, during which government's term was the Rogers Plan renewed after being frozen for six years? When did we hear for the first time: "Israel will have to withdraw to the borders of 4 June 1967 with minor adjustments"? Was it in the time of the Likud government or the Alignment government?

I remember when the Rogers Plan was presented to us. I was a member of the government then, in 1969. And then-Prime Minister Golda Meir summoned the correspondent of the *New York Times* and told him: if any Israeli government—and she was referring to a democratic government—were to accept the plan which bears Mr. Rogers' name, it would be a government of treachery. I must confess that I do not like the word "treachery." If it is a question of law and justice, that is one thing. In matters of policy, everyone has the right to hold views without being accused of treachery. That is the nature of freedom. But that is what Mrs. Meir said....For six years the plan was kept in mothballs, but shaken out a few months ago. Under which government did that happen? In the wake of what policy? What have you not managed to say? Why was it said? Have you asked yourselves that? Under your

government, with the policy you termed "reasonable," "compromise," "logical." And so, two nights ago, we heard it mentioned again.

Perhaps in another day or two a certain American document will be published, and all the Members of the Knesset, the entire nation, will learn that as my meeting with President Carter in late July approaches there may be differences of opinion between us, which we will discuss in a civilized way. We know our place: we are a small country, while over there is a Great Power, and President Carter is not only the president of the U.S. but also the leader of the free world....Perhaps when Israelis read a certain American document in another day or two they will discover that the Likud government may be given a warm welcome. Why should you say that we are setting Israel at odds with the whole world, and first of all with the U.S.? Under your rule there was a great argument. Did not Prime Minister Rabin have to tell America that we would never return to the borders of 4 June 1967...?

I hope that in my meeting with President Carter I will be able to say, with the backing of the entire House, not only the Likud government...that on that subject there is general consensus, and we are adamant in our stand: this nation will not return to the borders of 4 June 1967, not even with minor adjustments. I also hope that I will be able to tell the president of the U.S. that there is national agreement on our refusal to agree to the establishment of a Palestinian state in Judea, Samaria and Gaza....I repeat, it threatens every man, woman and child in Israel and it shall not arise. I shall say that with the support of more than 110 Knesset Members....

T. Toubi (Democratic Front for Peace and Equality): MK Begin, with that policy they failed, and you will too....

M. Begin (Likud): MK Toubi, even with your great victory at the polls you received only five seats. You can't form a government with those. Let me continue.

M. Wilner (Democratic Front for Peace and Equality): We may not be able to form a government, but we can bring peace.

M. Begin (Likud): MK Wilner, that's enough. Kindly let me speak. The leader of the opposition has said that the policy is sometimes mine alone. Permit me to quote: "We must not be tempted by all kinds of advisors and journalists to return to a country whose width at its 'waist' is ten or twelve miles. We must not be tempted, despite the difficulties, in Judea, Samaria and Galilee. If we return to a country which is 12 miles wide we will face an almost insurmountable defense problem. Everyone says we must defend the Golan Heights because of the high mountains there. There are peaks in Samaria too. It is said that there are agricultural settlements below the Golan Heights, that is true. But most of Israel's population lives below Samaria." Who said that? Mr. Shi-

mon Peres. So I am not alone. At least MK Peres is with me. Most of the Knesset supports that policy. We have learned from what happened in the Six Day War, and we know what it means to have enemy cannon threatening every town, village and settlement in Israel....We will prevent that....

It is true that MK Peres changed his mind. One day he decided to replace MK Rabin and be the Alignment's candidate for prime minister. In order to give himself the chance of gaining a majority he had to find favor in the eyes of MK Abba Eban and gain the support of MK Sarid, so that very little was left of his original opinion. But am I to blame for that? He changed his mind, and then what happened? Our majority may be small, but nonetheless, it is a majority....MK Rabin gave way, MK Peres took his place and was sure that the nation would give him its approval. But it did not. So one has to accept the public's verdict with good grace, and not adopt an aggressive tone on the day the government which has received the nation's confidence is presented.

We will treat the opposition differently. First of all, we recognize the position of the leader of the opposition...and I will cooperate with him, holding meetings with him from time to time and briefing him on the situation. That was not the case formerly. We will introduce that practice, which is accepted in democratic regimes. As long as the DMC is in opposition I will hold similar meetings with MK Yadin. But the leader of the opposition is the leader of the largest party. That is his status. We will respect it, and the opposition, and on general national topics on which we can find a common language we will doubtless ask him for his opinion and advice.

There appear to have been misunderstandings in the negotiations with the DMC....MK Yadin says that the Likud treated his movement as a junior partner...using the very phrase MK Rubinstein employed several weeks before the elections: "The DMC will form the next government, and it is irrelevant who its junior partner will be." So it was the DMC, not the Likud, which regarded either the Alignment or the Likud as a junior partner....

MK Rubinstein also said that this government will collapse like a house of cards....I am not making any promises. We are in the hands of the Knesset. Tonight you will give us your confidence, we hope. If you do not, I will submit my resignation to the president. We intend to govern for four years. If you shorten our term, we will go to the nation and it will decide. But meanwhile, MK Rubinstein, your dreams have collapsed like a house of cards. The DMC is not forming any government and cannot tip the scales....

Y. Yadin (Democratic Movement for Change): You're continuing with what you've been doing all along. You don't want us—say it.

M. Begin (Likud): No, you're wrong. What I said was correct....

M. Pa'il (Sheli): He wants you, but with some adjustments.

M. Begin (Likud): The DMC adheres to principles, and I am as great an admirer of principles as I am of adherence to them. Dear friends and rivals, as you know, we were in the desert of opposition for 29 years and did not abandon our principles for a single day. There were those who said that we lost votes because of those principles. Yet we adhered to them. That is why I admire adherence to principles so much....I would like to make it clear, despite your interjection, MK Yadin, that the entire Likud, as well as the NRP and Aguda—the whole coalition—wants the DMC in the government because of its adherence to principles. I am even prepared to renew the negotiations tomorrow.

Y. Yadin (Democratic Movement for Change): Without prior conditions and with everything open to discussion.

M. Begin (Likud): Without prior negotiations, and we can begin negotiating tomorrow. Mr. Speaker, it is late, after midnight. There are still a great many points I wanted to make, but there will be many other opportunities for that. I therefore propose that we conclude the debate. I ask the Knesset to express confidence in the government. There is much work to be done...in the economic, social, political and moral spheres....My colleagues and I will do it with devotion and dedication, with a good conscience, a sure heart and the belief that with God's help we will benefit the nation.

The Vote

Those in favor	63
Those against	53

(The proposal to express confidence in the government is adopted.)

Problems of Drafting Women into the Army

Introduction

As a concession to his Orthodox partners in the coalition, Prime Minister Begin had agreed to abolish the exemption committees which had hitherto reviewed applications from women who wished to be exempted from military service on religious grounds. In the future such exemptions would be granted automatically on the basis of the applicant's written declaration.

This concession, constituting a major departure from the status quo in religious matters which had served as a basis for previous coalition agreements under the aegis of the Alignment, was attacked in the Knesset from several angles.

Sitting 6 of the Ninth Knesset

29 June 1977 (13 Tammuz 5737)

O. Namir (Alignment): Mr. Speaker, distinguished Knesset, I have the honor of submitting my proposal to the Knesset regarding the damage to the IDF and the women of Israel arising from clause 27 of the coalition agreement between the Likud, the National Religious Party and Aguda...which reads: "A woman who declares that because of her religious family background she cannot serve in the IDF, which declaration is confirmed by a rabbinical court, will be exempt from military service on the basis of that declaration alone and without any further examination."...

Whereas the government's guidelines state that the religious status quo will be maintained, the coalition agreement of that same government seeks to introduce a basic and substantial change in the religious status quo....It is surprising that someone as fervent in his adherence to our defense needs as the leader of the Likud and the Prime Minister, Menahem Begin—who prior to the establishment of the state was the commander of the IZL, where women fought courageously and proudly—and the Minister of Defense, Ezer Weizman—a colonel in the reserves who served as Commander of the Air Force, where women serve in varied and responsible positions—have helped to harm the status of women in Israel and the security of Israel so significantly.

Their colleague, MK Geula Cohen, one of the bravest fighters of the IZL, is to be commended for declaring a few days ago that she would not

vote for the bill enabling religious women to evade military service when it came before the House.

When the Defense Service Law was brought before the First Knesset in 1949 it was decided that women would serve in the IDF in recognition of both their equal rights and duties and their contribution to the IDF.... The First Knesset exempted from military service women who were prevented from doing so "for reasons of conscience or religion"...after their cases had been reviewed by an exemption committee appointed by the Minister of Defense and they had submitted a written deposition giving the names of at least two witnesses, in addition to their verbal declaration."...The committee was also entitled to request further clarifications....

The severity of the conditions for granting exemption from military service to women for reasons of conscience or religion derive from the fact that human nature is weak and people are liable to be tempted to evade doing their duty, even at the price of lying....Have Israel's defense needs changed, or has there been a change in its social concepts and attitude to the position, status and contribution of women in a progressive, egalitarian society? Perhaps there has been a shift in the moral standards of some Israeli women? We may have underestimated the contribution of women to the IDF of late, for a variety of reasons....

Today approximately half the women of military age are drafted into the IDF. Those who are not drafted are exempt because of health reasons, marital status, religious reasons or unsuitability. This last category has been reduced of late as a result of the efforts of the former Minister of Defense, Shimon Peres, who is to be congratulated for this.... Those efforts were made in the belief that military service would raise the educational and professional standards of the women concerned, granting them greater independence, work habits, values and self-esteem....

Do the members of this House, and especially those of the religious parties, think that by making exemption from military service more accessible the number of Jewish women observing the religious precepts will increase? Did the necessity of proving that one was observant till now prevent any religious woman from obtaining an exemption? Will not the new arrangement encourage false declarations from women who are not observant? Does not encouraging people to lie constitute a grave violation of one of the precepts of Judaism? As for the claim that the IDF framework harms the women's morals...why should we concern ourselves with the moral welfare of only some women...?

Is our society divided in such a way that...only religious people are moral while secular people are not...? It is no secret that the majority of the girls exempt from military service on the grounds of unsuitability are the product of the religious education system. Should the IDF be prevented from providing what that education system has been unable to?

And if the IDF framework interferes with the religious background and life-style, why do some religious women and men serve in it...?

The military service of women is one of the basic tenets of Israeli society. There should be no additional concessions to those determined by the First Knesset. Granting exemptions in the way proposed means increasing the number of women evading military service by lying. That being the case, I suggest that the Minister of Defense review the proposal. I find it hard to believe that the majority of Israeli women will agree to live in a society whose egalitarian values are so weak....I believe that the Minister of Defense...who is well aware of the contribution of women to the IDF...has helped to harm the status of women serving in the IDF by being a signatory to the coalition agreement....Because of the gravity and sensitivity of the subject and the harm to Israeli women and the IDF, I request that the subject be debated by the plenum.

...

The Minister of Defense, E. Weizman: Distinguished Speaker and Knesset...it seems strange to me that my first speech as Minister of Defense should be on this of all subjects....The Alignment should be aware of the fact that there are many defense issues of greater importance which they could have raised....

Y. Navon (Alignment): That's irrelevant.

The Minister of Defense, E. Weizman: Possibly....It would seem to me, MK Namir, that if you are so concerned, justifiably, to avoid harming women and indicating one's lack of confidence in them, the thing to do is not to assume that their declaration is false and insist that they appear before a committee. First of all, let me say that in 1968/69, 11,000 women were exempt from military service for religious reasons, and that was not under the Likud government.

(From the floor: We protested against that, too.)

The coalition agreement says that women seeking exemption from military service on grounds of conscience or religion will have to submit a signed declaration which will be equivalent to a sworn statement....The law is not being changed....There are also men who do not do military service....The relevant clause of the coalition agreement is similar to an arrangement which existed until 1952, when a coalition government led by Mapai was in power...and even afterwards, knowing the sensitivity to the subject in certain groups, the IDF adopted a liberal approach to girls requesting exemption from military service....The basic approach of the current coalition agreement is that one should give credence to the declaration made by the women concerned....Women found giving false declarations are punishable by law....

Y. Navon (Alignment): How can they be found out? There's no check.

(From the floor: There's no committee.)

The Minister of Defense, E. Weizman: Leave that subject. Does everything have to be checked?

Y. Sarid (Alignment): You want to extend the cheating which is so widespread to the I.D.F....

The Minister of Defense, E. Weizman: We are proposing that a person's sworn declaration be given credence. Time will tell whether that trust was justified. I suggest that MK Ora Namir have a little more faith in women. I have from time to time....

D. Rosolio (Alignment): It's sad to see the Minister of Defense aiding draft-dodgers.

The Minister of Defense, E. Weizman: I know that many of the women who do not do military service do national service in schools, hospitals, etc. Their number has been growing in recent years....

D. Rosolio (Alignment): How will the IDF explain this to the women soldiers? What is the Minister of Defense defending?

The Minister of Defense, E. Weizman: Women's military service is not changing, the committee is.

D. Rosolio (Alignment): The committee isn't changing, the entire basis of exemptions is.

The Minister of Defense, E. Weizman: Let me finish....Exempting women from military service does not detract in any way from the esteem and importance the IDF attaches to women's service. This is evinced by the expansion of the areas and positions now open to women soldiers....

S. Aloni (Citizens' Rights Movement): The reference is to women who have no conscience or faith, according to the declaration of the new government. You are deliberately exempting a sector of the population from the obligation of serving in the IDF.

The Minister of Defense, E. Weizman: MK Shulamit Aloni, I know that you are responsible for women's consciences. Believe me—

S. Aloni (Citizens' Rights Movement): No, we are talking about your conscience this time....The conscience is that of the government, which is making a mockery of the law and is not acting impartially....

The Minister of Defense, E. Weizman: I think that whoever set up the committee doubted women's consciences. By annulling the committee we are returning to reliance on women's consciences. In conclusion, I ask that the subject be transferred to the Foreign Affairs and Defense Committee.

Y. Meshel (Alignment): You are a military man. Why did you agree to the exemption?

The Minister of Defense, E. Weizman: Because I think that there are far more important defense problems. I don't think this harms our defense....

O. Namir (Alignment): What has it got to do with the issue if there are other defense problems?

S. Hillel (Alignment): It undermines public morale.

The Minister of Defense, E. Weizman: I don't think it does.

S. Aloni (Citizens' Rights Movement): Have you heard of something called equality before the law?

The Minister of Defense, E. Weizman: MK Aloni, I have to answer as to whether it harms defense, which I do not think it does.

S. Aloni (Citizens' Rights Movement): No, you have to answer as to whether there is one law for all Israel's citizens and whether there is equality before the law....

A. Rubinstein (Democratic Movement for Change): Is the government going to implement the National Service Law...?

S. Aloni (Citizens' Rights Movement): Why don't you oblige the women whom you trust to do national service? Why have you decided to believe them when they say that they are religious, letting them work and enjoy themselves and further their own interests rather than doing national service?

The Minister of Defense, E. Weizman: If you'd kindly let me finish, MK Aloni. I understand your agitation and everyone else's, and as a military man I can say with my hand on my heart that I and other IDF commanders have tremendous appreciation for the women who serve in the forces...but that is not the issue here today. I hereby propose that the subject be transferred to the Foreign Affairs and Defense Committee.

...
(The proposal to transfer the subject to the Foreign Affairs and Defense Committee is adopted.)

Prime Minister's Statement on His Visit to the U.S.

Introduction

Prior to the elections of 1977 Mr. Begin had been depicted in much of the world media—including that of the U.S.—as a doctrinaire former terrorist, a “warmonger.” Thus, his first visit to the U.S. in his capacity as prime minister took on a special importance.

His report to the Knesset on the visit and the subsequent debate are notable for the general agreement that it constituted a “personal” success for Begin and for the peace initiative put forward by him calling for the reconvening of the Geneva Conference (chaired by both the U.S. and the U.S.S.R.) and aiming at definitive peace treaties rather than additional partial agreements. In what was and was not said, the outline of the Camp David agreements can be detected. The possibility of direct, face-to-face negotiations without any international umbrella seemed too remote to mention, however.

Sitting 18 of the Ninth Knesset

27 July 1977 (12 Av 5737)

The Prime Minister, M. Begin: Mr. Speaker, my teachers and Knesset Members, the following issues were raised in the talks in Washington: the situation in southern Lebanon, the Geneva Conference and its composition, the objectives of negotiations between Israel and its neighbors, the problem of the Arabs in the Land of Israel, Jewish settlement activity, Syrian Jewry and the Jews of the U.S.S.R.

In connection with the situation in southern Lebanon, we told the U.S. President: a. we desire no territory in Lebanon; b. we do not want any war to break out against the background of the events in Lebanon; c. we will not abandon the Christian minority in Lebanon. We explained that we had been a minority for many generations and were always threatened with annihilation, adding that although we were a large majority in our own country, in the Middle East we were a minority, and could not therefore accede in the attempt to destroy a minority. The Christian minority in this case has no less right to exist than the Moslem majority. With the aid of a map we demonstrated that the Christian villages in southern Lebanon constituted a small enclave surrounded by dozens of Moslem villages, and that there were 5,000 terrorists in southern Lebanon today.

T. Toubi (Democratic Front for Peace and Equality): Didn't you say that you were fanning the flames there?

The Prime Minister, M. Begin: And that they shelled the Christian villages every night. The State of Israel continues to extend help to the Christian villages...and without that help the Christian minority in Lebanon would be destroyed....

M. Wilner (Democratic Front for Peace and Equality): ...Has the government sent the army to shell villages in southern Lebanon?

The Prime Minister, M. Begin: With regard to the Geneva Conference and its composition: we proposed that a fresh session of the Geneva Conference be convened after October 10 this year, that is, after the Jewish holidays. That session, in accordance with the precedent set four years ago, should be convened by the two chairmen: the U.S. and the U.S.S.R., in accordance with clause 3 of Resolution 338, which states: immediately after and parallel with the ceasefire, talks will begin and negotiations will be opened between the sides involved, under appropriate auspices, with the object of attaining a just and permanent peace in the Middle East. We made the point that Resolution 338 includes and refers to Resolution 242, and we also suggested that the representatives of the following sovereign states should participate in the renewed Geneva Conference: Israel, Egypt, Syria and Jordan.

The countries participating in the Geneva Conference will not submit any prior conditions for their participation. After the opening, public session of the Conference, at which the representatives will present their statements, the following mixed committees will be set up: Egypt-Israel, Syria-Israel and Jordan-Israel. Within the framework of those committees negotiations will be conducted for signing peace treaties between Israel and its neighbors. The chair of the committees will be occupied in rotation by Israel and the neighboring country. After the contents of the peace treaties have been decided, namely, the termination of the state of war, the determination of the borders, and the establishment of diplomatic, economic, etc. relations, the Geneva Conference will be convened in another open session at which the peace treaties will be signed.

We agreed to the participation of Lebanon in the Conference, but not to that of the PLO. We did agree to the participation of Palestinians in the Jordanian delegation, provided they were not representatives of the PLO. I would like to make our position perfectly clear. The organization known as the PLO is an organization of murderers which aspires to destroy the State of Israel and is the Jewish people's most implacable enemy since the Nazis. There is nothing to negotiate with it. The so-called Palestinian Covenant declares that the State of Israel must cease to exist and the vast majority of its Jewish inhabitants forced to leave the country.... Naturally, all this is totally divorced from

reality, that organization of murderers will not destroy Israel, the Jews will not leave, and all its efforts will be in vain....We will have nothing to do with an organization whose methods and objectives are Nazi....

It should also be noted that the agreement between the U.S. and Israel regarding the Geneva Conference states that any change in its composition will require the agreement of all the participants. It is our right to oppose any change....The objective of the negotiations between Israel and its neighbors is, as agreed between the governments of Israel and the U.S...to attain peace treaties...in the internationally-accepted sense of the term and with all its implications...i.e., ending the state of belligerency, settling permanent borders, establishing diplomatic relations with the exchange of ambassadors, setting up economic relations, etc....

If, as has been rumored, Egypt and Syria insist on the PLO's participation in the Geneva Conference, the Conference will not be able to convene....We have agreed, should that be the case, that the U.S. government would use its good offices in the capitals concerned—Jerusalem, Cairo, Amman, Damascus and possibly Beirut—to establish the three or four mixed committees I have already mentioned, and which will conduct negotiations for peace treaties. Another alternative is to hold conciliation talks, as were proposed to us by the U.S. government in 1972, using the good offices of the U.S. During these talks negotiations will be held to attain peace treaties, within the framework of the mixed committees. We think that this is the most practical way both of convening a special session of the Geneva Conference and of attaining an alternative approach.

Mixed committees are no innovation. They existed in Rhodes in 1949 and produced an internationally-recognized agreement, namely the Armistice Agreements, which stated explicitly that they constituted a step towards permanent peace in the Land of Israel. Another clause of the Armistice Agreements noted that the boundaries should on no account be interpreted as territorial or political borders, and the agreement concerning them should not be regarded as determining a stand on the rights and demands of each side in connection with the final solution of the Palestine problem.

On the basis of that precedent, unfortunately, after a delay of twenty-nine years, we propose that permanent peace be made, as the sides undertook to do in 1949. There have been four wars since then and a great deal of bloodshed, which we regret. Neither the undertaking given by the Arab countries nor the other conditions of the Armistice Agreements have been fulfilled by them, such as the commitment to refrain from attacking the civilian population, whether by regular or by irregular forces....The Arab countries aided and abetted terrorists who attacked our civilian population throughout the years...and all the four wars

were the outcome of the aggression of the Arab countries and their refusal to make the peace which had been promised in the Armistice Agreements.

But those facts belong to the past. After a great and tragic delay...there comes a moment when one has to start bringing permanent peace to the Middle East. Consequently, the course of establishing mixed committees between Israel and its neighbors is the most practical way of reaching signed peace agreements.

The issue generally known as the Palestinian problem has been raised, though we take issue with that phrase, since Palestine is the Land of Israel, and the British Mandate accorded recognition to the link between the Jewish people and Palestine. Woodrow Wilson, who gave the world the concept of national self-determination, appointed a committee for Middle Eastern affairs after the First World War which recommended that "Palestine shall become a Jewish state." When the late Dr. Chaim Weizmann made an agreement with King Feisal it stated that there should be friendly relations and understanding between "the Arab state" and "Palestine," the former meaning the Arab nation and the latter the Land of Israel for the Jewish people....Thus, anyone who uses the phrase "Palestine problem" to refer to the Arabs of the Land of Israel is distorting the historical facts....

The term "Palestine entity" has also been used. We made it clear that any proposal of this kind will inevitably lead to the establishment of a state known as "Palestinian." And a Palestinian state, as is presumably being proposed by President Sadat of Egypt, in Judea, Samaria and Gaza, linked by an extraterritorial strip, that is, under Arab sovereignty...is a threat to the existence of the Jewish state.

We have no need of quotations to know what the organization which was authorized by the Rabat Conference to represent all the Palestinian Arabs wants. Then there will be continuous bloodshed. That is not theory. A similar situation obtained for nineteen years, and we had continuous bloodshed. We were attacked in Jerusalem, near Tel Aviv, in Ashkelon and Ashdod, in the north, the east and the south, every week, if not every day. It is characteristic that in making this demand the Egyptian President does not promise peace or a peace treaty but what is known as non-belligerency, something which has no status in international law, in other words, non-peace. If that situation were to obtain the Middle East would lose every chance of peace, because then, as I demonstrated to the president and his advisors, the Arabs would take another look at the map and ask themselves: why should we make peace with Israel? Their cannon would be nine miles from the sea facing Netanya, ten miles by way of Kalkilya, twenty miles from Tel Aviv, ten miles from Beersheba, etc. Modern Soviet artillery has a range of over thirty miles. There is no doubt that if a Palestinian state were established it would not be long before it received all the most up-to-date

and sophisticated weapons from the U.S.S.R...and a Soviet base was established there.

It is no coincidence that at the recent conference in Moscow chaired by Leonid Brezhnev both Castro and Arafat participated....

T. Toubi (Democratic Front for Peace and Equality): And if it is independent, like Israel, will you agree to that state then...?

The Prime Minister, M. Begin: ...As I have already said, no, on no account will we agree to a Palestinian state....I am telling the House and the nation what would happen if it were to come into existence. But it will not come into existence.

M. Wilner (Democratic Front for Peace and Equality): Then there will be peace and security....

The Prime Minister, M. Begin: That would be the reality, an extremely grave threat to Israel's existence and to the lives of every man, woman and child in Israel. As well as a threat to the free world, of course. We know what is happening in the Middle East. From Ethiopia to Libya. Is a Soviet base needed in the heart of the Middle East too, from which it will be possible to spread in every direction? The answer is obvious. We have made our position on this point absolutely clear, so that there should be no room for misunderstanding. We completely and utterly reject the establishment of a state known as "Palestinian," in any shape or form. Any proposal beginning with what is known as a "Palestine entity" will undoubtedly lead to the establishment of such a state. We say an unequivocal "no" to that idea, whatever its shape.

There are those who claim that by saying no to a Palestinian state we are adopting a negative attitude, but that is not so....As in the case of the ten commandments, for example, negation implies a positive injunction....Thus, by saying no to a Palestinian state we are making a positive statement about the chances of peace and the prevention of bloodshed....We have been asked not to establish new settlements across the Green Line, but we have made our position clear on this subject too. There are places in the U.S. called Hebron, Shiloh, Bethel, Bethlehem, etc. Those names indicate the deep connection between the American people and the Bible. Let us suppose that the governors of the states where those towns are situated were to declare that any American citizen could go and live there—except Jews. There would be an outcry throughout the U.S. at this discrimination. That is why we ask whether it is acceptable for a Jewish government to prevent Jews from buying land in the Land of Israel and building their homes in Bethlehem or Hebron or Shiloh...? In other words, we insist on the inalienable rights of Jews to live in the Land of Israel. There is no reason why Jews and Arabs can live in Jaffa and Haifa, Ramle and Lod, Acre and Nazereth and elsewhere, and cannot live side by side, in peace and mutual respect, in Judea and

Samaria, Gaza and Rafah. There is no justification for that, and that is the government's position.

The U.S. Secretary of State said yesterday that the settlements violated international law....With all due respect, I would like to tell him that that accusation is groundless. Israel upholds international law, but if someone is relying on the Geneva Convention of 1949, which is intended to protect the civilian inhabitants of occupied territories, I would like to say, first, that Jewish settlement activity on no account harms the Arabs of the Land of Israel. We have not dispossessed a single Arab of his land, nor shall we do so. The decision taken by the government yesterday refers to three existing settlements—Eilon Moreh, Ofra and Ma'aleh Adumim. No Arab land was appropriated in order to establish them....It is true that the previous government was in doubt about the permanency of one settlement, Eilon Moreh...but the attitude of the present government is different. We think that Jews have every right to live at Eilon Moreh...as well as in the other settlements...and that no injustice has been caused to a single Arab family. We will act similarly in the future, too. Jewish settlement activity will not be associated with dispossession and injustice of any kind to a single Arab inhabitant anywhere in the Land of Israel.

T. Toubi (Democratic Front for Peace and Equality): That's nonsense. The facts are different. Life has proved that every new settlement involves the dispossession of a people dwelling in its homeland.

The Prime Minister, M. Begin: With regard to international law, Israeli rule in the Land of Israel is not a rule of occupation. The Knesset ruled thus in 1967, when it passed a law saying that the government was entitled to issue an ordinance extending the jurisdiction, law and administration of the state to every part of the Land of Israel. That is the law. That is our law. That is the law that was adopted by the house of representatives of the sovereign State of Israel...and which empowers the government to act accordingly...meaning that no part of the Land of Israel can be regarded as occupied territory....

M. Pa'il (Sheli): Perhaps the Speaker would explain to us why that Knesset left Jordanian law in effect in Judea and Samaria, and Egyptian law in Gaza and Rafah.

The Prime Minister, M. Begin: There is no contradiction. As you know, when the state was established certain laws were left on the books while others were annulled, including the White Paper banning Jewish settlement in the Land of Israel....Consequently, the Minister of Defense extended our law to parts of the Land of Israel regarding which it was unclear whether it applied, and he did so by an administrative order, by virtue of the power vested in him. There is nothing new in that nor is there any contradiction....

As for the claim that we have violated international law, when is a country which has occupied the territory of another country regarded as an occupying power? When it is clear that the first country had sovereignty over the area taken away from it by war. The question is whether the government of Hashemite Jordan had sovereignty or acknowledged sovereignty over Judea and Samaria....The answer is absolutely not. Jordan invaded the western Land of Israel in violation of all international law. That was aggression. It caused bloodshed, destroyed synagogues and tried, together with Egypt and Syria, to destroy Israel's independence the day after it had been proclaimed....Does an act of injustice, of aggressive invasion, grant any right...?

M. Pa'il (Sheli): The same applies when the injustice is perpetrated by Jews.

The Prime Minister, M. Begin: We perpetrated no injustice. We defended ourselves. You were one of the defenders in 1948. You were attacked by the Arab Legion. They wanted to kill you too. By Divine intervention you remained alive, together with me.

M. Pa'il (Sheli): Why do you permit Jordanian law to remain in force in Judea and Samaria, while telling the Knesset that that is not so?

The Prime Minister, M. Begin: An act of injustice cannot grant any right. Furthermore, no country, apart from two, recognized King Abdullah's illegal act of annexation of the early 1950s. One of those two countries was Britain—in those days Glubb Pasha was still in Amman—and the other was Pakistan, that bastion of democracy. The U.S. never recognized that *de jure* annexation...and nor did the rest of the world, including the Arabs.

Z. Atshi (Democratic Movement for Change): ...Are you talking about land or inhabitants or both?

The Prime Minister, M. Begin: I am talking about the Land of Israel, my friend. You have switched parties, and the one you used to belong to preached that the Land of Israel belongs to the Jewish people by right....The Arabs, that is, those who live in the Land of Israel and do not have foreign citizenship, have every right to live alongside us in the Land of Israel, with equal rights with the Jewish inhabitants of the Land of Israel. You should know that there are today some 100,000 Jewish inhabitants who are not citizens and vote only for the local authorities, not the Knesset. We want exactly the same law to apply to the Arab inhabitants who do not have Israeli citizenship...i.e., that they may educate their children in their own language, according to their religion and tradition, and have the same individual rights as Jewish inhabitants.

Z. Atshi (Democratic Movement for Change): Are you prepared to grant them citizenship?

The Prime Minister, M. Begin: Yes. When the time comes, I am prepared to offer the Arab inhabitants free choice as to their citizenship. We will not force ours upon them, but if any of them want it, when the time comes, I shall propose that they receive it....

On behalf of the government of Israel, I would like to express deep regret and disappointment at the Secretary of State's statement, for which there was no justification. During our talks we left no room for doubt regarding our position regarding settlement activity in the Land of Israel. We do not want there to be any doubts today, either....It is true that there are differences of opinion on this score between the governments of Israel and the U.S. They are not new and have existed since the Six Day War...but Israel and the U.S. have friendly relations.... We have differences of opinion on other topics too...and must agree to disagree without allowing this to overshadow the deep friendship between our two countries....For years the U.S. affirmed its commitment to ensuring the security and survival of Israel, but we regard the word "survival" as having negative connotations, especially in this generation, and in view of the fact that the responsibility for this is ours alone....We therefore requested that "survival" be replaced by "well-being," and we hope that the differences of opinion between us will not cast a shadow over this phrase....

A. Nof (Democratic Movement for Change): With regard to being in favor of settlement activity, why wasn't the thing itself enough? Why did you have to issue a statement yesterday?

The Prime Minister, M. Begin: ...There was no statement yesterday. The Ministerial Committee on Settlement Activity, chaired by the Minister of Agriculture, met yesterday...and reached a perfectly ordinary, routine decision. There are three Jewish settlements which had not yet been officially recognized as regards the receipt of supplies and governmental support. That recognition was given to them. No statement. Just a simple decision....

M. Pa'il (Sheli): Apropos statements, what will be included in the opening statement of Israel's delegation to Geneva...?

The Prime Minister, M. Begin: ...I hope and pray that we reach Geneva. We want the Geneva Conference. Let us hope we get there and that the government of Israel makes decisions. And I am sure that when our representatives at Geneva speak on the basis of those decisions, the nation in Israel will be proud of their representatives and what they say.

M. Wilner (Democratic Front for Peace and Equality): That is a policy which will lead to a terrible war involving thousands of casualties and cemeteries. Why are you laughing?

D. Shilanski (Likud): We're laughing at the voice of Moscow.

As for the claim that we have violated international law, when is a country which has occupied the territory of another country regarded as an occupying power? When it is clear that the first country had sovereignty over the area taken away from it by war. The question is whether the government of Hashemite Jordan had sovereignty or acknowledged sovereignty over Judea and Samaria....The answer is absolutely not. Jordan invaded the western Land of Israel in violation of all international law. That was aggression. It caused bloodshed, destroyed synagogues and tried, together with Egypt and Syria, to destroy Israel's independence the day after it had been proclaimed....Does an act of injustice, of aggressive invasion, grant any right...?

M. Pa'il (Sheli): The same applies when the injustice is perpetrated by Jews.

The Prime Minister, M. Begin: We perpetrated no injustice. We defended ourselves. You were one of the defenders in 1948. You were attacked by the Arab Legion. They wanted to kill you too. By Divine intervention you remained alive, together with me.

M. Pa'il (Sheli): Why do you permit Jordanian law to remain in force in Judea and Samaria, while telling the Knesset that that is not so?

The Prime Minister, M. Begin: An act of injustice cannot grant any right. Furthermore, no country, apart from two, recognized King Abdullah's illegal act of annexation of the early 1950s. One of those two countries was Britain—in those days Glubb Pasha was still in Amman—and the other was Pakistan, that bastion of democracy. The U.S. never recognized that *de jure* annexation...and nor did the rest of the world, including the Arabs.

Z. Atshi (Democratic Movement for Change): ...Are you talking about land or inhabitants or both?

The Prime Minister, M. Begin: I am talking about the Land of Israel, my friend. You have switched parties, and the one you used to belong to preached that the Land of Israel belongs to the Jewish people by right....The Arabs, that is, those who live in the Land of Israel and do not have foreign citizenship, have every right to live alongside us in the Land of Israel, with equal rights with the Jewish inhabitants of the Land of Israel. You should know that there are today some 100,000 Jewish inhabitants who are not citizens and vote only for the local authorities, not the Knesset. We want exactly the same law to apply to the Arab inhabitants who do not have Israeli citizenship...i.e., that they may educate their children in their own language, according to their religion and tradition, and have the same individual rights as Jewish inhabitants.

Z. Atshi (Democratic Movement for Change): Are you prepared to grant them citizenship?

The Prime Minister, M. Begin: Yes. When the time comes, I am prepared to offer the Arab inhabitants free choice as to their citizenship. We will not force ours upon them, but if any of them want it, when the time comes, I shall propose that they receive it....

On behalf of the government of Israel, I would like to express deep regret and disappointment at the Secretary of State's statement, for which there was no justification. During our talks we left no room for doubt regarding our position regarding settlement activity in the Land of Israel. We do not want there to be any doubts today, either....It is true that there are differences of opinion on this score between the governments of Israel and the U.S. They are not new and have existed since the Six Day War...but Israel and the U.S. have friendly relations.... We have differences of opinion on other topics too...and must agree to disagree without allowing this to overshadow the deep friendship between our two countries....For years the U.S. affirmed its commitment to ensuring the security and survival of Israel, but we regard the word "survival" as having negative connotations, especially in this generation, and in view of the fact that the responsibility for this is ours alone....We therefore requested that "survival" be replaced by "well-being," and we hope that the differences of opinion between us will not cast a shadow over this phrase....

A. Nof (Democratic Movement for Change): With regard to being in favor of settlement activity, why wasn't the thing itself enough? Why did you have to issue a statement yesterday?

The Prime Minister, M. Begin: ...There was no statement yesterday. The Ministerial Committee on Settlement Activity, chaired by the Minister of Agriculture, met yesterday...and reached a perfectly ordinary, routine decision. There are three Jewish settlements which had not yet been officially recognized as regards the receipt of supplies and governmental support. That recognition was given to them. No statement. Just a simple decision....

M. Pa'il (Sheli): Apropos statements, what will be included in the opening statement of Israel's delegation to Geneva...?

The Prime Minister, M. Begin: ...I hope and pray that we reach Geneva. We want the Geneva Conference. Let us hope we get there and that the government of Israel makes decisions. And I am sure that when our representatives at Geneva speak on the basis of those decisions, the nation in Israel will be proud of their representatives and what they say.

M. Wilner (Democratic Front for Peace and Equality): That is a policy which will lead to a terrible war involving thousands of casualties and cemeteries. Why are you laughing?

D. Shilanski (Likud): We're laughing at the voice of Moscow.

The Prime Minister, M. Begin: The government discussed the issue of the settlements today, and I have the honor of bringing its decision before the Knesset: "The government authorizes the Ministerial Committee on Settlement Activity to decide to establish new settlements. The Committee's decisions will be binding on the government."

We raised the problem of our brethren in Syria and asked that action be taken to rescue them and get them out of the ghetto in which they are living. There are about 4,000 persons, or 800 families, living in fear. We will not rest until our brethren from Syria have reached a safe haven and a life of freedom.

We also raised the issue of the Jews of the U.S.S.R., where there has been a truly remarkable development. For almost two generations Soviet Jewry was cut off from its nation and its land, knowing neither the Bible, Hebrew, Israel nor the Jewish people. Then there was a tremendous awakening, and the Jewish youngsters of the U.S.S.R. have returned to us. They are prepared to sacrifice themselves, in faith and in love, to go to concentration camps and prisons, suffer hunger and persecution, for the sake of the right to immigrate to—in their phrase—the historic homeland of the Jewish people. The Jewish people will not rest, and will conduct a continual public campaign, until the day comes—and we believe it will—when every Jew who wishes to come home, to Israel, will be able to do so....

I also met with the U.S. Defense Secretary, Mr. Brown...and presented Israel's urgent defense problems to him. The next day the Secretary informed our ambassador...of the President's decision to supply us with ammunition, hydrofoil boats, the funds required to develop the project connected with the Merhava tank, and anti-tank helicopters, amounting altogether to almost 250 million dollars....

In my meeting with the U.S. Treasury Secretary I described our country's economic problems. I told him that our people wished to live by its own labors and looked to the day when it would not need financial aid from abroad, but in the immediate future we do need aid because we devote immense sums...to our national defense needs. He agreed, and further discussions will be held to determine the amounts involved....

I met with a total of seventy Senators...and two hundred Congressmen...and held good and productive discussions with them...as well as with other leading figures in the U.S. I also met the Secretary-General of the U.N., Mr. Waldheim, with whom I raised the subject of the Christians in Lebanon....I also proposed to him that he persuade the Arab delegations to maintain what is known as a political ceasefire until the Geneva Conference is convened. In addition, I asked him to intervene in Damascus on behalf of the Jews and the need to get them out of Syria. With regard to the resolution of the nine European countries, I told him that the Europeans should be very careful in raising matters whose outcome could be the shedding of Jewish blood. I told him that the continent

of Europe was saturated with Jewish blood, and that the Rhine, the Danube, the Vistula and the Dneiper rivers flowed with Jewish blood....

I had deeply moving meetings with American Jewry....The Presidents' Conference, the organization representing mighty, proud, free, influential American Jewry, announced immediately after the elections that it would support Israel following the change wrought by the voters democratically, proving that Israel is indeed the only democracy in the Middle East, both by the free elections and by the orderly transfer of government....Rabbi Schindler worked tirelessly to unite American Jewry, and public opinion in general, behind Israel after May 17....I felt a tremendous sense of unity between us and them....I also met with leading rabbis, and was deeply impressed by them. They believe in the eternity of the Jewish people. I received their blessing for my mission and learned a great deal from them. I am extremely grateful to them....

In my meetings with the leaders of Conservative and Reform Jewry they voiced their concern at the proposed amendment regarding conversions....I told them of my undertaking to amend the law, not because of pressure from the religious parties but because that is what I believe....This is a free country and everyone has the right to think and believe as he pleases...but conversion is primarily a feature of religious law, and we are not harming anyone by giving it its rightful place.... We did not reach agreement on that point, though we did agree that they would send a delegation to Israel to talk with me, the Minister of the Interior and all those concerned....

I also had extremely moving meetings with thousands of American Jews, and felt that the morale of the Jews of the diaspora is very high....Through the mass media I also had the opportunity of speaking to the entire American nation...and I answered the searching questions which were put to me to the best of my ability and understanding. The reaction we received was on the whole positive....

In conclusion...it was one of the outstanding events of my life to meet the President of the U.S., Mr. Carter....I spent eight years in the company of my teacher and mentor, Ze'ev Jabotinsky, and since then I am not easily impressed by people. I have met presidents, heads of government, ministers and great writers and am not easily impressed, but I emerged from the talks in Washington with the feeling that the U.S. President is a great man. He has a quick grasp of the main points of a problem, the ability to make rapid decisions and a love for human liberty, and hence his concern for human rights, in which Israel will support him unconditionally....Human rights must be upheld in the East as in the West—

M. Wilner (Democratic Front for Peace and Equality): First of all human rights should be upheld in the occupied territories.

The Prime Minister, M. Begin:—against all tyranny and dictatorship, wherever they might be....I am sure that he will do great things for the cause of human rights in the world.

Our talks were frank, and for quite a large part of the time personal, regarding which I am sure the Knesset does not expect a report....We are aware of the fact that there differences of opinion between us, as well as agreement on basic points. Those differences of opinion need not lead to a rift between the U.S. and Israel....As free men and as friends...because we contribute a great deal to the national security of the U.S., we may agree to disagree without impairing our warm relations with that mighty democracy, the hope of all mankind and the flag-bearer of freedom and democracy under the leadership of a president who is both the leader and the protector of the free world, on the one hand, and the revived Jewish state, a small country fulfilling the great historic vision of the Jewish people, which was persecuted throughout the generations and destroyed in this, and which summoned up the last vestiges of its national strength, by the heroism of its fighting men and endeavors of its brave pioneers, and established its state, on the other. And we will all see to it that it continues to exist as the Jewish state in our land forever.

S. Peres (Alignment): Madam Speaker, distinguished Knesset, the Prime Minister has returned from an exhausting journey in which there were some high points, and we welcome him back. It is evident that he gave a great deal of thought to dealing with this mission before he left, and how to describe it after he returned. On the one hand, he assured us before he left that this was no fateful mission, a statement which indicates a sense of proportion; on the other hand, he asked us to pray for him, as if a miracle or a disaster were about to happen in Washington. After returning he claimed on the one hand that an unwritten alliance had been established between us and the U.S., and on the other he admitted that there were differences of opinion between us. Both the unwritten alliance and the continuing differences of opinion indicate more about the temperament of the description than the actual state of affairs.

For the truth is that our friendship with the U.S. is deep-rooted and long-standing, and overrides differences of opinion. President Carter, like his predecessors, stated his commitment to Israel, its security, its welfare and its well-being, I am glad to add....He has undertaken to reject an imposed settlement and to seek a peaceful solution to the problem. What has changed, then, is not the friendship between us and the U.S. but the treatment of the differences of opinion between our two countries.

The choice confronting the Prime Minister was whether to try to reach an agreement with America regarding political steps to be taken

in the foreseeable future, or, in order to circumvent this problem, to be content with clarifying the possible procedures which might or might not be accepted by the Arabs, and to relieve the relations between Israel and the U.S. of the tradition of coordinating positions on the substance of the subject. He preferred a simple and immediate solution at the price of making things more difficult for future relations between Israel and the U.S.

Naturally, I congratulate the Prime Minister on his flexibility with regard to procedural matters, something to which we have not been accustomed from him. He agreed to things which seemed very difficult to him in the past: he adopted Resolution 242 as the basis for the convening of the Geneva Conference, despite the fact that in the past he has described it as "marching backwards" and claimed that it involves the repartition of Judea and Samaria....But now he too has agreed to its serving as a basis for the Geneva Conference. He has agreed that Judea, Samaria and even Jerusalem are negotiable, an expression he has never allowed to pass his lips till now....After the talks he postponed the imposition of Israeli law on Judea, Samaria and Gaza, though he has not abandoned the idea. Nor is it clear to me, sir, whether you have rejected the U.S. President's request to postpone actual settlement activity until after October.

You deserve credit for adhering to your principles. I don't think that the U.S. President asked you to betray your principles. He asked you for a postponement. I feel slightly uneasy, after yesterday's *de jure*, almost dramatic, recognition of three existing settlements, and the Minister of Agriculture's unaccustomedly diplomatic statement that he "neither confirms nor denies it."...I would like to say that if Mr. Begin were a member of a government not led by himself which was so quick to make concessions, even if only in the procedural sphere, he would have resigned from it by now. "I have no doubt that the Prime Minister is a firm person, but I have seen firm people make concessions, doing so with great firmness, particularly on the internal front." I ask the House not to be agitated, I am quoting what Mr. Begin said about Golda Meir when she agreed to Resolution 242....

Nor was he particular about the actual procedure: Geneva under the auspices of the U.S. and the U.S.S.R.—by all means; conciliation talks—by all means. There is no longer any strict adherence to the principle of direct negotiations....I ask myself why the Prime Minister...gave so much flexibility to the negotiating procedure and left so little for the actual subject to be negotiated. The answer would seem to be in order to refrain as far as possible from discussing the real subject on the agenda—what we are going to negotiate about, and how, with the U.S. and the Arab countries. The procedural aspect is enough for him.

The Prime Minister has asked me whether the Alignment's plan, the Allon plan or any other, would be acceptable to the Arabs and put an

end to warfare....I am not prepared to give a simple answer, and will only say that since the danger exists, we were and are prepared to accept interim agreements. Obviously, a peace treaty is preferable to an interim agreement, but an interim agreement is preferable to war, and the prevention of war is an extremely serious moral and political objective....

Mr. Begin claims that he has returned from America with two signal achievements, the first being personal friendship, on which I congratulate him, although it appears in a different light today, and the second being U.S. support for a peace treaty....That claim is completely unfounded, since President Carter expressed his support for a peace treaty long before Mr. Begin set out on his journey...so it cannot be described as his achievement....

I wouldn't mind the Prime Minister taking the credit for achievements which are not his, but what is really serious is that the President spoke about the peace treaty not as an entity in itself but as part of a three-point program involving a peace treaty, a "homeland" and withdrawal to the 1967 borders....The Prime Minister should not have separated one side of the triangle from the rest....One must tell the nation and the world the truth, not sink into unfounded optimism.

G. Cohen (Likud): Nor into unfounded demagoguery.

S. Peres (Alignment): One should not paint matters in unjustifiably rosy hues. I never claimed to have obtained from the U.S. President something I did not get. I know that we are in disagreement with him.

M. Arens (Likud): Are you saying that the U.S. President will agree to a peace treaty only on those conditions.

S. Peres (Alignment): If the negotiations were to be held with America, they wouldn't mind if the Likud kept both banks of the Jordan....The problem is the Arabs. The President stands in between the Arab and the Israeli positions. Really, why are we playing with words here? Instead of clarifying the whole triangle with President Carter, the Prime Minister has suggested that we keep all quiet. The President has had his say, but we must keep quiet vis-à-vis public opinion as October approaches. Where's the logic...? Did we not argue with the Americans, with Rogers, with Dulles, with Kissinger, in broad daylight, openly and without keeping quiet?

G. Cohen (Likud): You went down on your knees and begged.

S. Peres (Alignment): The attempt to conceal the disagreement can mean one of two things: either the government wants to create the false impression of an idyll, at least for a while on the internal level, creating enthusiasm which it will not be possible to sustain, or it believes that if it meets the Arabs at Geneva the Arab position will be more accommo-

dating than that of the Americans, especially after the Arabs have heard that the President favors a "homeland" and the 1967 borders....How do you expect the Arab position to change at Geneva, given the American position and the fact that the Russians will support them all along the line...?

Once it becomes clear to the Arabs that whereas there are no prior conditions for the negotiations, the Prime Minister's principle is that when the negotiations are over he will extend Israeli law to Judea, Samaria and Gaza, do you think they will sign a peace treaty?...And what will happen then? Will we ask the Russians and Americans to persuade the Arabs to modify their stand after we have absolved them of the need to do this, saying, let us meet them and then we'll manage? The Prime Minister claims that for 29 years we did not ask for a peace treaty. Does he think that by asking for it now he'll get it? On the basis of no political or territorial change in Judea and Samaria?

G. Cohen (Likud): On the basis of the fact that others, and not you, are in power.

The Prime Minister, M. Begin: What is your proposal for the functional division of Judea and Samaria? Have you accepted Mapam's position?

S. Peres (Alignment): I am more modest in my position than the Prime Minister is in his. I state explicitly that, being aware of the difficulties, I am prepared to accept interim agreements....

The Prime Minister, M. Begin: By all means, but what is to be the functional division of Judea and Samaria?

S. Peres (Alignment): Either Mr. Begin intends to change his attitudes in October, and if that is so why doesn't he coordinate them with the U.S. in July? If he does not intend to change them in October, what is the actual peace plan, not the procedure of the meeting? If he is prepared to compromise, why doesn't he ask the U.S. to attain a bilateral compromise from the Arabs too? If the Arabs agree, there will be peace. If not, they will be responsible for having rejected the idea, not us. But America is in a situation of compromise, not confrontation....

M. Nissim (Likud): You had three and a half years after the Yom Kippur War? What did you do?

S. Peres (Alignment): For three and a half years we nourished Arab-Israel-U.S. relations with interim agreements. That is our conception....We would certainly have gone to Geneva, but after preparing the ground and without creating unrealistic expectations....We would have considered what subjects to raise at Geneva—peace treaties, which we do not reject but doubt whether they are attainable since the Arabs are not always in agreement, or interim agreements, which may be more attainable. Whatever the topic, we would have sorted things out in ad-

vance with the U.S., ensuring either full coordination or its acceptance of our interpretation of Resolution 242...We would have informed the nation and the Arabs that we were prepared to compromise on every front, with all three countries, and that if they agreed there would be peace, if not, the responsibility would be theirs. As regards the settlements, we would have refrained from engaging in that kind of activity at this stage, having no need to create unnecessary dramas now....Finally, we would not have cut the budget of the Ministry of Defense without informing the Foreign Affairs and Defense Committee, as this government has done....

The main point is that we would have told the nation and the world the truth: we aspire to peace, but peace has a price....

The Minister of Health, E. Shostak: What price?

S. Peres (Alignment): The price must be paid by both sides, the Arabs and the Israelis. The Israeli side is prepared to pay the price....Peace is not a debating competition but a search for a common denominator between the two sides, and there is an Arab side to peace....The fact that we have more arguments does not mean that the Arab side does not exist. We must, in addition, maintain Israel's deterrent capacity. If they want it, we are ready for a comprehensive settlement, if not we will settle for an interim agreement. It is on that basis that we would go to the U.S. and try to talk to the U.S. President. We would come to grips with the problems now in order to pave the way in the future, and not create the impression that procedure will resolve everything.

...

S. Tamir (Democratic Movement for Change): Madam Speaker, Knesset Members, the Prime Minister has returned from an important mission to the U.S. which was crowned with success in many areas. The Prime Minister was impressive as a proud Jew and Israeli, imbued with faith in his mission, acting wisely, well and with human warmth on behalf of the entire nation....He did this with the Administration, on Capitol Hill, in the American media and in forging a path to all the strata of U.S. Jewry. As someone who has both praised and criticized MK Begin from this podium, when necessary, I would like to congratulate him now.

Nonetheless...there is a limit to personal relations and the deep impression cast by individuals as a political tool in the international arena....Both the Prime Minister and I learned from Ze'ev Jabotinsky that the deciding factor in international relations is a nation's interests, over and above sentiments and feelings, however important, and they are very important in the relations between the U.S. and Israel. Certain basic facts were not changed by the visit and could not be changed by it, and there is also a limit to the Prime Minister's ability to present our side....Today, it seems, even the Prime Minister is con-

cerned by the fact that presenting our side and making an impressive appearance are not enough, and he has been obliged to take the line of agreeing to disagree, because explanations were not enough to reconcile opposing political interests.

There is a broad base of common interests between the U.S. and Israel, but there are also increasing common interests between the U.S. and the Arab countries which surround us and are hostile to us....That is the situation in which Israel finds itself at present, and will continue to do so. There are no facile solutions to the problem or simple formulae for overcoming the objective difficulties....There is no alternative but to take the changed circumstances into account and adapt our policy to reconcile what is desirable with what is feasible.

I therefore congratulate the Prime Minister for having realized that his attitudes on a variety of subjects for which he fought in the past have to undergo a positive revision, in view of the circumstances and the fact that he is a prime minister who wishes to guide the State of Israel to the objective of peace. The arguments we have heard in the past about peace being unattainable were not expressed today, and that is a good thing....The Prime Minister stressed Israel's desire for peace not as a distant dream but as an urgent necessity for Israel's survival....Another good thing is the readiness to go to the Geneva Conference, when invited, on the basis of Resolution 242, a readiness which did not exist four years ago....

The Knesset and the public do not have precise information about the document the Prime Minister submitted to President Carter and the talks they held, though there have been some leaks about the former in the press....From them we learn that there is readiness to make territorial concessions in return for peace. That is also an unavoidable and praiseworthy—adaptation to current circumstances....As we all know, that has not always been the Prime Minister's approach....I commend the pragmatic approach, which is inevitable when he who is in power seeks to fulfill his mission....

The information which has reached us speaks of no withdrawal whatsoever in the east, territorial concessions in the Golan Heights and a significant withdrawal in the Sinai. If it were possible to reach full peace on that basis I am sure that the greater part of the nation would welcome it, but in the situation created after the Yom Kippur War that is not possible. If that is not clear in July, it will be in October, and if not in October, then at the beginning of next year. Not because it is desirable but because of the situation I described, namely, deep-seated U.S. interests in the Arab countries and the fact that the U.S. is our only significant ally in the international arena. In that situation there is no alternative but for Israel to be ready to make extensive territorial concessions on all three fronts. I propose that we leave legal arguments aside

for the moment, since they can always be interpreted in a variety of ways, and accept that it is interests which will determine matters....

What worries me greatly is that the hermetic sealing of the eastern front regarding our relations with Jordan might lead the government, because of international and U.S. pressure, to state in advance its readiness to make far-reaching withdrawals, more than are actually needed, in the north and the south. Why was the term "withdrawal" substituted for the more accommodating one of "compromise"? Why this readiness to make a significant withdrawal from the Sinai? In my opinion, the Sinai is very small compared with the Arab countries. Why did we have to go so far at this stage regarding the north and the south, unless because we had closed all the taps elsewhere...?

Mr. Begin objected vehemently to the use of the word "withdrawal" in government documents in the past....I say, and have said in the past, that there is no alternative to a territorial compromise, but let us not create a situation in which, because of a firm stand on one subject, however important, we are obliged to declare our readiness to withdraw in areas of the highest importance for our defense—the Golan Heights and the Sinai....We should have said: we will draw no maps, we will not speak of withdrawal, we are prepared in principle to reach a territorial compromise on all three borders, and will speak to the Arabs in the process of direct negotiations.

The Prime Minister, M. Begin: And is that so simple?

S. Tamir (Democratic Movement for Change): No, it's not. As I have said, there are no simple solutions, and we all have to make compromises with ourselves, with our own formulae, our own statements, in view of the circumstances....I am merely proposing a framework which in my opinion will be more acceptable to the Americans and perhaps far less dangerous for Israel's security....Above all, I maintain that taking an overly firm stand regarding the eastern front could rapidly push Israel to a position which the present Foreign Minister has advocated in the past, namely, one-sided withdrawals without peace in the north and the south, withdrawals which the Prime Minister and many of those now in the Opposition have opposed in the past and still do....

Z. Warhaftig (National Religious Party): Madam Speaker, my teachers and rabbis, I also wish to congratulate the Prime Minister on the success of his visit to the U.S., particularly in view of four achievements: 1. he established a good personal relationship with the U.S. President; 2. he showed the great American nation and the U.S. President the special relationship between the Jewish people and the Land of Israel, the holy land, clarifying our historic, religious and national rights; 3. he contributed to clarifying Israel's fierce desire for true peace, even in return for concessions and compromises, as is indicated

by the bold proposal to convene the Geneva Conference without prior conditions, everything being negotiable; 4. he gained the hearts of U.S. Jewry by the firmness of his convictions, strengthening their faith in and loyalty to the State of Israel....

I think that till now both Israel and the Arabs have been laboring under a delusion and ignoring reality by assuming that the U.S. would solve all the problems....Israel failed to realize that its principal partner was our Arab neighbors, whom we are obliged to encounter on the battlefield, alongside whom we must live and maintain relations of good-neighborliness, and with whom we must conduct negotiations for agreements, for peace. To a greater extent than Israel, even, the Arab countries deluded themselves that the U.S. would solve all their problems, bringing them the solution they sought on a silver platter, namely, Israel's withdrawal from the territories....

A great deal of blood has been shed in this region, both Jewish and Arab blood, because in their arrogance the Arab countries did not want to face historical reality and accept the fact of Israel's existence, and the historic and religious right of the Jewish people to their land....I think that the Prime Minister's visit made that clear to all concerned, as well as the fact that we must meet, talk and negotiate, and hence his proposal to revive the Geneva Conference without any prior conditions....There is a danger in that, and we must beware of going to Geneva without being prepared....By virtue of our nation's faith and the strength of the IDF, however, we must attempt to enter that lion's den of negotiations, and take the risk involved. The path is long and very difficult, but perhaps shorter than the alternative of interim agreements, which are only a last resort, not an end in themselves....

Allow me to point out that the Geneva Conference is not yet certain and the reactions of the Arab countries vary. Egypt's response, for example, is different from that of Syria. When the time comes, there may be internal differences of opinion in Israel...but there is no point in fanning the flames of internal dissent just now. We must maintain the national consensus as long as possible. Our strength lies in maximal national unity for as long as possible....The government of Israel must combine vision with practicality, making use of its advantages while being aware of its limitations...and then perhaps we may reach serious peace negotiations, and maybe even peace itself.

T. Toubi (Democratic Front for Peace and Equality): Distinguished Speaker and Knesset...one of the newspapers has reported that Mr. Begin told President Carter that "the Palestinian problem is the hoax of the century." The Prime Minister reiterated that view here today when he said that...the Palestinian Arab people had no right to a homeland, disregarding its existence, together with the U.N. resolutions on the basis

of which Israel came into existence and the rights of both nations, Arab and Jewish, to independence in this country were recognized.

But the hoax of the century is the imaginary success of the Prime Minister, Mr. Menahem Begin, during his visit to the U.S. We are told with a great fanfare that the Prime Minister established good personal relations with the U.S. President, and can talk to him whenever he wishes by phone, and that the Prime Minister and President Carter agreed that the Geneva talks should conclude with a peace treaty. All this is empty talk...intended to strengthen the Prime Minister's position and conceal the threat to peace arising from the Likud government's policy and the conspiracy being woven in Washington against the Geneva Conference and a just peace.

There is nothing new in saying that the Geneva Conference should conclude with a peace treaty. Everyone knows that the U.S.S.R. has repeatedly said that...The basic question is, however, how to attain it when the plan for the greater Land of Israel blocks the way and is merely a blueprint for a fresh war...It will not be long before the smoke of the propaganda regarding the Prime Minister's "successes" disperses and it becomes apparent that what we have here is a great loss to the cause of peace. The Prime Minister made a great fuss about what is known as "the secret peace plan," but there is in fact no peace plan nor any secrets...The Prime Minister's so-called plan for the solution of the crisis is a more extreme version of the Alignment's policy of annexation and disregard for the rights of the Palestinians, which blocked the path to peace till now.

That plan comprises: an extensive withdrawal from the Sinai, i.e., withdrawal which will leave parts of the Sinai under Israeli occupation; a limited withdrawal from the Golan Heights, i.e., continuing the Israeli occupation of most of the Golan Heights; Israeli military rule in the West Bank and the Gaza Strip, while giving limited authority to Jordan in the areas of economics and services...denying the Palestinians the right to self-determination and their own country alongside Israel. To speak of perpetuating occupation as the peace plan which Israel will bring to the Geneva Conference is an insult to one's intelligence and constitutes demagoguery. It involves misleading world public opinion and guaranteeing the failure of the Geneva Conference.

The Prime Minister stubbornly insists on ignoring the existence of the Palestinian nation, which demands to be freed from foreign occupation and is entitled to recognition and support from the U.N. and the entire world...The Prime Minister's position on the subject is simply unrealistic...The world has recognized the rights of the Palestinians, and if the Prime Minister says that the PLO cannot participate in the Geneva Conference, that the Palestinians have no right to a country of their own and that the West Bank and the Gaza Strip will be part of Israel, he is deliberately harming any chance of peace.

No one is going to swallow that line and the Prime Minister's demagoguery that the establishment of a Palestinian state in the West Bank and the Gaza Strip will involve constant war and bloodshed...No, sir, it is not the fulfillment of the right to self-determination of the Palestinians which will lead to bloodshed but your policy, your plan, which seeks to perpetuate occupation and deprive the Palestinians of their rights...To talk of a Soviet base, of Soviet cannon, in order to gain the support of the U.S. is empty talk, demagoguery, which should not be taken seriously.

While he was in the U.S. the Prime Minister spoke a great deal about his readiness to go to Geneva, and proposed a procedure whereby three or four bilateral committees would conduct negotiations without any prior conditions...He even said that Resolutions 242 and 338 would constitute the basis for the Conference. A veritable idyll. But all that becomes extremely cynical and meaningless when the Prime Minister presents a plan which is in complete contradiction to all that and when his government takes steps to create *faits accomplis*...Thus, the Prime Minister's peace plan is intended in effect to prevent the convening of the Geneva Conference, or to ensure its failure.

Without being ready to withdraw to the borders of 4 June 1967 and recognize the rights of the Palestinians in accordance with the resolutions of the U.N., everything the Israel government said in the U.S. about the Geneva Conference is misleading and disingenuous. Let no one in Israel be deluded that the Begin plan will bring Israel nearer peace or gain time or establish the occupation. It will merely accelerate the processes of deterioration towards war...

We call on all the forces of peace and democracy to fight this dangerous deterioration in the service of imperialism and reaction, and to work to prevent war and establish peace...What is most shameful is that the Alignment attacks the Likud government from the right flank...instead of joining forces against the nationalistic consensus, cooperating on a broad front with all the peace-loving forces...and bringing the rule of the Likud government to an end...

S. Aloni (Citizens' Rights Movement): Mr. Speaker, distinguished Knesset...I was among those who prayed for the success of your mission, Mr. Prime Minister, and I was very pleased, together with everyone else, to see your impressive appearance and the wonderful way you put across the problem of the Jewish people in the Land of Israel, a struggle not for the recognition but for the survival of the state. I think that not since Abba Eban's great speech at the time of the Six Day War—when the conditions were more favorable—has there been a more important act of stating our position on an international stage as this one.

I think that you took a splendid tactical step by putting the ball in our opponents' court. It is not for us to make peace, but we make an appeal

for peace and they must reply....What concerns me is that we may find ourself playing alone...while against us are ranged all our enemies, supported by the U.S.S.R., and the U.S. is not our ally, since we have agreed to disagree....Once again we are liable to find ourselves in the tragic position of "the whole world is against us," including our greatest friend. Because, despite all the excitement arising from the warm reception—and I am not exaggerating—this fills me with apprehension, since I recall that the U.S. President evinced the same affection for the Presidents of Syria and Egypt, and if we do not reach an agreement but agree to disagree the isolation is frightening.

And when, Mr. Prime Minister, with a tremor in your voice you remind the world of the tragedy which befell the Jewish people...we must remember that the world is cynical. Biafra, Bangladesh and Vietnam all came later. It makes no impression when one is discussing rational, practical affairs such as a conflict between forces and nations. As far as I can see, once we reach Geneva our isolation is inevitable, because in your arguments you ignored the fact that there is a Palestinian entity and used Mrs. Meir's unfortunate phrase "I am a Palestinian." Mr. Prime Minister, you are not a Palestinian, just as you are no longer a Polish citizen. We consciously and willingly relinquished being Palestinian, and that is why the State of Israel came into existence....

Today there is no Palestine. It is true that Jews were always told to go back to Palestine, which existed in an historical sense, but in 1948 we abandoned that identity....However, a certain population remained here which is not Israeli, which is nothing else and which regards itself as Palestinian. Whatever name we give it, it exists and is different from us, a different nation, and you did not refer to the problems of that nation....

In referring to the problem of settlement activity in the entire Land of Israel, you asked whether Americans would prevent Jews from living in certain towns in the U.S....The answer is clear. But the same answer obtains for the other side of the coin, namely, whether Arab inhabitants may be prevented from living wherever they choose....What you are saying is, in effect, that everything is ours and we may settle anywhere....

Incidentally...you claimed that we were the legitimate heirs of the Mandate and advocated extending Israeli law to the entire area of what was formerly Palestine. The government of which you were a member left Jordanian law and currency in force and adhered to the open bridges policy. In fact, it was waiting for a phone call, and did so deliberately because it did not want a binational state, because the nation on both banks of the Jordan is one nation, entity, culture and religion....

The Foreign Minister, M. Dayan: No one waited for any phone call, the phone call came. For ten years there were negotiations, we didn't waste

a single moment waiting for a phone call. Four governments received phone calls. This myth has got to stop.

S. Aloni (Citizens' Rights Movement): I am not claiming that Israel's governments did not try to hold negotiations. I am just saying that what was done was done in the hope that the phone call would come...and then that entity, with its population, would be united with Jordan....In effect, Israel was the third country to grant de facto recognition to the legitimacy of Jordanian law, currency and presence in Judea and Samaria. This has been going on for ten years and Israel imposed military rule as an occupying force, in accordance with international law....

To say today that because our proposals were not accepted we ignore the population and say that all that is the Land of Israel is an invitation to a fresh war or the exploitation of occupation, in which case you have to say what you intend to do with that population if you do not want a binational state. And if you give them all the rights and say that they are part of Palestine, the Land of Israel, which became the State of Israel, it is their right to buy land and settle anywhere, because anyone who says that what applies to Nablus applies to Jaffa must know that it works both ways....Is that what we really want? Is that what our neighbors and, indeed, the whole world, will accept? We can neither expel nor exterminate them. Nothing was said about those very real issues, which are beyond public relations, beyond information and beyond tactics, and statements like "I am a Palestinian," merely complicate matters....

Since we do not want a binational state and since we have not reached a prior agreement with the U.S., are we going to go onto the court with a genuine desire for peace but with a grand illusion, without the things which guarantee the legitimate rights of the Jewish people in its land, and negotiate for peace? We received no answer on this point from the Prime Minister's trip....

G. Hausner (Independent Liberals): Mr. Speaker, distinguished Knesset, on his return from a difficult mission the Prime Minister can point to an impressive list of achievements. Before his departure there were difficulties, and many people feared that the new government's policy would lead to a rift with the U.S. It should be noted that the apprehensions were unfounded. Ties were established with America's leaders, there were successes in putting our position across to the American public, and the Prime Minister spoke as a proud, upright Jew, explaining the problems of the Jewish people's existence against the background of the terrible Holocaust....

Nonetheless, there is cause to be apprehensive....The Prime Minister successfully skirted the differences of opinion between Israel and the U.S. and focused on the subject which embodied the maximum chances, namely, determining the process whereby an agreement could be attained rather than its content....Yesterday's State Department

statement constituted a sharp reaction to the first action the Prime Minister took upon his return, and I wonder why it was necessary to proclaim the establishment of three new settlements at this point....During the course of ten years we established over seventy settlements across the Green Line, we knew that on this point there was basic disagreement between us and the U.S., but we avoided a public argument because we never did so flagrantly. We determined *faits accomplis* on the ground...but the settlement of the territories in order to guarantee our security is acceptable to the vast majority of this House. Why was it necessary, given the delicate situation, to make the statement which was made yesterday, and to take the action which was taken today?

Y. Ben-Meir (National Religious Party): That's the way to build the country.

G. Hausner (Independent Liberals): It might help as a gesture as regards your circles....Facts have to be created, but pronouncements do not have to be made....Since there is agreement regarding the framework, there is no alternative but to formulate the content of an agreement, so as to mobilize maximum support for it. As far as I can gather, the agreement will eventually be based on a compromise. This should be the best it can be for Israel's security, but we will not be able to raise the support we need without agreeing to a compromise on the West Bank too....Without that support, at least from the U.S., Israel will be isolated at a critical moment of the peace talks, and the government will have to choose between the failure of the talks, with all that that implies...or the acceptance of a territorial compromise....

The peace agreement should also bring a solution to the Palestinian problem, whether that is the appropriate term or not....If someone wants to call himself a Palestinian, I will not attack him for that. Whether justifiably or not, the residents of the territories call themselves Palestinians. Is that the problem? There is a different problem, which cannot be ignored and to which a solution must be found, namely, the problem of political affiliation with regard to peace....

The Prime Minister did well to establish good relations with U.S. Jewry, but there should have been greater symmetry in his contacts with the various trends, and this should have reflected their concern and support for Israel. Too much time, publicity and attention was given to Orthodox Jewry, despite the fact that the other trends represent the majority of U.S. Jewry....

...

The Prime Minister, M. Begin: Mr. Speaker, Knesset Members...this debate has been very responsible and serious, as should be the case in a democratic parliament. The government was attacked, the opposition spoke, and now it is time to reply. Members from all sides of the House have said that my visit to America was a personal success. A personal

success? If I distinguished myself, that brought distinction to our nation. If I succeeded in the media, it was our nation's success. If I did well in my talks with Secretaries of State, Senators and Congressmen, our country did well. If my talks with President Carter prospered, the affairs of our country and the Jewish people prospered. What personal success? Who am I? Did I go to the U.S. as a private person? I went as the elected prime minister who had received the confidence of the Knesset. I appeared there on behalf of the State of Israel. If the Members of the House congratulated me for my personal success, that means that they welcomed the resultant gains to the State of Israel....

MK Peres, the leader of the opposition said that it has long been agreed that there should be peace treaties. I have read all the documents pertaining to our understanding with the U.S. government...and I have not found one which contains the words: "a comprehensive peace settlement embodied in peace treaties"...Before I left for the U.S. a State Department spokesman said that there should be peace treaties between Israel and the Arab countries, but that was the State Department spokesman, and we wanted to ascertain whether that was the official attitude of the U.S. government and president....It was agreed between our two governments that there should be a comprehensive and peaceful solution as embodied in a peace treaty. If you can prove that before last week any U.S. president agreed to that I will admit that I have been in error.

S. Peres (Alignment): I was referring to what President Carter said to the leaders of U.S. Jewry before your arrival.

The Prime Minister, M. Begin: So it was all just before my visit. Are you trying to tell me that he gave me something in advance? Well, never mind....One cannot compare a written document agreed upon by two governments with a verbal statement. We met with the Secretary of State and, in accordance with the president's views, reached that wording. The Secretary of State must bring it to the Arabs, and as you know the Arabs have refused to sign peace agreements till now...and we will have to wait and see what their response will be. The fact is that for the first time the Secretary of State, on behalf of the U.S. government, will bring that clause before the Arabs, i.e., that the Arab countries will have to sign a peace treaty with the State of Israel, not non-belligerency, not a peaceful settlement and not a peace agreement, but peace treaties....

When former Prime Minister Rabin returned from his visit to the U.S. in March he informed the nation that his visit had been a success and that the conditions for a dialogue with the U.S. had been created regarding certain moves, a timetable and joint objectives. Was that the truth...?

Y. Allon (Alignment): It was agreed that there should be a peace treaty.

The Prime Minister, M. Begin: You did not give a true report of your meeting with the U.S. president to the Foreign Affairs and Defense Committee. I was a member of that committee then, I heard your report, but I learned the truth about your visit to the U.S. only when I was prime minister.

Y. Rabin (Alignment): I think you are being very inaccurate.

The Prime Minister, M. Begin: Have patience...What did I find out, Members of the Knesset? I learned about Mr. Rabin's meeting with Mr. Carter from the record. I will not reveal what it said, all I can say is that those were very tough talks...When did the U.S. president first mention the phrase "Palestinian homeland" or "homeland for Palestinians"—during the term of the Likud government or of the one headed by Mr. Rabin?

M. Hacohen (Alignment): And has he retracted it now?

The Prime Minister, M. Begin: A "Palestinian homeland" was not mentioned to us.

M. Hacohen (Alignment): All that was said was that there were differences of opinion....

The Prime Minister, M. Begin: Why are you interrupting me all the time? What harm have I done you? Am I not debating with you in a parliamentary way? Have I injured someone? I am saying that now no one spoke with us in Washington about a Palestinian homeland.

M. Hacohen (Alignment): Then what are the differences of opinion...?

The Prime Minister, M. Begin: What was mentioned to us was a different concept; it was not good and we rejected it utterly. That was a "Palestinian entity," not a "homeland." Nothing remains of the phrase because we will not agree to it, since from the "entity" or the "homeland" will come a Palestinian state, a very grave threat to the existence of the State of Israel....

Naturally, we expressed our criticism of the fact that the U.S. has supplied forty Hercules planes to Egypt....During the term of the government headed by MK Rabin the U.S. sold weapons to the sum of eleven billion dollars to the Arab countries. In one of MK Rabin's interviews he praised the U.S. for slowing down the arms race in the Middle East. It's there in writing, believe me....When asked for my reaction, I gave the following reply to an American television crew three hours ago: Any supply of arms to a country which maintains a state of war with Israel is negative and makes it more difficult to attain peace. Our ambassador in the U.S. has been instructed to hold serious clarifications with the U.S. Administration regarding this decision to supply forty Hercules planes to Egypt. I gather that one such plane can transport one

hundred soldiers. Where would Egypt send 4,000 soldiers, possibly all at once? That is a large force. That must be clarified. We will not keep silent....

I have read that the leader of the opposition, MK Peres, has criticized me for saying in the American media that we contribute to the national security of the U.S....I did indeed say that, and we have contributed greatly, and will continue to do so....Because for years, under your rule, Israel was represented in the U.S. as a country which took.

Y. Allon (Alignment): That's untrue.

The Prime Minister, M. Begin: Isn't that true? Alright. But it's true....I wanted to place the relations between us and the U.S. on a footing of friendship and mutuality, not one-sided taking. That is why I gave the U.S. president a certain document, which dumbfounded all who read it, listing what we had done for the U.S. I know the disparity in strength between the large and powerful U.S. and our own small country, but a small country can do great things too....In that respect we have done great things for the U.S. I want U.S. public opinion to know that....

How does one put those things across? Permit me to quote from *Time* magazine of 31 January 1977: "What irritates the Israelis most is the insinuation that their arms agreements with the U.S. is a one-way affair. Actually, in addition to providing life-and-death combat tests for equipment, Israel has given the Pentagon—intact—the Soviet MiG 21, Sukhoi Su-7 and Su-11 jet planes, as well as advanced versions of Soviet surface-to-air missiles, Soviet tanks, anti-aircraft guns, anti-tank weapons and armored personnel carriers. Admits a U.S. Air Force officer: 'The Israelis, in effect, have provided us with a captive Soviet Air Force.'" And for conveying the message of our signal contribution to U.S. national security MK Peres has seen fit to criticize me....

The problem of agreement with the U.S. before going to Geneva is a serious one....Of course, we would all like such an agreement, but I do not accept the distinction between form and content. What you called procedure is content. Scientists say that a certain quantity can create a new quality...and in that sense I maintain that there is form which is content, and if we have taken an initiative regarding establishing a framework for the peace process, do not call it procedure. It is content.

What is the content? Now it is Israeli initiative. What happened until now? The Americans made proposals to you and you said no. That is what generally happened. What has happened now? We put proposals to the U.S. and the Secretary of State will go with some of them to the Arab capitals. He has said so publicly. That did not happen under your rule. And what we are talking about is a peace agreement, not interim agreements.

The leader of the opposition advises us to say that if there is no possibility of a peace agreement there will be interim agreements....What

does that mean? Israel's withdrawal without peace. As is proved by the statement you made in the past that the next agreement will come only if there is an end to the state of belligerency. You did not manage to achieve that end, but you signed agreements which meant withdrawal, despite your earlier statements. Nor is there an end to the state of belligerency....What good has been achieved by the clever phrase you used: "A piece of land for a piece of peace..."? Is it possible to make more interim agreements? Where...?

A. Yadlin (Alignment): I think that the Foreign Minister suggested an interim agreement in the Golan Heights. Ask him about it....

The Prime Minister, M. Begin: The Foreign Minister made no such suggestion....

The Foreign Minister, M. Dayan: As a member of the government, I gave my full consent to the agreements made after the Yom Kippur War. I opposed the additional agreement with Egypt. Since then I have not made any additional agreement or proposal....

The Prime Minister, M. Begin: As I have said, we would all like to have an agreement with America before Geneva....You spoke about an agreement of that kind knowing what the position of the U.S. was. With what pathos Mr. Peres—I thought Demosthenes was addressing us from this podium—shouted and banged on the desk, saying: you know what the position of the U.S. is and you must tell us the truth. Did you tell the nation the truth when you knew what the U.S. position was? Did you not go to the U.S. and try and reach an agreement with it? On what basis?

Let's assume that the U.S. position today—perhaps one of these days you'll hear an announcement on the subject—is still that Israel should withdraw to the borders of 4 June 1967 with minor modifications, it is inconceivable that Israel would accept that policy. The Americans heard and saw, including proof on the map, how Jerusalem would come under crossfire from El Bireh in the north and Bethlehem in the south, and how all our towns, settlements and farms would be in the range of the Arab artillery....

But is that the American policy since May 17? You knew what that policy was, yet still you went to the Americans and offered to make a substantive agreement regarding the borders prior to Geneva. What was the result...? What you were doing was to invite American pressure for an agreement on their terms. That is simple common sense. America stated its policy for ten years. Did you expect it to change it the moment you asked for an agreement? As was to be expected, the Americans told you that they stood firm on the policy of minor modifications.

As for the Allon plan, the reply was "totally unacceptable." That was said by Hussein, and not only by him, three times, including in Washington. And MK Allon has already experienced that elsewhere. I quoted

that and he said that it was incorrect. But MK Rabin said that he had heard those words with his own ears when he was Israel's ambassador in the U.S....

Y. Allon (Alignment): You're jumping from one point to another, to things which are not connected, and are giving the impression that I denied something that was true. From what you say it transpires that the Begin plan is "totally acceptable" to both the Arab world and the U.S.

The Prime Minister, M. Begin: Well, really, have I said that...?

Y. Allon (Alignment): President Johnson was prepared to accept a compromise plan from the late Levi Eshkol. But Eshkol couldn't propose it because the National Unity Government of the time made it impossible to reach a decision.

The Prime Minister, M. Begin: Well, I don't know about all that.... What I do know is that according to common sense if the Allon Plan, which means our remaining along the River Jordan but jumping Hussein and his governors and propaganda over the heads of our soldiers into Shechem and Bethlehem, Hebron and Jericho, is "totally unacceptable" to the Americans, what do you get when they adhere to the policy of minor modifications of the 4 June 1967 borders? At the most, something in between. So you invited U.S. pressure for withdrawal from your positions. That was inevitable.

Consequently, that was a mistaken policy. A grave error. Not only did you not achieve an agreement with America, you invited U.S. pressure on you. We changed that policy....We are prepared to go to Geneva. What will they do to us there, after all? They won't shoot us. They will speak, maybe even shout at us. We will reply quietly that our cause is just. That will be at the open meeting. It is true that our enemies will also speak. As will the Russians. As will we. We will put our case to the world. That is particularly important at a peace conference which, if it convenes, will do so without the PLO, in order to attain peace agreements and in the clear knowledge that on no account will there be a Palestinian state in Judea and Samaria. So why should we fear the Geneva Conference...?

Y. Allon (Alignment): What did you propose to the Americans should be done in Judea and Samaria? Till now we've heard what will not be done. Perhaps you'll tell us what is your constructive plan for Judea and Samaria as regards the Arab population there?

The Prime Minister, M. Begin: Very well. I maintain that that policy was mistaken, erroneous. We have corrected your mistake for the moment. We say, we will go to Geneva, the objective being peace treaties. How does one attain them? After the opening session joint committees of each side must discuss peace treaties with Israel. I say to you once

again, that is form which embodies content, and the content is undoubtedly different from yours....We will discuss the problems with all the countries, including the U.S...and certainly want agreement with the U.S....

What has been attained to date is that during the past few months all the communications media of the world...have discussed the Jewish people's right to the Land of Israel, not the PLO. Some write somewhat ironically about the Bible. So what? I would like to remind the House what your leader, Mr. Peres, David Ben-Gurion, said: "They say that the Mandate is our bible, but the opposite is the case, the Bible is our mandate." He was not ashamed, he was a very loyal socialist, especially then. He was not ashamed to rely on the Bible....

So now the pages of the world press are full of arguments about the Jewish people in the Land of Israel. Thank God we have reached that stage. That is a very serious turn and there is an Israel peace initiative, rather than Israel being drawn after the peace initiatives of others, and generally saying no. You supposedly wanted a positive policy. But you did not provide it. We attained it. A positive policy of how to conduct negotiations on a peace treaty...

S. Aloni (Citizens' Rights Movement): The "how" doesn't tell us "what."...

The Prime Minister, M. Begin: ...which is a basic change in Israeli policy, and it is a good thing that we have introduced it. You say that there are differences of opinion with the U.S. Of course there are. Have I ever concealed them...? I see that the citizens today have a new, higher morale. I see that everywhere. I think I am expressing the views of the vast majority of Israel's population when I say that today they have greater trust, more hope, a new morale. That is a great achievement. Oh, I remember our morale during the last months of the Alignment's rule.

I remember what appeared in the international press then. I remember. I do not wish to use bad language, especially not from the Knesset podium. Everyone remembers....I remember what the morale of the Jewish people was then....Today the tone is quite different, both in Israel and in the world and among the Jewish people....If you had only seen with what enthusiasm I was received by meetings of 5,000 American Jews, who were by no means supporters of the Likud....

M. Shahal (Alignment): This was the first time you went abroad as Prime Minister. Golda Meir appeared before 80,000 Jews and was extremely impressive.

The Prime Minister, M. Begin: Did I say that appearing before 80,000 Jews was nothing?

A. Amorai (Alignment): She did not boast as you have. She realized that it was not for her but because of her position as the Prime Minister of Israel. She did not take the personal credit for it.

Z. Shuval (Likud): We also saw the disaster she brought on Israel.

The Prime Minister, M. Begin: I said I wished you could have seen the enthusiasm, the trust and the unity. Why is that bad? What's annoying you? In what way have I detracted from previous appearances? But I compared the morale of our people in Israel and the diaspora with what it was during the last months of the Alignment's rule. What a difference....

I worked night and day in the U.S. I want to thank the colleagues who accompanied me, those who worked with former Prime Minister Rabin and who work with me in a spirit of loyalty and cooperation, of service to the nation, because they are faithful civil servants, and my new colleagues in the Prime Minister's Office, Dr. Ben-Elissar, Yehiel Kadishai and Shmuel Katz....We were indeed a team and worked together, all our hearts beating as one with love for the Jewish people and the Land of Israel. I would also like to thank the Knesset Members who encouraged me to undertake this mission...and all the Jews who prayed for its success....I hope I can say that their prayers were heard. We did not fail the Jewish people....This was no fateful mission, because the fate of the Jewish people is not bound up with any political meeting, however important....

The mission was important, that is true. I departed. Now I have returned. I have given you a report. I hope that we will continue to stand united on common issues. I have read that the Alignment has proclaimed that there is no consensus. Indeed? When we were in opposition did you not seek consensus with us? And did we not give it to you gladly? And so today there is no consensus....Do we not all oppose a Palestinian state? Why should we not say so on behalf of the entire House, with the exception of one or two party groups? Do we not all oppose the participation of the PLO in the Geneva Conference? Why should we not say so on behalf of the entire population of Israel, with the exception of a small party group? Do we not oppose returning to the borders of 4 June 1967? Why should we not say so on behalf of the entire country? If you proclaim that there is no consensus will that strengthen Israel in its struggle? I believe in your patriotism. You are patriots like me. So at least give a hand when it comes to consensus. Then, with God's help, we will advance and attain peace....

I will conclude my address to the Knesset with the same things I said at the meeting of Israel's emissaries in the U.S., who represented every political view: the time has come for all Israel's fighters, those who endangered their lives and shed their blood, from the Hagana, the Pal-

mach, IZL, Lehi, Mahal and our splendid army, to unite in the aspiration of bringing peace to Israel and the Middle East.

...

H. Corfu (Likud): Mr. Speaker, distinguished Knesset, on behalf of the Likud, NRP and Aguda party groups, I have the honor of bringing the following concluding resolution before the Knesset: The Knesset notes the statement of the Prime Minister, Mr. Menahem Begin, and his reply regarding his visit to the U.S., as conveyed to the House on 27 July 1977.

...

The Vote

Those in favor	59
Those against	36
Abstentions	13

(MK Corfu's concluding resolution is adopted.)

Political Situation in Light of the Joint U.S.-U.S.S.R. Statement

Introduction

The Middle East, the question of Palestine and the Israel-Arab conflict had often been discussed by the U.S. and U.S.S.R. governments, whether in the U.N. context or in bilateral conversations. At times—even when the Cold War was at its zenith—their interests had coincided, up to a point. At other times, however, even at the height of detente, their perceived interests clashed, having as a common denominator merely the joint interest in avoiding a Great Power military confrontation which might escalate into a nuclear war.

Coinciding or overlapping interests had emerged as early as 1947, when both Powers, albeit for widely different reasons, had supported the Partition Resolution. In 1956, again with widely divergent motives, both condemned Great Britain, France and Israel for undertaking Operation Musketeer (Kadesh), and insisted on immediate withdrawal. In 1967, after months of major disagreements, they agreed on Security Council Resolution 242. In 1973, Resolution 338 was worked out during Secretary of State Kissinger's visit to Moscow in October.

The joint U.S.-Soviet statement on the Middle East, published on 1 October 1977 after lengthy secret conversations culminating in a day-long meeting between the U.S. Secretary of State, Cyrus Vance, and the Soviet Minister of Foreign Affairs, Andrei Gromyko, as cochairmen of the Geneva Conference, was not in itself an innovation. However, it went beyond anything that had gone before in its indication of a Great Power condominium. It also went far in its emphasis of legitimate Palestinian rights.

At the behest of the Alignment, the Knesset was convened for a special sitting during the summer recess to discuss the implications of the statement and of a working paper worked out between the U.S. and Israel. In the ensuing mini-debate, Shimon Peres and Moshe Dayan, both cofounders of Rafi and, until shortly before, colleagues in the Alignment, faced each other from opposite sides of the political fence.

Sitting 27 of the Ninth Knesset

13 October 1977 (1 Heshvan 5738)

S. Peres (Alignment): Mr. Speaker, distinguished Knesset...the agreement between the U.S. and Israel reflects the most pessimistic

plan of any Israel government to date. It contains phrases indicating erosion and deterioration, and it is our duty to reveal the truth behind the "lack of confrontation" and the "good document."

The government's amazing procedural distortion derives from the fact that it is not prepared for substantive flexibility. The agreement between the U.S. and Israel might lead us to the Geneva Conference, but because substance will be discussed there, and on that score Israel's delegates will be able to present only the Likud's program, the Conference is liable to reach a dead end. The failure of the Conference could lead to the renewal of the Arab threat or an attempt to impose a settlement in conditions which will not suit even the most moderate among us. In retrospect, the deterioration appears to be a process which has been inevitable ever since the Likud assumed power.

The working paper is merely a draft which will go through the Arab mill and will not necessarily be left as it stands. It represents the optimum for Israel in political terms, and for America in tactical terms, and barely constitutes the minimum for the Arabs.

This document...derives from the U.S. policy based on the position of the Israeli government. The attitude adopted by President Carter's Administration is that Israel must be placated on the subject of peace, while the Arabs must receive satisfaction in the areas of the Palestinian entity, the borders and Palestinian representation. It was not for nothing that a "senior U.S. official" expressed satisfaction at the fact that Israel had agreed to a joint Arab delegation, i.e., a separate Palestinian delegation....

I believe that the government has not changed its position on the Palestinian subject, but by agreeing to the formation of a Palestinian side to represent the Palestinians it has gone further than could have been imagined. Attitudes may be changed, but a side remains. The government which would not recognize the Palestinian entity is now enabling it to appoint representatives. The previous governments did not ignore the Palestinian issue, but insisted that its problems be solved within the framework of negotiations with Jordan, the Palestinians constituting part of the Jordanian delegation and being subject to its influence....

The Arabs have gained a great deal through this document, even before the negotiations begin....By this document Israel has agreed to alter Resolution 242, if not in theory then in practice, albeit only as regards the opening session of the Geneva Conference, by recognizing a mini-Arab League with a joint Arab delegation as well as a separate Palestinian delegation which does not have to undertake to recognize Israel or accept Resolutions 242 and 338....Moreover, in order to free the Palestinian delegation of the burden of the U.N. resolutions, the two Powers have produced a joint document which bypasses the resolutions,

and that document was praised even after Israel expressed its reservations about it....

The U.S.-U.S.S.R. document, which will be the bible of the Arab delegations, refers to sides, not countries. In mentioning withdrawal from territories it does not say that this should be to recognized and secure borders. It speaks of "resolving the Palestine problem and assuring the legitimate rights of the Palestinians" without saying a word about freedom of navigation.

It is easy to see why the U.S. and the Arabs accepted this document, but why did the government of Israel...? The only possible explanation for that is the one given by a member of the opposition in the past: "This government has a unique diplomatic system. First it climbs out on a limb, then tries to find a way down." The quote is from Mr. Menahem Begin. This government has placed itself in verbal chains....I am sure that both the Likud and the Alignment want peace, and both realize that peace has a price, but the Alignment has stated that it is prepared to pay the price in the form of a compromise on the three fronts, while the Likud claims that at least on one front it can get what it wants for nothing.

The Likud has said that not only can it get something for nothing but that it can also attain full peace with a peace treaty and diplomatic relations, while in return Israel is prepared to give three things: a far-reaching withdrawal from the Sinai; withdrawal from the Golan Heights; lack of foreign rule in Judea and Samaria, as is noted in the program for imposing Israeli law there.

The Likud must ask itself whether, in return for the imposition of Israeli law on the West Bank, the three delegations—Palestinian, Egyptian and Jordanian—will be prepared to sign peace treaties with Israel...whether Syria will make peace with us in return for an insignificant withdrawal from the Golan Heights, and whether Egypt will make peace with us for even a substantial withdrawal from the Sinai....

Deep in their hearts the Likud leaders know that the answer to all those questions is negative...and so they have latched on to an original idea, saying: since it is difficult to speak of Arab agreement, let's agree to talk. That is the difference between the Alignment and the Likud. We always said: let's go to Geneva with a program for negotiations, while the Likud wants to wait and see what develops at Geneva. It's not a bad idea, but the problem is that other sides are involved in the negotiations, and it is doubtful whether they will agree to regard negotiations as a substitute for an agreement.

This has further complicated matters. Since Geneva is the program, the main thing is to get to Geneva. And if there are obstacles on the way to Geneva, one can and should discard attitudes and principles....Israel has not only urged that the Geneva Conference be convened at the earliest moment possible, its Prime Minister has even accepted the idea of a "joint Arab delegation," thereby abandoning one of the principles to

which Israel has always held fast in the past. Small wonder he was heaped with praise in America....Is that the way the Likud retains the trust of its voters...?

At the end of September the Americans conveyed a working paper to Israel. In a marathon session lasting less than two hours, the government approved that extremely tough document, and in order to prove its trustworthiness made its contents public. According to the document, the government has agreed: a. that a ceremonial opening shall be held with a joint Arab delegation; b. that the delegation shall comprise Palestinian Arabs who are not known to be members of the PLO, that their credentials shall not be checked and that at the opening sessions the Palestinians shall not constitute a separate delegation but shall be part of the Jordanian delegation; c. that there shall be no negotiations with the joint Arab delegation; d. that after the opening meeting the joint delegation shall split up into separate delegations according to the various countries, each delegation conducting negotiations on the subject which concerns it.

Unfortunately, very little of that document remains. The ceremony has been omitted from the first clause...meaning that the Palestinians will constitute a separate side and a working group. The second clause is both unprecedented and scandalous....The phrase "their credentials shall not be checked" has been omitted from the Hebrew version, and no satisfactory explanation has been given for this by the Cabinet Secretary....What good is there to any agreement we may have on this point with the U.S. if we have already agreed to all this...?

Not much is left of the fourth clause either, because the negotiations on the West Bank and Gaza will not be held with individual countries but with a joint Arab delegation which will include Egypt, Jordan and the Palestinians, all of them benefiting from the U.S.-U.S.S.R. statement. We will be left on our own, resting our case on Resolutions 242 and 338, which we have agreed to alter.

In the new document we, on the other hand, have agreed explicitly to a new and decisive clause: "The topics of the West Bank and Gaza will be discussed in a working group comprising Israel, Jordan, Egypt and the Palestinians." Here we have agreed to three things not contained in the U.N. resolutions: a. to regard the topics of the West Bank and Gaza as an independent clause; b. to regard the Palestinians escorted by Egypt and Jordan as a side which is equal to Israel; c. neither to absolve Egypt of the obligation to discuss Gaza, nor to free the discussion with Jordan of the participation of independent Palestinians.

There is no point burying our heads in the sand. Even if Israel reserves the right to walk out of the Geneva Conference—incidentally, how can it do that when the Conference is the be-all and end-all of its policy?—should members of the PLO participate or the subject of a Palestinian state be raised, let's not kid ourselves. What will the Pales-

tinian delegation talk about? The arrangements for pilgrimages to Mecca and housing for refugees? Even if we do examine their credentials, can we muzzle them? What will that delegation ask for? That Israel should remain in the West Bank and Gaza? That the Jordan River should be the security border? That we should establish settlements in Judea and Samaria? Will that delegation claim that Israel has liberated the West Bank, not occupied it, and forego any political expression for that population?

Or, alternatively, that delegation, however restricted its authority...will take the podium and tell the listening world that it demands the termination of Israeli rule in all the territories....And are there no Palestinians other than the PLO? The Foreign Minister has even said that if they affirm their affiliation with the PLO we will not be able to do anything. And even if we leave the Conference, will they keep quiet? The moment we recognize a new body, we acknowledge its right to speak out, and there is no reason to suppose that it will remain silent....

Moshe Dayan once wrote: "The main achievement of the PLO is not its acts of terror or the image of the liberation movement it has created for itself amongst part of world public opinion, but the fact that it has raised the Palestinian flag in the struggle between us and the Arab countries." We would do well to remember that now.

Israel may have come under heavy pressure from the U.S. and may have been obliged to make concessions and withdraw....If that is the case, the government should have said as much to the nation, without describing the document as a tremendous boon....We may have drawn closer to Geneva, but we have not drawn closer to peace and we have drawn closer to conflict. The Likud government has finally realized what the situation is, but that situation has revealed the pointlessness of the Likud government's policy....

The problem confronting us is an action, not a document, and an action about which we have warned you and to which we continue to propose an alternative—the aspiration to agreements. If a peace treaty can be attained, fine. If not, better a less perfect agreement than nothing, with the backing of the U.S. and an attempt to get to Geneva after doing the groundwork properly which puts an agreement within our reach provided we are ready to compromise substantially....That will eventually lead us to peace.

The Foreign Minister, M. Dayan: Mr. Speaker, distinguished Knesset...all the parties in this House have said not merely that they want peace but that they are prepared to go to Geneva....The question is, how do we go, and what are we permitted and not permitted to do once the Geneva Conference is resumed?

The joint U.S.-U.S.S.R. statement is very serious both for what it says and for the fact that this is the first time the two Powers have coordinated their policy on the Middle East....There have always been two

chairmen of the Geneva Conference...that is inevitable, given the fact that each can veto the other...but that is a long way from a joint statement and coordinated policy....

This is difficult for us, and has aroused the opposition of certain circles in the U.S....Israel submitted a memorandum to the U.S. protesting against the fact that the joint statement had been made and rejecting its contents because it ignores Resolutions 242 and 338, which are the sole basis for an agreement in the Middle East, distorts the contents of Resolution 242 by referring only to Israel's withdrawal, introduces the concept of "the legitimate rights of the Palestinians," refers to an agreement and not to "just and lasting peace," and introduces a new element into peace negotiations, which is possible only with the consent of the original parties who participated in the Geneva Conference of 1973. We have agreed that the Arabs of the Land of Israel may participate in the discussion of the problems of Judea, Samaria and the Gaza Strip, but the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. cannot decide unilaterally who should participate in the Conference....We have made it clear to the U.S. that the Geneva Conference in which we agree to participate is solely the conference based on the terms agreed prior to its first meeting, namely: Security Council Resolutions 242 and 338 and the invitation issued to us via the Secretary-General of the U.N. Furthermore, the statement contradicts the undertakings given to us in writing by the U.S....

I would like to make it clear that there is no connection between the joint U.S.-U.S.S.R. statement and our working paper...and the U.S. has not insisted that we accept that statement....I would also like to point out that at the prior discussions at Geneva in 1974 Israel agreed to conduct negotiations on disengagement agreements with a combined Syrian-Egyptian delegation....The Alignment agreed to that at the time, as we all did, because we wanted the disengagement agreement and that was the only way to get Syria to sign it....

In my view, with regard to the present agreement concerning procedure, what matters is that no procedure should be determined which could act as an obstacle to the attainment of our substantive objectives...namely, a peace treaty, in due course....I do not think that what is contained in the working paper precludes this....To answer MK Peres' questions, which were not meant seriously, I know, of course Syria will not make peace with us on the basis of the Likud's program and of course Jordan will not make peace with us without our withdrawal from Judea and Samaria. The reason why I say that MK Peres was not in earnest is because it is equally unlikely that Syria will agree to peace on the basis of the Alignment's program. Has Jordan agreed to what you proposed...? Has any program proposed by any party—apart from Rakah—evoked any indication of agreement from the other side...?

The working paper we submitted at the request of the U.S. and which was to serve as the basis for a peace agreement between Israel and Jordan contained the following elements...: a. in Judea and Samaria there must be equal rights and full coexistence between Jews and Arabs; b. no part of that area shall be subject to foreign rule or sovereignty; c. every agreement must take Israel's security needs fully into account. In this context it is our position that Israel's security on its eastern border must be based on the River Jordan. That is the working paper we submitted to the U.S. preparatory to the Geneva Conference and on which we wish to base our peace agreement with Jordan. It does not say that we wish to impose Israel's sovereignty on Judea, Samaria and the Gaza Strip, it says that we reject any idea that the area should come under foreign rule or sovereignty, and that we want equal rights and full coexistence between Jews and Arabs there....

The working paper regarding the reconvening of the Peace Conference at Geneva states...:

1. the Arab sides shall be represented by a joint Arab delegation which will include Palestinian Arabs. After the opening sessions the Conference shall split up into working groups;
 2. the working groups for conducting negotiations and making peace treaties will be as follows:
 - a. Egypt-Israel;
 - b. Jordan-Israel;
 - c. Syria-Israel;
 - d. Lebanon-Israel, if Lebanon is added to the Geneva Conference;
 3. the subjects of the West Bank and Gaza shall be discussed by a working group comprising Israel, Jordan, Egypt and the Palestinian Arabs;
 4. the solution of the problem of the Arab and Jewish refugees shall be discussed in accordance with rules which will be agreed upon;
 5. the agreed basis for negotiations at the Geneva Conference on Peace in the Middle East is Security Council Resolutions 242 and 338;
 6. all the initial terms of reference of the Geneva Peace Conference remain in force, except for what shall be agreed upon by the sides....
- This agreement says that there will be a joint Arab delegation at the opening session, not that there will be any negotiations with it on any subject....Any attempt to represent the agreement as saying something else is a distortion of the facts....The working groups will conduct negotiations and sign peace agreements, and will each comprise one of the neighboring countries plus Israel, nothing more....The Palestinians will participate in the Geneva Conference as part of the joint Arab delegation at the opening session and in the working group which will discuss Judea, Samaria and the Gaza Strip....They will not be members of the PLO. On that there is full agreement. The previous draft, which was

submitted by the Americans and which MK Peres read, mentioned the PLO, but all that has been cancelled....We have suggested that the representatives of the Palestinians shall come from the inhabitants of the territories, provided they are not identified with the PLO....Any deviation from the agreement will lead to our withdrawal from the Conference....

Clauses 3 and 4 are bilateral. Clause 4, which refers to the solution of the refugee problem, also mentions the Jewish refugees, and the same rules will be applied in each case....The question is whether we do or do not wish to discuss resolving the refugee problem. In our view, the solution lies in settling them in the countries where they are to be found at present...but in order to reach a solution discussions must be held with the countries concerned and with the Palestinians themselves....Because the subject is complicated, there being approximately 200,000 refugees in Kuwait and Iraq, not to mention the question of compensation for Jewish refugees from Iraq, and we do not want to bring all that into the framework of Geneva, the relevant clause reads: "The solution of the problem of the Arab and Jewish refugees will be discussed in accordance with rules which will be agreed upon."...It may be preferable to deal with this problem outside the framework of the Geneva Conference, but it would be incorrect to say that it is possible to resolve the Israel-Arab conflict without dealing with the refugee problem.

As for clause 4, which mentions the participation of Israel, Jordan, Egypt and the Palestinian Arabs in the working group dealing with the West Bank and Gaza...the basic question is simple: do we want, in 1977 or 1978, to discuss a settlement of any kind, within the framework of a peace agreement, regarding Judea, Samaria and the Gaza Strip, without talking to the Arabs living there? I don't. I admit that I want to talk to them. There are one and a quarter million people there.

S. Arbeli-Almoslino (Alignment): One can talk to them here. Why in Geneva?

The Foreign Minister, M. Dayan: MK Almoslino, one can talk to them here. Do you think that they will talk to us here about a separate agreement? Do you think that it is possible today or will be next year to make a peace agreement...and say, we don't want to talk to them or about them? If you think that, you're being unrealistic. If someone honestly and seriously thinks—and I assume that all or most of the House wants it—that it is possible to reach a peace agreement which will include Judea, Samaria and the Gaza Strip, and we will say in Geneva, when the subject comes up there, we don't want to talk with the Palestinian Arabs—anyone who believes that is mistaken, in my view. I don't want that. I don't want the state and the people of Israel to appear as not being prepared to sit down and talk with the representatives of the 400,000 Arabs in the Gaza Strip who are prepared to discuss peace with us.

S. Arbeli-Almoslino (Alignment): What will you talk about with them in Geneva?

The Foreign Minister, M. Dayan: Good question....I deliberately read out what we think should be the basis for the agreement for joint life in the West Bank....That is what we will talk about with them at Geneva...."In Judea and Samaria there must be full and equal rights and coexistence between Jews and Arabs." "No part of that area shall be under foreign rule or sovereignty." "Every agreement shall take Israel's security needs fully into account."...

We have also said that if the Arabs wish to propose what the Alignment proposed in the past, namely, the partition of the West Bank, we will discuss that with them. For ten years they did not agree to do so, but if they suggest that now, we will discuss it. But whatever the proposal...do you think it is possible to discuss it without involving representatives of the Palestinians in the process...? We wanted the Palestinians to be part of the Jordanian delegation, but Jordan does not agree, thinking for some reason that it has the same sovereign rights as any other country....

(Shouts from the floor.)

Since Jordan has refused...there are two alternatives open to us: to say that we agree to some other form of representation, or not to agree, in which case there will be no Palestinian there....What we have said is that we will not conduct negotiations for a peace treaty with that delegation, which will comprise Egypt, Jordan and the Palestinians....With regard to the West Bank and Gaza nothing is said about signing a peace treaty, as it is with regard to the negotiations with Egypt, Syria, etc...but that that subject will be discussed by a working group consisting of Israel, Egypt, Jordan and the Palestinians. Egypt participates by virtue of it being the country which once occupied the Gaza Strip....

I don't think that when we establish procedural patterns, before going into the content, we should go beyond that to other questions of procedure. What must be made absolutely clear, and has been, is that we are not going to discuss the establishment of a Palestinian state of any kind....The working paper which has been approved by the U.S. separates that subject from the others in which peace treaties between countries are to be discussed...but we are prepared to discuss the topic....

In my view, we must guarantee three things for ourselves: first, that we stand firm on our refusal to return to the previous borders, and hence Resolution 242 as we and the Americans interpret it...; secondly, that on no account do we agree to the establishment of an independent or partial or annexed Palestinian state in the West Bank and the Gaza Strip. That is why we agreed to that procedure separate from the other parts which deal with relations between sovereign countries...and no independent status is accorded to the Palestinian delegation; thirdly, we will accept

no working paper which embodies the possibility of our sitting down to negotiate with the PLO. And that does not exist here in any form. Consequently, in my view this working paper is reasonable, even good.

Finally, we are not talking about a working paper or an agreement which will serve us alone....If we really want to attain a peace agreement with the Arabs...we must be ready to determine operative procedures which will be acceptable to both sides within a possible framework of peace negotiations....Since the Foreign Affairs and Defense Committee reviewed this subject yesterday, and will undoubtedly do so again...I see no point in proposing to transfer this subject to committee....I therefore propose that the subject be removed from the agenda. We will discuss it again, both in the plenum and in the Committee, when there is something to discuss.

...

The Vote

Those in favor	41
Those against	28
Abstentions	7

(The proposal to remove the subject from the agenda is adopted.)

Knesset Visit of Egyptian President Sadat

Introduction

In January 1977 Jimmy Carter assumed the Presidency of the U.S. From the beginning of his term he declared that the resumption of the Geneva Peace Conference, designed to achieve a comprehensive solution of the Israel-Arab conflict, constituted one of the principal foreign policy objectives of his administration.

Preparations for that resumption were interrupted when Yitzhak Rabin lost his parliamentary majority; they were resumed once Menachem Begin had been installed as Prime Minister, following the elections. A principal stumbling block was the question of Palestinian representation. Against the Arab summit resolution of Rabat 1974 to the effect that the PLO was the "sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian Arabs," stood the unequivocal refusal of the government of Israel to have any traffic with that organization, whose declared aim was the destruction of the State of Israel.

An open rift between the governments of the U.S. and Israel was avoided when Foreign Minister Dayan, in the course of a visit to Washington, referred to a working paper calling for a joint Arab delegation, including Palestinian Arabs not officially known as members of the PLO.

Even thereafter the going was difficult and slow. Some Arab governments did not react to the working paper, others proposed amendments. Procedural obstacles seemed to pile up, and the likelihood of a conference being convened before the end of 1977, as promised by Carter, receded rapidly.

On 1 October 1977, following a rapidly convened meeting of the foreign ministers of both countries, the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. published a joint declaration calling *inter alia* for Israeli withdrawal from territories occupied in the course of the Six Day War and for the recognition of the legitimate rights of Palestinian Arabs. It was the most far-reaching document subscribed up to that date.

However, rather than hastening the convening of an international conference, the apparent willingness of the U.S. to admit the U.S.S.R. as an equal partner in the Middle East, without having consulted the parties in the region, increased President Sadat's misgivings and thereby contributed to a dramatic change in the history of the prolonged conflict. On November 8, President Sadat, in the course of a speech to the Egyptian parliament, declared his willingness to go to the ends of the earth, "and even to the Knesset in Jerusalem," in order to save a single Egyptian soldier from being wounded. A few days later he had in his

no wor
negoti
quentl
Fi
which
ment
dures
of per
mitted
again
tee.....
We w
when

The

T

T

A

(

hands an official invitation, signed by Prime Minister Menahem Begin. On Thursday, November 17, in the late afternoon, it was announced that Sadat would arrive in Israel on Saturday night, after conclusion of the Sabbath, and would address the Knesset, which was convened for a special sitting, exceptionally—on a Sunday, in the afternoon of November 20.

Sitting 43 of the Ninth Knesset

20 November 1977 (10 Kislev 5738)

The Secretary-General of the Knesset, N. Lorch: Their honors, the Presidents! (The Knesset Members rise and applaud the President of Egypt, Anwar Sadat, and the President of Israel, Ephraim Katzir.)

The Speaker, Y. Shamir: I hereby open the Knesset sitting. Knesset Members, this sitting has been convened under clause 65A of the Knesset's rules of procedure, at the request of the government and in accordance with the decision of the House Committee of 8 Kislev 5738 (November 1977).

Knesset Members, permit me to open this special sitting with a verse from the Book of Books: "And it shall come to pass in the days, that the mountain of the Lord's house shall be established in the midst of the mountains, and shall be exalted above the hills; and all nations shall flow unto it. And many people shall go and say, Come ye, and let us go up to the mountain of the Lord, to the house of the God of Jacob: for he will teach us of his ways, and we will walk in his paths: for our seed shall flourish, and we shall be fruitful, and we shall be multiplied, and we shall possess the land for ever. For the word of the Lord shall be fulfilled for us, and we shall not be ashamed, because we shall have obtained the word of the Lord, and we shall be fruitful, and we shall be multiplied, and we shall possess the land for ever. And he shall judge among the nations, and shall rebuke many people, and they shall beat their swords into plowshares, and their spears into pruninghooks: nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more."

Knesset Members, in the spirit of the Prophet Isaiah the son of Amos, I extend a warm welcome to our distinguished guest, the President of the Egyptian Arab Republic, Mr. Mohammed Anwar Sadat. With joy and admiration we accepted his offer to come to the Knesset and address you. We will listen to him eagerly and with hope in our hearts.

I hereby invite his honor the President to address the House. (The Knesset Members applaud the President of Egypt.)

The President of Egypt, A. Sadat: (Translated from the original Arabic.) In the name of Allah, distinguished Speaker, gentlemen, permit me first of all to express my sincere gratitude to the Speaker of the Knesset for having allowed me to address you on this occasion. I would like to begin by saying, peace and the mercy of the Lord be upon you, and

all of us, if it be God's will. May peace be upon everyone on earth, both in Arab countries and in Israel, and everywhere in the whole wide world which is embroiled in bloody battles, which is shaken by sharp divisions, which is subject to the threat of destructive war from time to time, by wars which make one man kill his fellowman. In the final event, in the ruins of what man has built and the remains of the corpses of man's victims, there is no victor and vanquished. In actual fact the true vanquished is man, the highest of God's creatures, man who was created by God, in the words of Ghandi, the emissary of peace: "in order to walk upright, build his life and serve his God."

I have come to you today, with both feet planted firmly on the ground, so that we may build a new life and establish peace for all of us on this land, the land of God. All of us, Moslems, Christians and Jews, all worship God, and God alone. Accordingly, what God has commanded us is love, truth, honesty and peace.

I justify all those who received my decision to come to your parliament, when I made my intentions public, with astonishment and even confusion. The surprise led some of them to assume that my decision was merely a verbal maneuver intended to deceive world public opinion; others even described it as a political tactic designed to disguise my intentions of embarking on a new war.

I will not conceal from you the fact that one of my aides in the Ministry of the President of the Republic contacted me late at night after I had returned home from the People's Assembly and asked me with concern: and what will you do if Israel really does extend you an invitation? I replied quietly: I will accept it immediately. I have already said that I am ready to go to the ends of the earth. I will go to Israel, because I wish to present the full and complete facts to the nation in Israel.

I justify all those who were astonished by my decision or doubted the genuineness of the intentions underlying it. No one imagined that the President of the largest Arab country, which bears the heaviest burden and the prime responsibility for the subject of war and peace in the Middle East, could announce that he was prepared to go to the enemy's country when there was still a state of war between us. Even more than that, when we are all still suffering from the consequences of four cruel years during thirty years. And above all, when the families of the casualties of the October 1973 War are still enduring the tragedy of widowhood and orphanhood, of having sacrificed fathers and sons who fell in battle.

Similarly, as I have already stated, on the subject of this decision I did not consult any of my colleagues or my brethren the presidents of the Arab countries, or the countries involved in the conflict. Some of them, who contacted me, even evinced opposition after I had announced my decision, because there is a situation of doubt and disbelief in the hearts of the Arab countries, including the Palestinian nation, on the one

hands an official invitation, signed by Prime Minister Menahem Begin. On Thursday, November 17, in the late afternoon, it was announced that Sadat would arrive in Israel on Saturday night, after the conclusion of the Sabbath, and would address the Knesset, which was to convene for a special sitting, exceptionally—on a Sunday, in the afternoon of November 20.

Sitting 43 of the Ninth Knesset

20 November 1977 (10 Kislev 5735)

The Secretary-General of the Knesset, N. Lorch: Their honors, the Presidents! (The Knesset Members rise and applaud the President of Egypt, Anwar Sadat, and the President of Israel, Ephraim Katzir.)

The Speaker, Y. Shamir: I hereby open the Knesset sitting. Knesset Members, this sitting has been convened under clause 65A of the Knesset's rules of procedure, at the request of the government and in accordance with the decision of the House Committee of 8 Kislev 5735 (18 November 1977).

Knesset Members, permit me to open this special sitting with a few verses from the Book of Books: "And it shall come to pass in the last days, that the mountain of the Lord's house shall be established in the top of the mountains, and shall be exalted above the hills; and all nations shall flow unto it. And many people shall go and say, Come ye, and let us go up to the mountain of the Lord, to the house of the God of Jacob; and he will teach us of his ways, and we will walk in his paths: for out of Zion shall go forth the law, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem. And he shall judge among the nations, and shall rebuke many people: and they shall beat their swords into plowshares, and their spears into pruninghooks: nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more."

Knesset Members, in the spirit of the Prophet Isaiah the son of Amoz I extend a warm welcome to our distinguished guest, the President of the Egyptian Arab Republic, Mr. Mohammed Anwar Sadat. With joy and admiration we accepted his offer to come to the Knesset and address it. We will listen to him eagerly and with hope in our hearts.

I hereby invite his honor the President to address the House.
(The Knesset Members applaud the President of Egypt.)

The President of Egypt, A. Sadat: (Translated from the original Arabic.) In the name of Allah, distinguished Speaker, gentlemen, permit me first of all to express my sincere gratitude to the Speaker of the Knesset for having allowed me to address you on this occasion. I would like to begin by saying, peace and the mercy of the Lord be upon you, and on

all of us, if it be God's will. May peace be upon everyone on earth, both in Arab countries and in Israel, and everywhere in the whole wide world which is embroiled in bloody battles, which is shaken by sharp divisions, which is subject to the threat of destructive war from time to time, by wars which make one man kill his fellowman. In the final event, in the ruins of what man has built and the remains of the corpses of man's victims, there is no victor and vanquished. In actual fact the true vanquished is man, the highest of God's creatures, man who was created by God, in the words of Ghandi, the emissary of peace: "in order to walk upright, build his life and serve his God."

I have come to you today, with both feet planted firmly on the ground, so that we may build a new life and establish peace for all of us on this land, the land of God. All of us, Moslems, Christians and Jews, all worship God, and God alone. Accordingly, what God has commanded us is love, truth, honesty and peace.

I justify all those who received my decision to come to your parliament, when I made my intentions public, with astonishment and even confusion. The surprise led some of them to assume that my decision was merely a verbal maneuver intended to deceive world public opinion; others even described it as a political tactic designed to disguise my intentions of embarking on a new war.

I will not conceal from you the fact that one of my aides in the Ministry of the President of the Republic contacted me late at night after I had returned home from the People's Assembly and asked me with concern: and what will you do if Israel really does extend you an invitation? I replied quietly: I will accept it immediately. I have already said that I am ready to go to the ends of the earth. I will go to Israel, because I wish to present the full and complete facts to the nation in Israel.

I justify all those who were astonished by my decision or doubted the genuineness of the intentions underlying it. No one imagined that the President of the largest Arab country, which bears the heaviest burden and the prime responsibility for the subject of war and peace in the Middle East, could announce that he was prepared to go to the enemy's country when there was still a state of war between us. Even more than that, when we are all still suffering from the consequences of four cruel wars during thirty years. And above all, when the families of the casualties of the October 1973 War are still enduring the tragedy of widowhood and orphanhood, of having sacrificed fathers and sons who fell in battle.

Similarly, as I have already stated, on the subject of this decision I did not consult any of my colleagues or my brethren the presidents of the Arab countries, or the countries involved in the conflict. Some of them, who contacted me, even evinced opposition after I had announced my decision, because there is a situation of doubt and disbelief in the hearts of the Arab countries, including the Palestinian nation, on the one

hands
gin. C
nounc
conclt
conve
noon

Sitti

The
ident
Anw

The
Mem
set's
danc
Nov

I
vers
days
of th
shal
us g
he
Zior
And
and
pru
sha

I ex
Egy
adr
We

Th
bic
me
set
to

hand, and in that of Israel, on the other, and that still obtains in all the hearts and souls. Let the long months in which we could have established peace and which have been lost because of fruitless disputes and wrangles focusing on the procedural aspects of the Geneva Conference which reflect doubts and lack of trust, be enough for us.

But I am speaking to you with complete frankness. I reached the decision after protracted thought and deliberation and I know that it is a great risk. But if the almighty and gracious Lord has ordained that I should bear responsibility for the Egyptian nation and share responsibility for everything that concerns the fate of the Arab people and the Egyptian nation, it follows that the first obligation in that circle of responsibility is to exhaust every possibility of removing the disasters arising from destructive, murderous wars, whose outcome only God knows, from the Egyptian nation and the Arab people. After pondering the matter at length I was convinced that adherence and loyalty to my responsibility before God and the nation impelled me to go to the very ends of the earth, and even to come to Jerusalem and speak to the Members of the Knesset, the representatives of the Israeli nation, about all the truths and facts of which I am convinced, in order then to leave you to decide for yourselves by yourselves. After that, may God do with us as He wills.

Ladies and gentlemen, there are moments in the lives of nations and peoples when it is the duty of everyone with intelligence and the ability to see and understand things correctly to look beyond the past, with all its burdens and complications, in order to take a bold leap towards new horizons. Those who, like us, carry the burden of responsibility should be the first to summon the strength to make fateful decisions which meet the situation. We must all rise above all expressions of fanaticism, self-delusion and outdated theories of superiority, and the most important thing is that we must never forget that only God never errs.

In saying that I wish to remove from the entire Arab people the disasters inevitably arising from new, painful and dreadful wars, I also wish to tell you quite frankly that I feel the same emotions and responsibility for everyone in the world, and certainly for the Israeli nation. Every soul destroyed in war is a human soul, and it makes no difference if it is Arab or Israeli. The woman who has been widowed is a person who has the right to live in the bosom of a happy family, whether Arab or Israeli. The innocent children who lose the love and care of their parents are the children of all of us, whether they live on Arab or Israeli soil. We bear a great responsibility for them and for ensuring them a pleasant present and a good future.

For the sake of all that, in order to protect the lives of our sons, our brothers and our sisters, for the sake of the development of man and happiness, in order to give him the right to live honorably, for the sake of

our responsibility to the generations to come and for the sake of the smile of every baby born on our land—for the sake of all that I have decided to come to you despite all the risks and to address you directly.

I have borne and still bear the burden of historic responsibility, and consequently I stated several years ago—on 4 February 1971, to be precise—that I was prepared to sign a peace agreement with Israel. That was the first such statement made by an Arab in a responsible position since the start of the Arab-Israel conflict. Because of all those motives deriving from the responsibility of leadership, I said on 16 October 1973 before the National Assembly, that is, the Egyptian parliament, that we should call for an international conference at which a permanent and just peace would be decided upon. At that time I was not in a situation which required me to ask for peace or a ceasefire, but because of the motives arising from the historical responsibility of leadership we signed the first Disengagement Agreement and, subsequently, the second Disengagement Agreement in the Sinai.

We began knocking at open and closed doors in order to find a way towards a permanent and just peace. We opened our hearts to all the peoples of the world so that they would understand our motives and objectives and be convinced that we really and truly wanted justice and peace. With all those motives I decided to come to you with an open mind, heart and will, in the hope that we might build a true peace based on justice.

Fate has decreed that the peace mission should fall on the great Moslem feast, the blessed feast of the sacrifice, when our blessed father Abraham, the forefather of the Arabs and the Jews, put his fate totally in God's hands, not out of obedience but out of tremendous spiritual strength and free will, in order to sacrifice his offspring. He did this out of an impulse based on a deep, firm faith in the highest ideals, which grant life the deepest content. Perhaps this coincidence embodies a new content for the souls of all of us, and perhaps it will become a genuine hope, the message of confidence, tranquillity and peace.

Ladies and gentlemen, let us be open and speak frankly and clearly, without any circuitousness. Let us be frank with one another at a time when the whole world, both East and West, is watching these rare moments which may be a substantive turning-point in the historical process in this part of the world, and perhaps in the whole world. Let us be open in giving our answers to the great question of how it is possible to attain a stable and just peace. First of all, I have come to you with a clear and honest answer to this great question so that the nation in Israel might hear it, as well as the whole world and all those whose genuine calls for peace have reached my ears, in the hope that at the conclusion of this historic meeting there will be the results for which millions of people hope and pray. Before giving my frank and clear answer I would

hand, and in that of Israel, on the other, and that still obtains in all the hearts and souls. Let the long months in which we could have established peace and which have been lost because of fruitless disputes and wrangles focusing on the procedural aspects of the Geneva Conference, which reflect doubts and lack of trust, be enough for us.

But I am speaking to you with complete frankness. I reached the decision after protracted thought and deliberation and I know that it is a great risk. But if the almighty and gracious Lord has ordained that I should bear responsibility for the Egyptian nation and share responsibility for everything that concerns the fate of the Arab people and the Egyptian nation, it follows that the first obligation in that circle of responsibility is to exhaust every possibility of removing the disasters arising from destructive, murderous wars, whose outcome only God knows, from the Egyptian nation and the Arab people. After pondering the matter at length I was convinced that adherence and loyalty to my responsibility before God and the nation impelled me to go to the very ends of the earth, and even to come to Jerusalem and speak to the Members of the Knesset, the representatives of the Israeli nation, about all the truths and facts of which I am convinced, in order then to leave you to decide for yourselves by yourselves. After that, may God do with us as He wills.

Ladies and gentlemen, there are moments in the lives of nations and peoples when it is the duty of everyone with intelligence and the ability to see and understand things correctly to look beyond the past, with all its burdens and complications, in order to take a bold leap towards new horizons. Those who, like us, carry the burden of responsibility should be the first to summon the strength to make fateful decisions which meet the situation. We must all rise above all expressions of fanaticism, self-delusion and outdated theories of superiority, and the most important thing is that we must never forget that only God never errs.

In saying that I wish to remove from the entire Arab people the disasters inevitably arising from new, painful and dreadful wars, I also wish to tell you quite frankly that I feel the same emotions and responsibility for everyone in the world, and certainly for the Israeli nation. Every soul destroyed in war is a human soul, and it makes no difference if it is Arab or Israeli. The woman who has been widowed is a person who has the right to live in the bosom of a happy family, whether Arab or Israeli. The innocent children who lose the love and care of their parents are the children of all of us, whether they live on Arab or Israeli soil. We bear a great responsibility for them and for ensuring them a pleasant present and a good future.

For the sake of all that, in order to protect the lives of our sons, our brothers and our sisters, for the sake of the development of man and happiness, in order to give him the right to live honorably, for the sake of

our responsibility to the generations to come and for the sake of the smile of every baby born on our land—for the sake of all that I have decided to come to you despite all the risks and to address you directly.

I have borne and still bear the burden of historic responsibility, and consequently I stated several years ago—on 4 February 1971, to be precise—that I was prepared to sign a peace agreement with Israel. That was the first such statement made by an Arab in a responsible position since the start of the Arab-Israel conflict. Because of all those motives deriving from the responsibility of leadership, I said on 16 October 1973 before the National Assembly, that is, the Egyptian parliament, that we should call for an international conference at which a permanent and just peace would be decided upon. At that time I was not in a situation which required me to ask for peace or a ceasefire, but because of the motives arising from the historical responsibility of leadership we signed the first Disengagement Agreement and, subsequently, the second Disengagement Agreement in the Sinai.

We began knocking at open and closed doors in order to find a way towards a permanent and just peace. We opened our hearts to all the peoples of the world so that they would understand our motives and objectives and be convinced that we really and truly wanted justice and peace. With all those motives I decided to come to you with an open mind, heart and will, in the hope that we might build a true peace based on justice.

Fate has decreed that the peace mission should fall on the great Moslem feast, the blessed feast of the sacrifice, when our blessed father Abraham, the forefather of the Arabs and the Jews, put his fate totally in God's hands, not out of obedience but out of tremendous spiritual strength and free will, in order to sacrifice his offspring. He did this out of an impulse based on a deep, firm faith in the highest ideals, which grant life the deepest content. Perhaps this coincidence embodies a new content for the souls of all of us, and perhaps it will become a genuine hope, the message of confidence, tranquillity and peace.

Ladies and gentlemen, let us be open and speak frankly and clearly, without any circuitousness. Let us be frank with one another at a time when the whole world, both East and West, is watching these rare moments which may be a substantive turning-point in the historical process in this part of the world, and perhaps in the whole world. Let us be open in giving our answers to the great question of how it is possible to attain a stable and just peace. First of all, I have come to you with a clear and honest answer to this great question so that the nation in Israel might hear it, as well as the whole world and all those whose genuine calls for peace have reached my ears, in the hope that at the conclusion of this historic meeting there will be the results for which millions of people hope and pray. Before giving my frank and clear answer I would

like to assure you that it rests on a number of facts which no one can refuse to acknowledge.

The first fact: one person cannot be happy at the expense of someone else. The second fact: I will not use ambiguous language. I have not conducted, nor will I conduct, a dual policy, I will negotiate only in a straightforward, above-board way. The third fact: direct confrontation and direct communication are the closest and best ways of attaining a clear aim. The fourth fact: the call for a permanent and just peace based on respect for the resolutions of the U.N. has become the property of the whole world and the international community, whether in the major policy-making capitals or in general public opinion, which in turn influences policy and decision-making. The fifth fact, which is perhaps the most important and the clearest: the Arab people does not work for and aspire towards a stable and just peace from a position of weakness or exhaustion but quite the contrary, from a firm basis of strength and stability which makes what it says derive from a true and frank desire to attain peace, a desire which arises from a genuine esteem for culture and in order to avert certain disaster from ourselves and you and the whole world. There is indeed no alternative to a decision to attain a just and stable peace which will not be rocked by storms, will not be overshadowed by doubts and in whose path there are no twists or bad intentions.

In all frankness, I would like to warn you of these facts, which I sought to lay before you as I see them. I warn you of things which might come into your minds. The obligation I feel to be open impels me to tell you the following:

1. I have not come to you to sign a separate agreement between Egypt and Israel. That is inconceivable in Egypt's policy. The problem is not Egypt and Israel. No separate peace between Egypt and Israel or between any of the countries of conflict and Israel will bring a just peace to the entire region. Moreover, even if there is peace between all the countries of conflict and Israel, without a just solution of the Palestinian problem the just and stable peace which the world urges us to attain cannot be established.

2. I have not come to you to seek to achieve a partial peace, i.e., to conclude the state of belligerency at this stage and then defer the entire problem for a later stage. That is not the fundamental solution which could lead us to a stable peace. In this connection, I have not come to you in order to reach a third disengagement agreement in the Sinai or the Golan Heights or the West Bank, because that would mean that we were merely postponing lighting the fuse to the future. It would also mean that we lacked the courage to stand face to face with peace and that we were too weak to bear the burden and responsibility of a stable and just peace. I have come to you so that together we may build a permanent and just peace and so that not another drop of blood need be shed on either side.

For that I have said I am prepared to go to the ends of the earth. And this brings me to answer the great question: how do we approach a permanent and just peace? In my opinion—and I say this from this podium to the whole world—the answer is neither impossible nor hard, even though there have been long years of blood vengeance, hostility, hatred and the education of generations in a spirit of being completely cut off from one another and ever-increasing enmity. The answer is neither impossible nor hard if we take the straight course and do so in openness and faith. You wish to live together with us in this part of the world.

I want to tell you quite frankly that we welcome you among us with confidence and security. That in itself is a tremendous turning-point, an indication of a sharp historical shift. In the past we rejected you, and we had our reasons for doing so. Yes, we refused to meet with you anywhere. Yes, we described you as "so-called Israel." Yes, we would attend international conferences or organizations together and our representatives would not—and still do not—exchange greetings with yours. Yes, that has happened and is still happening. We stipulated that at all talks there should be an intermediary who would meet with each side separately. Yes, that is how the first and second disengagement agreement talks were held. Our representatives to the first Geneva Conference, for example, met in that way, without exchanging a single word directly. Yes, that happened.

But today I say to you and to the whole world: we agree to live together with you under a just and permanent peace. We do not wish to surround you, or for you to surround us, with missiles intended to destroy or with bombs of hatred and hostility. I have said on more than one occasion that Israel is an established fact which has been recognized by the world and for whose security and survival the two world Powers have accepted responsibility. And because we honestly and truly want peace there was a very high wall between us and you. You sought to build that wall for twenty-five years. But that wall was smashed in 1973. It was a wall of psychological warfare which was based on hatred and enmity. It was a wall of intimidation by a force which could take the entire Arab nation by storm. It was a wall based on the view that as a nation we had become a motionless body. Moreover, there were those among you who said that even in another fifty years the Arabs would not be able to stand upright. It was a wall which constantly threatened to use force which could reach anywhere, no matter how far. It was a wall which warned us of destruction and loss if we tried to use our legal right to liberate our occupied lands. Together we must recognize that that wall crumbled and was smashed in 1973.

But there is another wall. That other wall constitutes a complex psychological barrier between us and you, a barrier of doubts, of alienation, of fears, of deception, of delusions regarding behavior or actions or decisions, of the cautious and mistaken interpretation of every event and

statement. It is to that psychological barrier, which constitutes 70 percent of the problem, that I was referring in my official statements. I would like to ask you today, during this visit of mine, why should we not extend our hands to one another genuinely and in faith and honesty, to destroy that barrier together? Why should we not unite in our true and genuine desire to put aside all the doubts, fear, treachery and bad intentions as well as the hidden purposes? Why should we not stand as one man, with the courage of men and the bravery of heroes who sacrifice their lives for a higher aim? Why should we not stand as one man, bravely and courageously, in order to build the exalted structure of peace which will endure forever and light the path for generations to follow with the glow of a human mission for construction, development and human benefit? Why should we bequeath to the generations to come the results of bloodshed, destruction, orphanhood, widowhood, the desolation of the families and the sighs of the casualties?

Why should we not believe in the wisdom of the Creator, as expressed in the Proverbs of Solomon: "Deceit is in the heart of them that imagine evil; but to the counsellors of peace is joy. Better is a dry morsel, and quietness therewith, than a house full of sacrifices with strife." Why should we not read together from David's Psalms: "Unto thee will I cry, O Lord...Hear the voice of my supplications, when I cry unto thee, when I lift up my hands toward thy holy oracle. Draw me not away with the wicked, and with the workers of iniquity, which speak peace to their neighbors, but mischief is in their hearts. Give them according to their deeds, and according to the wickedness of their endeavors....Seek peace and pursue it."

Ladies and gentlemen, I will tell you the truth, peace will not truly prevail unless it is based on justice rather than the conquest of the land of others. You cannot demand for yourselves what you deny to others. With all frankness and in the spirit which brought me to you today, I say to you: you must finally abandon the dreams of invasion and discard the belief which says that force is the best way of dealing with the Arabs. You must learn well the lessons of the clash between us and you, and expansion will not help you in any way. If we are speaking frankly: our land is not to be bargained for or subject to arguments. For us, our national land is like the sacred valley where Allah spoke to Moses, of blessed memory. None of us is entitled to or will agree to forego an inch of that land or to accept the principle of bargaining for it.

I will tell you the truth: we have before us today the best opportunity for peace, one which this period cannot offer us again, if we are really serious in our struggle for peace. If we miss this opportunity it will be accursed by mankind and history.

What is peace for Israel? That it should live with its neighbors in the region in peace and security. That is the logic to which I say, yes, Israel should live within the framework of its borders, calm and secure from

all aggression. That is the logic to which I say, yes, Israel should receive every kind of guarantee which assures it those two things. That is the demand to which I say yes. More than that, we know that we will agree to all the international guarantees you imagine and from whoever you wish to obtain them. We know that we will agree to accept all the guarantees you want from the two Powers, or from one of them, or from the five leading nations, or from some of them. I state once more unequivocally that we agree to all the guarantees you receive, and that we will also receive. Thus, when we ask what peace means for Israel, the answer is that Israel should live within the framework of its borders with its Arab neighbors, in tranquillity and security, and within the framework it desires of guarantees obtained by the other side.

But how will this be attained? How can we achieve this result, and thereby the stable and just peace? There are truths which have to be faced bravely and lucidly. There is Arab land which has been occupied by Israel and is still being retained by armed force. We insist on complete withdrawal from these areas, including Arab Jerusalem, the Holy City, to which I came as the city of peace, which was and always will be the living embodiment of coexistence between all the believers of the three faiths. But it is not reasonable for someone to think that with its special position the city of Jerusalem should exist within the framework of annexation or expansion. It must be free and open to all believers. Above all, it is important that this city should not be cut off from those who have chosen it as their permanent dwelling-place for hundreds of years. Instead of inciting the hatred of the Crusades we should endeavor to revive the spirit of Omar ibn al-Hatab and Saladdin, namely, the spirit of tolerance and respect for rights. Places of prayer, both Moslem and Christian, are not merely sites where ceremonies and prayers are held. They are more than that, genuine evidence of our uninterrupted existence in this place, whether political or spiritual.

No one must err in evaluating the importance and respect which we attach to Jerusalem, we Christians and Moslems. Permit me to say to you unequivocally, I have not come to you under this roof in order to ask you to remove your forces from the occupied land. Complete withdrawal from the Arab land occupied after 1967 is self-evident. On that point we can accept no argument, and on that point we will not beg anyone for anything because there is no meaning to any discussions for a stable and just peace and there is no point to any step intended to guarantee our life together in this part of the world in peace and security when you occupy Arab land by force. No peace will be stable if it is based on the occupation of someone else's land. Yes, that is self-evident. It cannot be debated and discussed, if the intentions are good and if the struggle is genuine for a stable and permanent peace for our generation and all those which are to follow.

With regard to the Palestinian problem, no one will deny that that is the heart of the entire problem. No one anywhere in the world will accept today the slogans which have been voiced in Israel ignoring the existence of a Palestinian nation and even asking, where is that nation? The problem of the Palestinian people and its legitimate rights cannot be ignored or denied by any side. Neither logic nor reason can tolerate such a denial or dismissal. It is a fact which has been accepted by international agreement in the West and the East and has gained recognition, sympathy and support within the framework of international agreements and official statements, and it will avail no one to stop his ears to what is said day and night and to close his eyes to this historic fact. Even the U.S.A., your first ally, which is deeply committed to defending Israel's existence and security, which has given and is giving Israel every moral, material and military support, I say, even the U.S.A. has chosen to stand behind the truth and acknowledge that the Palestinian people has legitimate rights and the Palestinian problem is the heart and crux of the conflict, and as long as that problem remains unresolved that conflict will grow and assume new proportions.

I say to you in all honesty: peace cannot be attained without the Palestinians. It is a grave mistake of unprecedented immensity to close one's eyes to that problem or neglect it. I will not continue to describe the events of the past since the Balfour Declaration of sixty years ago. You are well aware of the facts. If you found the legal and moral justification for establishing a national home on land which was not entirely your property, you will certainly understand the insistence of the Palestinian nation on reestablishing its state in its homeland. When some of the extremists demand that the Palestinians abandon that sublime aim, that would mean, in effect, that they abandon their identity and all hope for the future.

I congratulate Israeli voices which have demanded that recognition be accorded to the rights of the Palestinian people so that peace may be attained and guaranteed. I tell you, ladies and gentlemen, that there is nothing to be gained from refusing to recognize the right of the Palestinian people and its right to establish its state and return to it.

We Arabs have undergone that experience in the past with you and with the fact of Israel's existence. The struggle went from one war to another, to ever-greater numbers of casualties, until today we have reached the brink of a dangerous abyss and a terrible disaster if we do not utilize the opportunity for permanent and just peace together. You must face reality bravely, as I have done. There is no solution to any problem by retreating from it or ignoring it. Peace cannot be stabilized by making misguided assumptions which the world has rejected and has called collectively for recognition and respect for justice and truth. There is no need to question the right of the Palestinian people. There is

no value in creating barriers in order to delay or obstruct the advent of peace.

As I have told you, there is no happiness at the expense of the misery of others. Similarly, direct confrontation and direct communication are the closest and best way to a clear objective. Direct confrontation with the Palestinian problem and the only language for dealing with it in the direction of a just and permanent peace are embodied in the establishment of a state for the Palestinian people, with all the international guarantees you require. You must not fear a young country which will need the support of all the countries of the world to sustain it. And when the bells of peace ring out, no hand will beat the drums of war. And if such a hand be found, its voice shall not be heard.

Imagine the peace agreement we shall present at Geneva to the world which is hungry for peace, a peace agreement based on the following points: a. the termination of the Israeli occupation of the Arab lands occupied in 1967; b. the fulfillment of the basic rights of the Palestinian people and its right to self-determination, including the establishment of its state; c. the right of all the countries of the region to live in peace within their secure borders, defended by agreed means and which will provide the appropriate guarantees for the international borders, in addition to appropriate international guarantees; d. all the countries of the region undertake to maintain relations among them, in accordance with the aims and principles of the U.N. Charter, particularly the prohibition on the use of force and the solution of disputes by peaceful means; e. the conclusion of the state of war which exists in the region.

Ladies and gentlemen, peace is not signing a piece of paper but rewriting history. Peace is not a competition in order to protect avarice or conceal aspirations. The essence of peace is a tremendous struggle against desires and greed. The experience of ancient and modern history has taught us all that missiles and nuclear weapons do not bring security. On the contrary, they destroy security.

For the sake of our peoples, for the sake of human culture, it is incumbent upon us to defend men everywhere from rule by force of arms. It is incumbent upon us to exalt the rule of humanity and the strength of the values and principles which elevate man.

If I may be permitted to address an appeal to the Israeli nation from this podium, I appeal with the truth to every man, woman and child in Israel and say: from the Egyptian nation which welcomes this sacred mission for peace I bring a mission of peace to you. It is the mission of the Egyptian nation, to which fanaticism is alien, whose Moslem, Christian and Jewish sons live in a spirit of friendship, love and tolerance. It is Egypt which has placed in my hands the pledge of a sacred mission to you, a mission of security and peace. I appeal to you, to every man, woman and child in Israel, to encourage your leaders to strive for peace, so that efforts may be diverted to the establishment of a mighty

structure of peace instead of building fortresses and shelters buttressed by missiles of destruction. Show the whole world the nature of the new man in this part of the world, so that he may serve as an example of the man of love, the man of peace, everywhere. Tell your sons that what was in the past was the end of wars and suffering. Now there is a new beginning, a new life, a life of love, blessing, freedom and peace.

Ah, every bereaved mother, every widow, every son who has lost his father or brother, ah, all victims of war, fill the earth and the universe with the praises of peace, fill hearts with hopes of peace, turn the song into a living, productive reality, turn hope into a law of work and struggle. Because the willpower of nations comes from the willpower of God.

Ladies and gentlemen, before coming here I turned my entire heart and mind to God, may He be praised. When I prayed the festival prayer in the Al-Aksa Mosque and when I visited the Church of the Annunciation, I asked God to guide my spirit and preserve my great faith, so that this visit of mine may fulfill His aims for a happy present and an even happier future.

I have chosen to deviate from all the rules and precedents known by countries which were at war with one another, despite the continued occupation of the Arab lands. My statement that I was prepared to come to Israel was a great surprise and caused tremendous excitement and even doubts as regards the objective of my coming. Nonetheless, I made the decision in the full belief that I was truly expressing the desires and intentions of my people. I have chosen this difficult course even though many people regard it as the most difficult course. I have chosen to come to you with an open heart and mind. I have chosen to give priority to the efforts being made in the world for peace. I have chosen to come to you, to your House, and put the facts before you, the simple truths, not in order to maneuver or gain something but so that we may walk together through the most difficult struggle of modern times, the struggle for a just and permanent peace. It is not my struggle alone nor that of Israel's leaders. It is the struggle of every single individual in our countries, every one of which has the right to live in peace. This is the conscious and responsible commitment in the hearts of the millions who are awaiting the longed-for peace.

When I announced this initiative many people asked: what do you think can be gained from that visit? What do I expect from it? I will tell you what my reply was: I have not taken this initiative in order to obtain what may be gained during the course of a visit. I have come on a mission and I have told you of my mission. Read the word of the Lord, as spoken by the prophet Zechariah: "therefore love the truth and peace."

And I derive inspiration from the verses of the Koran which say: "Say, we believe in God and in what was handed down to us and handed down to Abraham, Ishmael, Isaac, Jacob and the tribes, and in what was

given to Moses and Jesus and the Prophet of their sovereignty, and that we accept." And the words of the great God are true.

(Applause.)

The Speaker, Y. Shamir: I give the floor to the Prime Minister.

(Applause.)

The Prime Minister, M. Begin: Mr. Speaker, Mr. President of the State of Israel, Mr. President of the Arab Republic of Egypt, Knesset Members, we congratulate the President and all the members of the Moslem faith in our country and everywhere on the occasion of the Feast of the Sacrifice, Id al-Adha. That festival commemorates the binding, when the Creator tested the faith of our common ancestor Abraham, and Abraham proved himself. As regards morality and human progress, that marked the ban on human sacrifice. The tradition of our two nations learned and taught that ban while the other nations around us still sacrificed people to their idols. And thus the Jewish and Arab peoples contributed to human progress, and continue to do so to this very day.

I congratulate the Egyptian President on his coming to our country and participating in the Knesset sitting. The flying time between Cairo and Jerusalem is short, but the distance between the two cities was infinite until last night. President Sadat crossed that distance courageously. We Jews appreciate courage, and admire it in our guest, because we owe our existence and survival to courage.

Mr. Speaker, this small nation, the surviving remnant of the Jewish people which returned to its historic homeland, has always wanted peace. When the dawn of our independence rose on 14 May 1948, 4 Iyar 5708, in the Proclamation of Independence, the founding document of our national freedom, David Ben-Gurion said: "We extend the hand of peace and good-neighborliness to all the states around us and to their peoples, and we call upon them to cooperate in mutual helpfulness with the independent Jewish nation in its land."

A year before that, while still in the underground, facing the fateful battle for the liberation of the country and the salvation of the nation, we appealed to our neighbors, saying: "In this country we will live together and advance together to a life of freedom and happiness. Arab neighbors, do not spurn the hand extended to you in peace."

But it is my duty, my duty, Mr. Speaker, not only my right, to say today that the truth is that our hand which was extended in peace was not taken, and a day after the renewal of our independence, in accordance with our right, which is eternal and incontrovertible, we were attacked on three fronts and stood almost without weapons, a few against many, the weak against the strong, when an attempt was made, the day after the declaration of our independence, to stifle it and also put an end to the last hope of the Jewish people in the age of destruction and revival.

No, we do not believe in force, and we have never based our relations with the Arab people on force. On the contrary, force was used against us. Throughout this generation we have continually been attacked by force with the object of destroying our nation, ending our independence and annulling our right.

We defended ourselves. It is true that we defended our right, our existence, our honor, our wives and children, against the repeated attempt to use force against us, and not on one front alone. It is also true that with God's help we overcame the aggressive forces and assured our nation's existence, not only in this generation but also in the generations to come.

We do not believe in force, we believe in right, only in right, and that accounts for our deeply-held aspiration, to which we have always adhered, for peace.

Mr. President, Mr. President of Egypt, in this democratic House are to be found the commanders of all the fighting Jewish underground organizations. They had to wage a war of few against many, against a mighty force. There are to be found here our senior commanders, who led large masses, large masses, into battles which were forced on them, to the victory which was inevitable because they were defending their right. They belong to different parties, hold different views, but I am sure, Mr. President, that I am expressing the opinion of them all without exception when I say that we have one aspiration in our hearts, in which we are all united, and that is to bring peace, to our people, which has not known a single day of peace since we began returning to Zion, and peace to our neighbors, to whom we wish well. And we believe that if we make peace, true peace, we can help one another in every aspect of life and cultivate a new era in the Middle East, an era of growth and development, of blossoming and fertilization, as it was in days of yore.

Let me, therefore, say today how we understand peace. We seek full, genuine peace with complete conciliation between the Jewish and Arab peoples. We will not sink into memories of the past. There have been wars. There has been bloodshed. Wonderful members of the younger generation have fallen on both sides. We will always bear with us the memory of our heroes who gave their lives so that this day could come, and this day has come. We appreciate the courage of a rival and we give respect to all the members of the younger generation among the Arab nation who fell too. We will not sink into the memories of the past, however hard they may be for us all. We must overcome them. We must look to the future, to our nations, to our children, to our joint future. We must see to it that in this region we will all live together, for generations to come, the great Arab nation with its countries and the Jewish people in its country, the Land of Israel. That is why we must determine what the content of the peace is to be.

Let us conduct negotiations for a peace treaty, Mr. President, as free men and, with God's help, so we wholeheartedly believe, the day will come when we will sign it in mutual respect, and then we will know that the period of wars has ended, that we have extended our hands to one another, that we have shaken one another's hand and that the future is bright for all the peoples of the region. The first thing to do is to sign a peace treaty and annul the state of war.

I agree, Mr. President, that you have not come to us, and we have not invited you to our country, as it is customary to say of late, in order to drive a wedge between the Arab nations. Someone made use of the ancient phrase *Divide et Impera*. Israel desires neither to rule nor to divide. We want peace with all our neighbors, with Egypt, with Jordan, with Syria and with Lebanon. We wish to negotiate—

T. Toubi (Democratic Front for Peace and Equality): Why not with the Palestinian Arabs? Why not with the Palestinian Arabs?

The Prime Minister, M. Begin: Mr. President, my colleague interrupted me, but I am glad this time he did not interrupt you. (Applause.)

There is no need to distinguish between a peace treaty and an end to the state of war. We are not proposing or requesting that. On the contrary, the first clause in a peace treaty is the annulment of the state of war and forever. We want to establish normal relations between us, such as prevail among all nations even after all the wars. We have learned from history, Mr. President, that war is avoidable. Peace is inevitable.

Many nations have waged war on one another, sometimes using the foolish phrase "implacable enemy." There are no implacable enemies. After all the wars comes the inevitable—peace. That is why we seek to establish diplomatic ties, such as are customary between civilized nations, in a peace treaty.

Today two flags fly in Jerusalem—the Egyptian and the Israeli. Together, Mr. President, we saw our little children waving both flags. Let us sign a peace treaty and establish that situation forever, in both Jerusalem and Cairo. I hope the day will come when Egyptian children will wave both those flags. You, Mr. President, will have an accredited ambassador in Jerusalem and we will have one in Cairo, and even if differences of opinion arise between us, we will clarify them in a civilized way, by means of our authorized representatives.

We propose economic cooperation to develop our countries. In the Middle East there are wonderful countries, God created it thus, an oasis, but there are also desert areas, and they can be made fertile. Let us cooperate in that. Let us develop our countries, put an end to poverty, hunger and homelessness, let us raise our nations to the level of developed countries so that they will no longer be called developing countries. I am respectfully prepared to confirm the words of His Majesty the King

of Morocco, who said even in public that if there were peace in the Middle East the combination of the Arab genius with the Jewish genius could turn the region into a paradise. Let us open our countries to freedom of movement. You will come to us and we will visit you. I am prepared to announce this day, Mr. Speaker, that our country is open to the citizens of Egypt. I do not make this dependent on any condition on our part. I think that it is only right and fair that such an announcement should be reciprocal. But just as there are Egyptian flags in our streets and a distinguished Egyptian delegation in our capital and our country today, the visitors will increase. Our border will be open to you, as will all the other borders. And, as I have said, we want that in the south, the north and the east.

I consequently renew my invitation to the President of Syria to follow in your footsteps, Mr. President, and to come to us in order to start negotiations for peace between Israel and Syria and the signing of a peace treaty between the two countries. I regret to say that there is no justification for the mourning they have decreed beyond our northern border. On the contrary, visits such as this, ties such as these, clarifications of this kind, can and must be days of rejoicing, days of exultation, for all nations.

I invite King Hussein to come to us and discuss together all the problems between us. I also invite genuine spokesmen of the Palestinians of the Land of Israel to come and hold talks of clarification with us about our joint future and about guaranteeing human rights, social justice, peace and mutual respect. If they invite us to come to their capitals we will accept their invitations. If they invite us to embark on negotiations in Damascus, Amman and Beirut, we will go to those capitals in order to conduct negotiations there. We do not wish to divide. We want true peace with all our neighbors, as reflected in peace treaties with content such as I have described here.

M. Wilner (Democratic Front for Peace and Equality): You want to distract us from the Palestinian people. The Palestinian issue is central.

The Prime Minister, M. Begin: Mr. Speaker, it is my duty today to tell our guests and the nations watching us and listening to us about the link between our people and this country. The President mentioned the Balfour Declaration. No, sir, we did not take any alien land. We returned to our homeland. The link between our nation and this land is eternal. It began in the dawn of human history. It has never been severed. In this land we established our culture, here our prophets, whose words you quoted today, prophesied, here the kings of Judah and Israel ruled, here we became a nation, here we established our kingdom and when we were exiled from our land because of the force that was used against us we did not forget this country for one day. We prayed to it, we yearned

for it, we believed that we would return to it from the day the words: "When the Lord turned again the captivity of Zion, we were like them that dream. Then was our mouth filled with laughter, and our tongue with singing," were pronounced. That psalm applies to all our exiles, all our afflictions, the consolation of the return to Zion which would surely come.

That right of ours was recognized. The Balfour Declaration was included in the Mandate which was acknowledged by the nations of the world, including the U.S.A. In the preamble to that recognized international document we read: "Whereas recognition has thereby been given to the historical connection of the Jewish people with Palestine and to the grounds for reconstituting their National Home in that country."

What is mentioned is, then, the historical connection between the Jewish people and Palestine, or the Land of Israel, *Eretz Yisrael* in Hebrew, and on the reestablishment of their National Home in that country, i.e., the Land of Israel.

In 1919 we also gained recognition of that right from the spokesman of the Arab nation. The agreement of 3 January 1919 signed by Emir Faisal and Chaim Weizmann read: "Mindful of the racial kinship and ancient bonds existing between the Arabs and the Jewish people, and realizing that the surest means of working out the consummation of their national aspirations is the closest possible collaboration in the development of the Arab state and of Palestine." This is followed by the various clauses regarding cooperation between the Arab state and Palestine. That is our right. Its existence is the truth.

What happened to us when our homeland was taken away from us? I accompanied you to Yad Vashem, this morning, Mr. President. With your own eyes you saw what befell our people when this homeland was taken away from it.

There is no annexation. We both agreed, Mr. President, that no one who has seen what is contained in Yad Vashem with his own eyes can fail to understand what happened to this nation when it was without its homeland, when it was deprived of its homeland. We both read a document dated 30 January 1939 which contained the word "*Vernichtung*," if war were to break out the Jewish race in Europe would be destroyed. Then, too, people said to us: don't take any notice of it. The whole world heard. No one came to save us, not in the nine fateful, crucial months after the statement was made, the statement which was unparalleled by any made by any man ever since God created man and man created Satan, and not in the six years when millions of our brethren, including one and a half million little Jewish children, were destroyed in every manner imaginable. No one came to save us, neither from the East nor from the West. Consequently we, that entire generation, the generation of destruction and revival, swore a solemn oath: never again shall we allow our nation to be in danger, never again shall we permit our

wives and children—whom we must protect even, if necessary, at the cost of our lives—to be within the range of the enemy's destructive fire.

Furthermore, since then, it has been our duty in every generation to remember that certain things which are said about our people must be taken seriously, and for the sake of our people we must on no account accept any advice which counsels disregarding such statements.

President Sadat knows, and he knew this from us before he came to Jerusalem, that our views regarding the permanent borders between us and our neighbors differ from his. But I call on the President of Egypt and all our neighbors: do not say that there will be no negotiations about something. I propose, with the support of the majority of this House, that everything should be open to negotiation. Anyone who says "In the relations between the Arab people or peoples in the region and the State of Israel there are things which should not be subject to negotiation," is taking a heavy responsibility upon himself. Neither side should say the opposite. Neither side should submit preconditions. We will conduct the negotiations with dignity. If there are differences of opinion between us, that is nothing unusual. Anyone who has studied the history of war and the chronicles of peace treaties knows that all negotiations for peace treaties begin from differences of opinion between the sides, and during the negotiations they reach an agreement which makes the act of signing a peace treaty possible. That is the course we suggest taking. We will conduct the negotiations as equals. There are no victors and vanquished. All the nations of the region are equal and each will treat the other with respect. And in that spirit of openness, of readiness to listen to one another, to facts, reasons and explanations, with all the accepted means of human persuasion, let us conduct the negotiations as I have requested and suggest beginning and continuing, proceeding consistently until we reach the happy moment when we sign a peace treaty between us.

We are not only ready to sit down with the representatives of Egypt, as well as with the representatives of Jordan, Syria and Lebanon, if they should want this, at the Peace Conference in Geneva, we have proposed renewing the Geneva Conference on the basis of the two Security Council resolutions, 242 and 338. Furthermore, if there are problems between us before the convening of the Geneva Conference, we will clarify them today and tomorrow, and if the President of Egypt wants to continue clarifying them in Egypt, we will be only too happy to do so. If he prefers a neutral spot, we have nothing against that. Let us clarify the problems which need clarification before the Geneva Conference, and our eyes and ears will be open to every proposal and problem raised.

I will permit myself to say a few words about Jerusalem. Mr. President, today you prayed in the house of prayer which is sacred to Islam and from there you went to the Church of the Holy Sepulchre. You saw for yourself, as everyone knows, that since this city was reunited there is

complete freedom of access, without any let or hindrance, to the members of all religions to the places which are holy to them. This positive phenomenon did not exist for nineteen years. It prevails for about eleven years, and we can assure the Moslem world and the Christian world and all the nations that there will always be freedom of access to the holy sites of each religion. We will protect that right of freedom of access because that is what we believe in—equal human and civil rights and respect for every faith, every single faith.

Mr. Speaker, this is a special day for our parliament and will undoubtedly be remembered for many years to come in the annals of our nation, as in those of the Egyptian nation, and those of all mankind. This day, Members of the Knesset, I offer up a prayer that the shared God of our fathers will give us the wisdom required to overcome the difficulties and obstacles, the inflammatory statements and the insults, and with God's help we will reach the day we long for, for which all our nation prays—peace. In the words of the Psalmist of Israel: "Righteousness and peace have kissed each other," and of the Prophet Zechariah: "therefore love the truth and peace." (Applause.)

(The Prime Minister of Israel, Menahem Begin, and the President of Egypt, Anwar Sadat, shake hands.) (Applause.)

The Speaker, Y. Shamir: I give the floor to MK Peres.

M. Wilner (Democratic Front for Peace and Equality): Point of order....I ask the Speaker to permit all the party groups in the Knesset to express their opinions in brief. Our party group wishes to propose that the Knesset accept President Sadat's proposals that Israel go to Geneva and, on that basis, sign a peace treaty benefiting everyone. Then we will finally put an end to the nightmare of wars and bloodshed.

The Speaker, Y. Shamir: I thank MK Wilner. This sitting has been convened under Section 56 (A) of the Rules of Procedure. At a sitting of this kind there are no conclusions or proposals. The agenda is decided by the House Committee and I therefore have no alternative but to reject your proposal. I give the floor to MK Peres.

S. Peres (Alignment): Mr. Speaker, Mr. President of the Egyptian Arab Republic, Mr. President of Israel, distinguished Knesset Members, I am speaking today not on behalf of the opposition but on behalf of the unity of our nation, because there is no opposition to peace in our nation. Even though there are differing views regarding the possible and desirable settlement, there are no differences of opinion as to the urgent need for a peace settlement.

Our nation is united, Mr. President, as you could feel wherever you went, in its desire for peace, at last full peace, true peace. We are also united in welcoming you to Jerusalem, the city of faith and peace, the

city of hope and prayer. Your coming appears to us as a fresh start, a step taken by a leader of vision, the leader of Egypt, the vanguard of the Arabs, the representative of a long and glorious history, and primarily as a step which must not be wasted.

You displayed courage in taking the risk of overturning old habits and fixed practices and making a fresh start. In war, too, one takes risks, but the chances are always bitter. In war there are decisions, but even victors pay a heavy price. While taking a risk for peace may involve losses, it will not involve loss of life. Your coming symbolizes a new beginning of that kind, and I assure you that we will all try to free ourselves of preconceptions so that we may see things in a new light and against a new background. We will support any step the government of Israel takes to attain a peace settlement and we will continue to make whatever contribution we can so that your visit here constitutes a genuine success, for the sake of our nations, for the sake of peace.

Mr. President, I listened to what you said with great attention. I could not agree to the content, neither as regards peace—we hold a different view—nor as regards the settlement. But all negotiations begin with disagreement. We will listen to you and you will listen to us. We may find a compromise or a third alternative which neither you nor we had thought about previously, and therefore this dialogue from this podium is of such importance. As you stand here, on the podium of our Knesset, together with the Prime Minister of Israel, before the elected representatives of our country, with its Jewish, Moslem, Druse and Christian inhabitants, we feel that we are experiencing a breathtaking moment in the course of history, as hundreds of millions of peace-loving people watch us and follow every moment of this visit.

The eyes of millions of viewers and thousands of years of Egyptian and Jewish history are turned to this podium today. You and we constitute the continuation of a history which is among the oldest in the annals of mankind, a history which has known conflicts and cooperation, a history which is imbued with both suffering and hope. From the peaks of the most prominent of the structures built by man—the pyramids—and from the pages of the most ancient book—the Bible—we are confronted by the penetrating question: will we be able to ascend to the true peaks of human endeavor and emerge from the tribulations of war to the open spaces of peace, as we freed ourselves from the burden of slavery and attained the heights of freedom?

It is not only the distance past which links us, however, but also a great future. The worried eyes of millions of Egyptian, Syrian, Jordanian, Palestinian and Jewish mothers are focused on this podium now, waiting to see whether we can tell them and their sons that there will be no more wars, no more threats, no more bereavement, destruction and refugees, and that henceforth there is a chance that our young people may grow up in an atmosphere which is free from fear, terror and sud-

den disaster. Everyone is waiting to hear that wisdom has defeated enmity, and that the art of statesmanship has overcome military doctrine.

Your very coming here has achieved part of that aim. You and we exist and are speaking to one another. Without yet having resolved the differences between us, your coming has created the chance which did not exist beforehand, the chance that if we are able to invest in peace even some of the efforts we invested in the military sphere, your visit will always be remembered as the beginning we have been waiting for.

Knesset Members, for thirty years we have waited for this moment, for this visit. We always believed that the face to face meeting of the leaders of the nations would create the conditions for a fruitful dialogue and the impetus which would lead to peace. Peace, Mr. President, not only at the summits but also at the roots, of statesmen, of poets, of laborers, of academics, of children, of adults, of us all, in real life, in books, in work. The Prime Minister talked about it. All the prime ministers which preceded him spoke in favor of an approach of this kind. David Ben-Gurion said: "There is no conflict between us and the Egyptian people; we do not want the continuation of anarchy in our relations with Egypt and we are ready to conduct negotiations for a stable peace, cooperation, neighborly relations, in conditions of direct negotiations without prior conditions, without coercion by either side." Sharett and Eshkol repeated the hope that it would be possible "to renew the days of glory when Jews and Arabs contributed together to the culture of mankind." Mrs. Meir said: "I appeal to the President of Egypt as the president of a great nation," proposing "that we meet as equals and make a supreme and joint effort to reach the solution of all the problems between us." Mr. Yitzhak Rabin stated: "I hereby announce my readiness to meet with any Arab head of state at any time, anywhere, for the purpose of peace talks."

Since 1973 we have reached solutions which none of us had predicted. Through the intermediacy of our American friends we agreed to sign various agreements, as you mentioned: the Interim Agreement of 1974 and another agreement in 1975. Those agreements came under criticism at the time. It was claimed that Israel was relinquishing concrete benefits, withdrawing from territory which seemed to it to be essential, while Egypt and Syria were agreeing to things which were basically political: an assurance of tranquillity in the region, the revival of the life of the region, the aspiration to live in peace. We would not have been able to do that had we not believed that Egypt, the Egyptian President and the Egyptian people really and truly wanted peace.

Peace requires that one give credit to attempts at a dialogue, it also requires patience—let us not forget that—and responsiveness to the expectations of many citizens in both countries. It also requires that one rid oneself to some extent of the cost of security as well as of the danger

of war, for the sake of the exaltation of man, the improvement of society, the development of agriculture, the expansion of industry, the advance of science and the amelioration of the standard of living of every single citizen. Like you, we preferred the proposals of the U.S., as brought to us by Secretary of State Kissinger in his roving airplane, to the threatening involvement of the U.S.S.R., which could have contributed to peace but contributed to war instead.

M. Wilner (Democratic Front for Peace and Equality): That's untrue.

S. Peres (Alignment): I admit that you are an expert in untruth, but there's no point in interrupting all the time.

Your coming here today puts the procedures and processes which have been customary to date in the shade. The assurance that everything is open for discussion gives your visit genuine, powerful and immediate content. The desire to discuss your proposals in a good atmosphere brings the possibility of achieving a solution nearer. Both you and we will express our views and reach agreement.

I speak on behalf of the Labor movement in Israel, a movement which, from the first day of its existence and till today, has never stopped believing in peace, in good human relations between laboring men at home and in the region. I am convinced that the socialist movements of the world, including the Egyptian Socialist Union, are not purely concerned with classes and trades unionism, but are popular movements which believe that the working man will benefit only when the country in which he lives benefits. Neither are they purely national movements, also being universal and advocating humane and democratic socialism which is resolved to release the individual from coercion, exploitation and discrimination and to liberate nations from bondage and hostility. All efforts must be coordinated to attain one aim: the dignity of man, the justice of society and the peace of the world.

From this podium we must say to one another directly and honestly what has to be done, what concrete steps must be taken now to attain peace. Apart from expressing the views of each one of us and without dismissing any method or approach which might lead to peace, whether it is a gradual policy of step by step, one country at a time, or several simultaneously in one great and comprehensive step, the objective must be permanent peace, full peace, genuine peace with everyone and between everyone, with ambassadors and political, economic and commercial relations, as is customary between countries in the same region.

Peace must be based on direct relations between the Arab and Jewish peoples, without any outside intermediary, without dependence on others, without imported barriers. Each country must live alongside the other, as each individual lives alongside others, along the lines of the framework existing between the countries of Europe or Scandinavia to-

day, having reached a time of close communication, without obscuring their separate identities, after periods of hostility. Mr. President, every nation should decide its identity for itself and should be able to express its identity itself, educating its children in the spirit of its heritage, expressing its views, enjoying freedom of movement, establishing contacts with other countries, respecting equal rights and refraining from turning equality into privilege and difference into violence.

Peace must be based on mutual compromise, unlike war, which is based on a unilateral decision. We will support an honorable and genuine compromise and will not demand a compromise from either side in the sphere of its ability to defend itself. We have said that we will agree to territorial compromises with every Arab country provided they do not endanger our security, just as our neighbors would not want their security endangered. We can all save in the security sphere what we will gain from peace, but there will be peace between us and each one of us will have security. This is important, because we do not want the involvement of foreign forces in our region. We rejected them in difficult times and we do not want them at a time when, as I believe, the chances of peace are increasing.

Peace must create recognized and permanent borders, it must also provide an answer for the refugee problem, and there are refugees on both sides. Approximately one third of Israel's inhabitants came from Arab countries. They are not refugees but residents in every sense of the word. Approximately half the Palestinians currently living in the area between the River Jordan and the sea are inhabitants, and some of them are refugees. By a joint endeavor we can offer them all a new standard of living, a new life in which they are no longer refugees but residents living a normal life.

We are prepared to advance through peace to any settlement which we all find desirable, either with each country separately or with all of them jointly. We recognize the fact that Egypt has a senior position of leadership in the Arab world and the entire region, and that peace can in the final event be based on advanced unity between nations rather than serving as a wedge between them. The unions which led to enmity must be replaced by a new union which leads to peace. As far as can be seen, Mr. President, there is no reason whatsoever why there should be any conflict between us and Egypt. We are convinced that the disputed subjects, and what appear to be disputed subjects, can be settled within a short space of time. The enmity between us was a protracted error. An agreement between us is within our grasp.

There is no reason for the conflict between us and Jordan. We have tasted Jordanian shells, but we have also tasted the open bridges. We regret those shells but we are also convinced that the caravan of peace can cross the open bridges without restraint. We will be ready to negotiate a

lasting peace with the Syrians. A peace agreement can rapidly be reached with Lebanon.

We will not conceal the fact that we are aware of the existence of the Palestinian identity. Any nation may decide its identity for itself, without requiring the approval of another nation, but the Palestinian identity must be expressed without endangering Israel's security—or Jordan's, for that matter, though that is not our concern—and we have already seen how civilized nations have resolved the problem of differing identities within one entity, each group working alongside its neighbor without a solution being imposed by bitterness, with peaceful coexistence, each group under its own leadership and administration within responsible existing political frameworks.

The holy places, the economic needs and the security circumstances all require maximum openness. No border should prevent access to the holy places, no political map should interfere with the economic map and no security need should be involved where the spiritual heritage of our respective nations is concerned.

Mr. President, we are very proud of what we have achieved in Israel. History has been kind to the Egyptian nation, which has not been exiled from its land. History has been cruel to us and we have experienced dispersion, persecution and annihilation. We prevailed by the force of prayer, the yearning for Zion and the love of Zion. Today you are a distinguished guest on the soil of our revival.

We have very great respect for the renewal, revolution and great independence which you and your generation have bestowed on the Egyptian nation and the Arab world. The revival and the renewal released hidden energies which we thought had sunk and been lost in the course of history, but a great deal of energy was also wasted on the hostility between our two countries. Let us emerge from that and unite our forces once more, each one of us remaining true to his course, faith and dream as we do so. Let us cooperate and together make our region the most fertile in the world, the most prosperous society ever known in the region. In the words of the prophet Jeremiah, who spoke two thousand five hundred years ago: "Ye shall not see the sword, neither shall ye have famine, but I will give you assured peace in this place."

It took you less than one hour to get from Ismailiya to Lod. When you emerged from the plane we did not know how our encounter would go. It is difficult to remember another moment in history when, as almost the whole world watched, a distance narrowed and a gulf almost disappeared. This is a great moment in the lives of all of us. We feel that this great moment should also be a moment of truth: we will have to relinquish things which we want and you, Mr. President, will have to relinquish things you want if we are to meet somewhere where we can build peace.

The long and bitter years of hostility entrapped us all. There is no disputed topic between Israel and Egypt which cannot be resolved through peaceful discussions, and we will all do our best to see to it that your dramatic and brave peace mission, a mission which we have long awaited, at long last bears fruit and history records this moment as one which marked the beginning of a new era, the era of peace. May this be an auspicious moment for us all in the Middle East. Let us establish unity for the sake of peace, for peace unites us all. (Applause.)

The Speaker, Y. Shamir: Would the guests in the Chamber and the galleries kindly remain in their places for a few minutes until their honors the Presidents leave the Chamber.

The Secretary-General of the Knesset. N. Lorch: Their honors, the Presidents!

(The Knesset Members stand as the President of Egypt, Anwar Sadat, and the President of Israel, Ephraim Katzir, leave.)

The Speaker, Y. Shamir: I hereby close the sitting.

Israel's Peace Plan

Introduction

Detailed negotiations concerning the peace treaty, initiated in the course of President Sadat's visit to Jerusalem and continued in Cairo by the Director-General of the Prime Minister's Office, Elyahu Ben Elissar, promised to be long and complicated. On 14 December 1977 Prime Minister Begin travelled to the U.S. in order to present to President Carter a peace plan, providing *inter alia* for autonomy for the Arab inhabitants of the Gaza Strip. Carter considered the plan to be a sound basis for negotiations. On 25 December 1977 Begin travelled to Ismailia. At his meeting with Sadat several major discrepancies emerged. Begin was willing to accept a formula concerning a solution to the problems of the Palestinians, while Sadat insisted on the Palestinian problem, as well as on a commitment from Israel to withdraw not only from the Sinai but also from the Golan Heights, the Gaza Strip, Judea and Samaria, all this no doubt in view of the vehement Arab reaction to Sadat's visit and Egypt's growing isolation.

No joint communique was achieved but at a joint press conference Sadat announced an agreement to continue the dialogue within the framework of a political committee convening in Jerusalem and a military one convening in Cairo.

Soon after his return Begin reported to the Knesset.

Sitting 61 of the Ninth Knesset

28 December 1977 (18 Tevet 5738)

The Speaker, Y. Shamir: I hereby open the Knesset sitting....I welcome the Prime Minister back from the peace mission to Ismailia. I give the floor to the Prime Minister.

The Prime Minister, M. Begin: Mr. Speaker, Knesset Members, once peace is established we propose introducing administrative autonomy for the Arab inhabitants of Judea, Samaria and the Gaza District, on the basis of the following principles:

The administration of the Military Government in Judea, Samaria and the Gaza District will be cancelled, to be replaced by administrative autonomy of and for the Arab inhabitants. The inhabitants of those areas will elect an Administrative Council consisting of eleven members which will act on the basis of the principles laid down in this document. Every citizen aged eighteen or more, irrespective of citizenship and in-

cluding those without citizenship, will be entitled to vote for the Administrative Council. Every citizen aged twenty-five or more on the day the list of candidates is submitted will be eligible for election to the Administrative Council. The Administrative Council will be elected by general, direct, personal, equal and secret elections. The Administrative Council will serve for four years from the day it is elected and will sit at Bethlehem. All the administrative affairs concerning the Arab inhabitants of Judea, Samaria and the Gaza District will come under the jurisdiction of the Administrative Council.

The Administrative Council will comprise the following departments: education; religious affairs; finance; transport; construction and housing; industry, commerce and tourism; agriculture; health; labor and welfare; refugee rehabilitation; administration of justice and supervision of the local police force. The Administrative Council will issue regulations pertaining to the activities of these departments. Security and public order in Judea, Samaria and the Gaza District will be in the hands of the Israeli authorities. The Administrative Council will elect its chairman. Its first sitting will be held thirty days after the publication of the election results.

Thus far, Mr. Speaker, with reference to the administrative expression of autonomy for the Arab inhabitants of Judea, Samaria and the Gaza District. And now to address the parliamentary expression.

The inhabitants of Judea, Samaria and the Gaza District, irrespective of citizenship, and including those without citizenship, will be given the option of receiving Israeli or Jordanian citizenship....The inhabitants of those areas who opt for Israeli citizenship will be entitled to vote for and be elected to the Knesset, in accordance with the Elections Law; those who have or opt for Jordanian citizenship will be entitled to vote for and be elected to the parliament of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan, in accordance with that country's elections law....Questions arising from the vote of inhabitants of Judea, Samaria and the Gaza District to the Jordanian parliament will be clarified by negotiations between Israel and Jordan.

A committee comprising representatives of Israel, Jordan and the Administrative Council will be established to examine existing legislation in Judea, Samaria and the Gaza District, to determine what legislation shall be maintained and what annulled, and to decide what the Administrative Council's legislating authority shall be. The decisions of that committee will be reached unanimously.

The inhabitants of Israel will be entitled to purchase land and settle in Judea, Samaria and the Gaza District. The Arab inhabitants of Judea, Samaria and the Gaza District who have opted for Israeli citizenship will be entitled to purchase land and settle in Israel.

A committee comprising representatives of Israel, Jordan and the Administrative Council will be established to determine the immigra-

tion laws to Judea, Samaria and the Gaza District. The committee will determine the rules whereby Arab refugees from outside Judea, Samaria and the Gaza District may be permitted to immigrate into those areas to a reasonable extent. The decisions of the immigration committee will be reached unanimously.

The inhabitants of Israel, Judea, Samaria and the Gaza District will be assured freedom of movement and economic activity in Israel, Judea, Samaria and the Gaza District. The Administrative Council will appoint one of its members to represent it before the government of Israel in order to discuss current concerns, and one of its members to represent it before the government of Jordan for the same purpose....

Israel insists on its right and claim for sovereignty over Judea, Samaria and the Gaza District. Knowing that other claims exist, it proposes—for the sake of the agreement and the peace—that the problem of sovereignty over these areas remain open. A special proposal will be prepared and submitted regarding the administration of the sites which are holy to the three faiths in Jerusalem, guaranteeing freedom of access to the members of all the religions to their holy places. The above principles may be reexamined after a period of five years....

Clause 11 of our plan reads: "Security and public order in Judea, Samaria and the Gaza District will be in the hands of the Israeli authorities." Without that clause there is no significance to the program for administrative autonomy....

T. Toubi (Democratic Front for Peace and Equality): It is the continuation of the occupation. How can there be peace if the occupation continues...?

The Prime Minister, M. Begin: If it were proposed that we withdraw our army from Judea, Samaria and Gaza, on no account would we allow the murderous organization known as the PLO, the basest organization of murderers in history, apart from the Nazi organizations, to assume control in those areas....It boasts of the murders it has perpetrated and threatens to solve the problems of the Middle East with one bullet in the heart of President Sadat of Egypt, as its predecessors did in the Al-Aksa Mosque with King Abdullah....Small wonder that the Egyptian government has said that if that bullet is fired it will reply with a million bullets. We want to say that on no account will that organization be allowed to take control of Judea, Samaria and Gaza. If we were to withdraw, that is precisely what would happen.

Consequently, let it be clear to anyone who wishes to reach an agreement with us that the IDF will remain in Judea, Samaria and Gaza and that there will also be other security arrangements, so that all the Jewish and Arab inhabitants of the Land of Israel can live in peace and security....

Clause 24 reads: "Israel insists on its right and claim to sovereignty over Judea, Samaria and the Gaza District. Knowing that there are other claims, it proposes—for the sake of the agreement and the peace—that the problem of sovereignty in these areas remain open."

I said these things to both President Carter of the U.S. and President Sadat of Egypt. We have the right and the claim to sovereignty over those parts of the Land of Israel. It is our country, and belongs to the Jewish people by right. We want an agreement and peace; we know that there are at least two other claims to sovereignty over those areas. If there is a mutual desire to reach an agreement and bring peace, what is the way to do it? If these conflicting claims remain and there is no answer to the clash between them, there will be no agreement between the sides. Consequently, in order to enable an agreement to be made and peace to be attained, there is only one way: to decide to agree that the question of sovereignty remain open and to deal with people, with nations, namely: the Arabs of the Land of Israel should receive administrative autonomy, and the Jews of the Land of Israel true security. That is the fairness of the content of the proposal, and that is how it was received abroad too....

With this plan and the proposal for the settlement of the relations between Israel and Egypt, which I will detail immediately, I went to the U.S. and President Carter....The second part, namely, the arrangements for settling the relations between Egypt and Israel in connection with a peace treaty, is as follows: Demilitarization—the Egyptian army will not cross the line of the Gidi and Mitla passes, and the agreement to reduce the forces will remain in effect between the Suez Canal and this line. The Israeli settlements will remain where they are and will be linked to Israeli administration and jurisdiction. They will be defended by Israeli forces. I will repeat that phrase for reasons known to the Knesset Members—they will be defended by Israeli forces. There will be a transition period of several years, during which the IDF will remain on the defense line in the central Sinai, and Israeli airfields and warning installations will remain in place until our forces withdraw to the international border. Freedom of navigation will be assured in the Straits of Tiran, which will be recognized as an international waterway which must be open to all navigation under whatever flag. This will be made clear in a special statement to be issued by the two countries, the waterway to be kept open either by a U.N. force, which can be withdrawn only with the consent of both countries and the unanimous agreement of the Security Council, or by joint Egyptian-Israeli military patrols.

I went with this peace plan to President Carter of the U.S. I met with him *tete-a-tete* and on that occasion as well as during the talks between the U.S. and the Israeli delegations he expressed his positive assessment of the plan. On Saturday night, at our second and concluding

meeting, the U.S. President stated that the plan was a fair basis for peace negotiations.

Vice President Mondale and Secretary of State Vance, as well as other leading U.S. officials and senators, and leaders of the Jewish community, also expressed their approval of the plan....On my way home from America I stopped in London and put our peace plan before the Prime Minister and Foreign Minister of England, and they found it to be a most constructive plan. I also submitted the plan to the special representative of the President of France....

While I was in the U.S. I asked the Secretary of State to inform President Sadat that I wished to consult him, whether in Cairo, a neutral spot or, if he so wished, in Ismailia. I mentioned Ismailia because when President Sadat visited Jerusalem we spoke of it as a possible meeting place. The President of Egypt informed me via the Secretary of State that he chose Ismailia as the site of our meeting. I agreed. And so, a few days after the conclusion of my mission to the U.S. and Britain, the meeting in Ismailia took place.

Mr. Speaker, it was a successful meeting. Its success came at its beginning. President Sadat and I held a personal conversation, and the main point—the continuation of the negotiations between the two countries for the attainment of a “peace treaty,” rather than the phrase “peace agreement,”—was achieved during the first five minutes of the conversation. These negotiations will be held at a high level, the committees being: political, to be situated in Jerusalem; and military, to be situated in Cairo. The chairmen of the committees will be the Foreign Ministers and Ministers of Defense of Egypt and Israel. The chairmanship of the committees will alternate: our Foreign Minister will open the committee meetings in Jerusalem; the Egyptian Foreign Minister will open the meetings of the military committee in Cairo. One week later the chairmen will rotate. The political committee will deal with the civilian settlements in the Sinai peninsula, and with what might be termed the Jewish-Arab moral issue of the Arabs of the Land of Israel. The military committee will deal with all the military problems connected with the peace treaty regarding the Sinai Peninsula.

And so, Mr. Speaker, for the first time after almost thirty years, in another two weeks, direct, face-to-face negotiations will begin between accredited, ministerial representatives of Israel, and accredited representatives of Egypt, its Foreign Minister and Minister of Defense. No third man shall take the chair at those committees, as was customary in all the meetings between us and the Arab countries, the ministers themselves conducting the meetings and alternating the chairmanship.

The negotiations will be thorough and detailed, focusing on both political and security aspects, so that agreement and a peace treaty may be attained. Because this is happening for the first time since the establishment of the state, for the first time after five wars, for the first time

after statements from various sides that the State of Israel must be destroyed, we must welcome this shift and hope and pray that during the weeks or months while the committees are working they will reach agreement, and if there is agreement, that it will serve as a basis for the peace treaty which in this case will be signed by the authorized representatives of Israel and Egypt.

It can be said that at the Ismailia meeting both sides agreed to make a joint statement, but it was not issued because the two delegations did not reach agreement regarding the problem which we, rightly, call the problem of the Arabs of the Land of Israel, and which the Egyptians—as is their right—term the Palestinian problem. We tried, we made a great effort to reach a joint formulation. But it transpired that we could not....We postponed Sunday's meeting to Monday on the assumption that if both sides made an effort a solution would be found, as was indeed the case.

Agreement of a kind was reached on a joint formula, on the basis of the precedents of international conferences, after we proposed—and this was accepted—that each side should determine its position and use its phraseology. Consequently, the statement regarding the problem of the Arabs of the Land of Israel, as was read out by the President of Egypt at our joint press conference, was in two parts, namely: “The position of Egypt is that a Palestinian state should be established in the West Bank and the Gaza Strip.” And the second part: “The Israeli position is that the Palestinian Arabs residing in Judea, Samaria and the Gaza District should enjoy self-rule.”

Because of the difference on this issue the statement on which there was complete agreement was not published. We did not see fit to press for the publication of a joint communique if the Egyptian side said that under those conditions it could not sign it. But I should point out that the actual content was agreed on by both delegations.

A. Yadlin (Alignment): What content...?

The Prime Minister, M. Begin: If it was not published, why should it be published in the Knesset?

A. Yadlin (Alignment): I fail to understand how the settlements will be defended by Israeli forces if the IDF withdraws to the international border.

The Prime Minister, M. Begin: That will be part of the debate....

A. Yadlin (Alignment): There are differences of opinion between us regarding Yamit.

The Prime Minister, M. Begin: Mr. Speaker, with the completion of the meeting at Ismailia we have done our part. We have given what we can. Henceforth, the ball is in the other court. For peace, for a peace treaty, we

have taken upon ourselves a heavy burden of responsibility and risks....

At this very moment and ever since my return from the U.S., a difficult and painful discussion has been conducted between my best friends and myself. From this podium I will say, as I told them, that if it has been ordained that I should conduct this argument, I will do it with love. They are my friends. We have gone a long way together, in good times and bad, and I love and respect them, as I will continue to do. But there is no alternative. You have to accept responsibility with the same degree of civil courage without which there are no political decisions.

It is obvious to me that we are taking the right course to enable a peace treaty to be negotiated and signed. After examining all the other courses...I have no doubt that the only way to enable negotiations to be held and a peace treaty to be signed is the one proposed by the government. Consequently, if it is necessary to argue on this issue with dear and close friends, we will do so....

If the routine thinking of officials in the Egyptian Foreign Ministry leads them to assume that they will be able to exert international pressures on us to accept their positions, to which we do not agree and which we will not accept, they are mistaken. We are accustomed to having pressure exerted on us and refusing to give in....But I am sure that no international pressure will be put on Israel....The people who praised our peace plan as being fair, constructive and a breakthrough are very serious men. They are aware of its full content, apart from certain adjustments which do not alter the essence of the plan and which have been brought to the notice of our American friends. This is the plan I brought before President Carter and President Sadat, and they cannot change their minds at the behest of the routine thinkers of the Egyptian Foreign Ministry....

We have today massive moral support throughout the U.S., both in the Administration, in both houses of Congress, and, last but not least, among U.S. public opinion....That is why the routine thinkers of the Egyptian Foreign Ministry are deluding themselves if they think that we will accept their outdated formulae which are totally divorced from reality if international pressure is brought to bear on us. It will not be brought to bear, and we will continue on our course of bringing peace to the nation in Israel and the Middle East, because that has been my desire not since May or June of 1977 but since November and December of 1947 when, after an interval of peaceful relations between the Arabs and Jews of Palestine, the first shot was fired at a Jew by an Arab, and when I appealed to the Arabs of Palestine from the underground not to shed Jewish blood and to build the country together to the benefit of both peoples. But the bloodshed continued, there were five wars and we want to put an end to them by establishing peace and signing peace treaties.

T. Toubi (Democratic Front for Peace and Equality): How can the country be built up, how can there be cooperation, when one side wants to suppress the other...?

The Prime Minister, M. Begin: Is your sitting here an expression of suppression?

T. Toubi (Democratic Front for Peace and Equality): Don't obscure the issue of a nation which wants independence and its own state.

The Prime Minister, M. Begin: Our object, and, I am sure, that of the whole House, with the possible exception of one party group, is to bring peace to this country after having liberated it....

...

S. Peres (Alignment): Mr. Speaker, distinguished Knesset, this House has not lost its shared hope, a hope which sweetens discord and bridges gaps, that the rock of peace which is being rolled up the hill has not lost its momentum and will continue to ascend to its goal at the summit. We approve of the government's policy of peace, even though we disapprove of considerable sections of it. We will be counted among those who seek to inspire hopes rather than those who pour cold water on things.

I would like to start by expressing my admiration for the government and the Prime Minister on several points. Even though it is difficult, to quote Anatole France, "to distinguish between the outcome of wisdom and the product of luck," I must say that the government has devoted itself to both these, with their concomitant tempo. The Prime Minister did not hesitate, despite the dangers of being hasty, to apply political oil to the wheels of the chariot of events, and gallop with it from the shores of the hazards of war to those of the hopes of peace. There is no point thinking that tomorrow it will be easier to conduct peace negotiations. "If not now, then when?" is the question most suited to the effort to attain peace.

I also have praise for the Prime Minister's readiness to make decisions, even to abandon certain assumptions to which he adhered in the past, to propose concessions, to agree to compromises and to delineate withdrawals, in order to create the background for the possibility of an agreement. I know that it is not simple and doubtless involves pain, but the nation must be told the truth: there is no way of attaining peace without compromises and concessions. In war one has to take the other side's army into account and seek to defeat it; in peace one has to take the other side's aspirations into account and seek to meet them halfway.

Knowing that this is both essential and difficult, as the responsible opposition we will not criticize the government in any way for its readiness to take the course of compromises and concessions. We will not castigate it for its willingness to relinquish territory, to abandon previous positions, to grope in the dark of negotiations so that peace may

eventually emerge. Moreover, despite the fact that we are very critical of parts of the government's plan, we will not take parliamentary steps to impede its implementation, because we know that the alternative at this time is not a plan of ours but the failure of the negotiations, and we do not want that.

Mr. Speaker, for thirty years, as President Sadat said in his speech to the Knesset, Egypt tried to ignore Israel...It is a fiction to say that the change in the attitude to peace depends on Israel and not on Egypt. To the best of my knowledge, there is no rejection front in Israel. The rejection front is a purely Arab phenomenon.

Like all the Prime Ministers who preceded him, Mr. Begin aspired to meet with the President of Egypt. The change is in the President of Egypt, not in the prime ministers of Israel. We congratulate the President of Egypt for that and have every admiration for his welcome initiative. But just as he, the President of Egypt, demands concessions from us, it must also be made clear to him that without concessions on his part too it will be very difficult to attain peace. The peace negotiations have been bogged down in the past because of the selfsame difficulties which have been encountered now. Namely, not because of the geographical or political issues but because of the link with Judea and Samaria. I am not surprised that the government has also learned something which some have tried to forget, i.e., that Egypt waged war on us, at least in the War of Independence, also because of the Palestinian issue. It also hoped to damage Israel and refused to conclude peace negotiations with us for that very reason. I must admit that it has adhered to that position, at least in public, with hardly any change, until this moment.

I am sure that the entire House appreciates Sadat's visit and hopes that both our Knesset and the Egyptian parliament will go towards one another with a new readiness and new attitudes. We disagree with the government both because on several basic aspects our point of departure is different and because the course of the negotiations has taught us that a tack different from the one taken by the government should have been adopted. Allow me first of all to indicate the difference in the points of departure:

First, despite our link to the heritage of our fathers, we must distinguish between heritage and state. The land may always remain an historic heritage, but the character of the state is generally determined by the prevailing demographic situation, both actually and potentially, that is, today and tomorrow. We are convinced that the Jewish character of the State of Israel at present and in the future must be maintained. No one can change this country's past, but the future of peace makes a change in the borders of the past necessary. Even the Herut Movement acknowledged this when it dropped the demand for the East Bank of the Jordan River from its platform. We agreed to Partition in 1947. We refrained from imposing Israeli law in 1967. We expressed readiness to

reach a compromise in order to maintain Jewish sovereignty and true peace with the Arabs.

The second point of departure is that the entire peace agreement must ensure not only Israel's independence but also the independence of its defense. Whether there is a defense treaty or not, we cannot deprive the generations to come of the minimum territory required for our survival. This underlies our policy regarding defensible borders, settlements and territories. The settlements were established for that reason, and that reason still holds.

Thirdly, we all respect our Arab, Moslem, Christian and Druse neighbors, and the Arab desire for independence. But just as that requires that in Arab countries there should be non-Arab minorities, it also apparently requires that there should be a non-Jewish minority in Israel. We have no aspirations to rule Arab settlements which are not in Israel, just as we have no intentions of discriminating against the Arabs who live in Israel.

A fourth point of departure: we think that the way to peace is through compromise in government, time, territory, but not in the life-span of peace. Hence our opposition to the establishment of another Palestinian state between us and the Kingdom of Jordan. A state of that kind, more than being an independent framework, would be an excuse for continual aggression and geographical difficulty which would fan the flames of war.

Knesset Members, these assumptions have led us to several tactical and diplomatic conclusions, some of which have in effect been adopted by the government. We said that the background had to be prepared to the Geneva Conference or a concluding conference elsewhere, as in fact was done. We said that it had to be coordinated with the U.S., of whose sincere desire to further peace in the Middle East we are convinced, and this was also done. We proposed, and still do, that interim arrangements should not be rejected. My impression is, Mr. Prime Minister, that you adopted that approach, because the clauses regarding Judea, Samaria and Gaza in the program you read out are marked by their interim nature—

The Prime Minister, M. Begin: If that is so, you have every reason for voting for the plan.

S. Peres (Alignment): There are other reasons too, provided you adopt them. Wait a bit, you're on the right course. The interim nature of the clauses pertaining to Judea, Samaria and Gaza are evident since sovereignty is not defined, the borders are not marked, the form of government is not finalized and the time-limit proposed does not exceed five years....The Arabs will doubtless wish to shorten that period.

Our other criticisms are still valid too. We think that the government has gone too far in its proposals regarding the Sinai as an opening

gambit. It seems that by submitting those proposals at this early stage you will not help to soften the Egyptian position regarding Judea and Samaria, and it is doubtful whether these proposals will be accepted by Egypt....It is reported that the Egyptians are themselves surprised by Israel's proposals regarding the Sinai...and that they are ready to give Yamit sovereignty. That is quite something.

We should remember that even according to Resolution 242 there is room for border adjustments in order to create secure borders. Taking the vast area of the Sinai into consideration...why did the government not demand minor adjustments on the international border, for example, a territorial strip ten or twenty miles wide west of the international border, a strip which would give our planes room to breathe and land to our settlements and brigades?

We also think that the government is closing its eyes to the true alternative in Judea and Samaria. In the long run important parts of those areas could become associated with Jordan or serve as a base for the PLO. We are not agents of the Jordanian crown, but anyone who rejects the PLO must accept Jordan.

The advantages of a Jordanian connection are evident, making it possible to issue Jordanian passports to the inhabitants of Gaza too. Because if the Prime Minister says that the option will be open, it is not in his hands. Can he tell the inhabitants of Gaza to take a Jordanian or an Israeli passport? A link with Jordan creates the possibility of organizing the defense of the entire Land of Israel from invasion from the outside or treachery from within. A link of this kind will transfer the principal concern with the PLO to Jordan, and Jordan has proved that it can deal with that problem. Moreover, Jordan can decide what its relations with the PLO are to be without publicity or political pressure.

A link with Jordan enables all the sides to draw defensible borders based on a political rather than a security compromise. Even if that approach is acceptable at present to the King of Jordan, we must not forget that the real interests of the Egyptians, the Jordanians, the Palestinians, the Israelis, and, I venture to add, the Saudi Arabians, lead towards ensuring that the African Rift is not open to forces which threaten stability, peace and freedom in our region.

The government's proposal lacks those advantages, but contains other disadvantages. For linguistic reasons, the Prime Minister prefers the Greek term "autonomy" and the English term "self-rule" to "self-government" and its connotations....Giving a choice between an Israeli and a Jordanian passport raises the possibility, at least in the Gaza Strip, that Jordanian passports will not be issued, but the Israeli passport will indicate to the refugees that it might be feasible to demand their lands and property in Israel too.

Although the proposal regarding the right to mutual settlement enables the inhabitants of the territories to purchase land in Israel, it

grants parallel rights to Israelis, since the lands of both the Wakf and the government will be subject to the Administrative Council which will be established. Incidentally, you may have doubts about Jordan, yet you proposed a tripartite council with a Jordanian representative; in other words, there are both doubts and hopes, which reinforces my argument on this issue. Private landowners in Judea and Samaria will always be subject to intimidation by Jordanian law, which imposes the death penalty on anyone who sells land to Jews.

The government's plan suffers not only from unclear definitions but also from the pressure of its temporary nature. If it can be questioned in five years' time, does anyone imagine that the Arab side will omit to do so? Does anyone seriously expect the Arabs to sit quietly for five years and do nothing, simply waiting for the "review," and drawing closer to Israel rather than becoming more extreme...? And what side will be taken by world public opinion, which supports us today, partly because of the concessions we have made...? Will it support the side which advocates the continuation of the interim situation, that is, us, or will it support those who demand a permanent solution which takes the existing population in the territories into account?

In the absence of Jordan from the plan, will the PLO also be absent? And with the constant threat of the PLO there is no way of knowing what the results of rule of that kind will be. In my view, the government has erred in choosing its direction. It might have been able to avoid some of these mistakes if it had adhered to parliamentary procedures, whose object is not merely to give respect to the parliament but to add understanding, resourcefulness and experience to the government itself. Parliamentary regimes, for all their drawbacks and leaks, are far stronger than closed regimes....

We know that the Ismailia conference was not a complete success, but it was successful. We welcome the establishment of the two committees. A security committee in Cairo and peace in Jerusalem is preferable to a conference in Geneva for procedural purposes. That is direct and important negotiation, and its importance cannot be doubted. Despite the difficulties which have come to the surface...I do not accept the Prime Minister's optimistic line. I think he is being overoptimistic, because in the nature of things the difficulties are not dependent solely on us. But there is no reason to despair....

At the same time, we all know that the alternative to peace negotiations, whether in the form of Soviet arms or U.S. pressure or the renewal of the military option, no longer offers much to the Arab side. And the alternative of returning to the previous situation does not exist and is not desirable for Israel. Postponement will not help and evasion will do no good.

We aspire towards bringing a new order to the Middle East, not one which is based on wars, occupation and conquests, but one based on

peace, good-neighborliness and mutual respect. The whole House is agreed that Israel's hand should remain extended in peace. We are open to new ideas, and the unity of this House for true peace, whether the government's or the opposition's, remains firm, good and promising. We will make our own positive proposals and vote for them. We will not vote against the government's decisions, just as we cannot vote for them because of the deficiencies I have mentioned....We will permit all our members to vote as they choose.

...

M. Zorea (Democratic Movement for Change): Madam Speaker, distinguished Knesset...before addressing the government's plan, permit me to direct a few words to my colleagues throughout the House. Our efforts today must be directed towards the future, consequently let us not turn the debate into a narrow, party-political discussion of the past. Let us review the issues, without making any allusions. Just as Sadat did not reply when he was asked why he had not taken action during the past thirty years, the question is equally irrelevant as regards which government is responsible for today's achievements....The debate is an historical one, and should be left to history. Today, then, we must take our political problems to the national level, with our sights fixed on the future.

I would like to address the problem of mutuality and political momentum. Sadat came to Jerusalem. The whole world—including us, to my regret—overreacted in expressing admiration for this. The mere fact of his coming was recorded as an historic event. We must not belittle that event, because it was indeed a turning-point for him and us, signifying the recognition of Israel's existence with Jerusalem as its capital, something which no other Arab leader has done to this day, although our existence needs no imprimatur from Sadat...and he recognized our right to live in security, and we must make him keep his bond on that score. To date we have not done that, unfortunately. That pledge of his contradicts his unbending stand on what he calls "the lands," for example....

At Ismailia we began from the end, as it were....We have nothing left to give or relinquish. We have already gone too far in making concessions, especially in the Sinai. Consequently, we must not let a situation in which the momentum demanded of us erodes us from within, while Sadat's inertia, i.e., the fact of his having come here, is regarded as momentum for him. As if by coming here he has made his contribution. Of this the Prophet said: "Therefore hell hath enlarged herself, and opened her mouth without measure." I think we are on the edge of that abyss, if not beyond it.

Our security cannot be based solely on the goodwill of one ruler, international institution or Power or another....Our security cannot be based solely on warning systems or technology. Our security will be

based first and foremost and amongst other things on territory, which is essential for defense and for settlement....For us that is a precondition for our existence, while for Sadat, in the Sinai, for example, it is not an existential condition. We abandoned that condition too much in the Sinai. We could have begun with far less as an initial starting-point, as MK Peres has proposed and others doubtless will.

All the same, the government, led by Mr. Menahem Begin, has done well in preparing the way to peace since its establishment. It is to be congratulated and supported for that. It is doubtful whether the momentum for peace would have been maintained and whether Egypt would have accepted our proposals had we not made such far-reaching and painful concessions....

The price is high, and this would seem to be inevitable, but the question to be asked is what is the maximum we are prepared to pay for peace...? My reply would be: there must not be a third country between the sea and the desert, because for us that is an existential condition. That condition is met by the government's plan. The defense of the Land of Israel from the sea to the River Jordan and the preservation of law and order must always be in the hands of the IDF. That condition, the Prime Minister told us here, will be met.

A. Yadlin (Alignment): What about the historical forces—military control plus demographic increase—what does that lead to?

M. Zorea (Democratic Movement for Change): We are also historical forces. When our security control there is complete we can foil the activities of what you call "historical forces."...

I would like to list the conditions which seem to me to be essential, and without which there can be no peace....It seems to me that a line more or less like the one described by MK Peres, from El Arish to Ras Muhammed, must be defended by the IDF. Weighty security and settlement considerations support this, though this is not the place to give them. Unfortunately, this condition is not met in the plan before us.

The second condition is that there should be no withdrawal in the Golan Heights, apart from minor adjustments which can be termed "cosmetic." The plan makes no mention of the Golan Heights. I gather that it is the Prime Minister's intention to implement most of the points I have mentioned, and which are essential....

Israel has submitted its plan for peace, in return for which, without any further erosion, we will give Egypt and the Arab countries peace. They need it. If they understand and accept, it will go well with them, but if they do not, let it be said here and now, from this podium, that the Arab countries, led by Egypt, have kept peace away from our region.

We all hope that peace will come on those terms, and we support the government, although not always agreeing with every detail, in its current course towards peace. Thank you.

...

Z. Warhaftig (National Religious Party): Mr. Speaker, my mentors and teachers, one does not offer congratulations until a task is completed, but I offer best wishes on the courage to take the first steps along the long road towards peace. Peace is made and requires long and arduous efforts. I would like to point out that the course the government has suggested taking has achieved important, albeit modest, results.

The first achievement: after thirty years of war with our neighbors, direct, face-to-face negotiations have begun. For years we dreamt about it, asked for it, seeking peace. We tried to convince our neighbors to come to the negotiating table with us. It has been agreed that two committees should be established to negotiate for a peace treaty....That is of great value.

The second achievement is that today Israel has a peace plan, a generous plan. Formulating a plan is also an important achievement, because there is no peace without some sacrifice and compromise. Our sages tell us to love both truth and peace....

I would like to stress five points in the plan presented by the Prime Minister. First of all, with regard to Judea, Samaria and Gaza and self-rule for the Arabs living there. This began beforehand, really. Elections were held for the local authorities. We did not interfere in the internal affairs of towns like Nablus, Tulkarm, etc. If that prevails in this plan for self-rule it will satisfy the Arabs of Judea, Samaria and Gaza to a great extent....

Secondly, the right of Jews to settle in Judea, Samaria and Gaza and for this to be governed by Israel directly rather than by the Administrative Council. Thirdly, the cooperation between Israel, Jordan and the Arabs of the Land of Israel on important issues, a functional condominium, as it were, between Israel, Jordan and the Arabs regarding immigration to Judea, Samaria and Gaza and important legislative matters. Fourthly, the solution of the problem of the refugees in our country and a modest and reasonable contribution to easing the suffering of the Arab refugees in other countries.

The fifth point is that the IDF will remain in charge of internal security in Judea, Samaria and Gaza, otherwise there will be chaos there. We can see what is happening in Lebanon. With central government undermined, the internecine clashes in Lebanon have led to greater loss of life there than in all the wars between Israel and the Arabs in the Middle East. Withdrawing the IDF from these areas would bring disaster on the country.

The third achievement I would like to note is the backing given to Israel's peace plan by the U.S. and Britain. There has been a change of atmosphere in the West in recent months, because we have come up with a comprehensive peace plan which has the backing of friendly countries. That might affect the negotiations with our neighbors.

We must protest against the hostile stance of the U.S.S.R. and its satellite states. Why do they disturb the efforts to attain peace...? If we manage to attain peace with one large neighbor, peace with the other countries will follow. We must also appeal to countries which oppose negotiations to change their position....

I am fully aware that this plan is by no means ideal. It contains many pitfalls and dangers, including the possibility that existing and potential settlements may be affected. I appeal from this podium to my colleagues, the members of Gush Emunim, not to let us down, not to fight against peace, and in that way to help strengthen existing settlements and establish new ones....

The plan also contains a great political danger. It is obvious that self-rule has a tendency towards self-government, and then to irredentism. It is evident that we must be aware of that and the struggles which it could entail. There may be pressure for change and for compromises which do not tend towards a functional division, when the time comes. We know that it is not in our power today to bring all our neighbors to the negotiation table. Why should we not make every effort to make peace with whoever is prepared to do so? Perhaps with time the other neighbors will become more amenable and it will be possible to make peace with them.

I hope that the nation and its representatives will focus on the existing efforts of the government of Israel and give it the power and strength to attain peace, and may God bless his people with peace.

...

M. Wilner (Democratic Front for Peace and Equality): Madam Speaker, Knesset Members, we are currently discussing a question which is fateful for the nation, the entire region and to some extent world peace too. The recent past has proved once more that the nation in Israel wants peace, the nation in Egypt wants peace and that the Arab peoples and all the nations of the world want peace in the Middle East. We think that peace is the supreme interest of the nation in Israel, and that everything should be done to attain it and put an end to bloodshed once and for all....

The question before the Knesset is: does the government's plan further peace or not? Does it or does it not embody a solution for the Israel-Arab conflict and the Palestinian problem? In our opinion, the government's plan does not solve the Israel-Arab conflict or bring peace nearer, and may well lead to the failure of the efforts to bring peace to the Middle East. The problem is not solely in the details of the plan; the problem is more fundamental: are we, the Knesset of Israel, cognizant of the basic fact that two nations—the Israelis and the Palestinian Arabs—live in this country?

On the basis of its right to self-determination, the Jewish people established its state, the State of Israel, and I am proud to have been one

of the signatories of its Declaration of Independence. That document states, amongst other things, that we established the state on the basis of the Security Council resolution of 29 November 1947, which determined that two countries—one Jewish, the other Arab—should come into being in this country. Thus, the issue of a Palestinian state is not something which has to be decided again in the international arena. It is not a right which needs to be recognized once more....Anyone who denies Israel's right to exist is against peace, even though he speaks of peace, and by the same token, anyone who denies the Palestinians' right to a state of their own alongside Israel is against peace even though he speaks of peace day and night.

The term "rejection front" refers to all those extremists in the Arab world who are not prepared to acknowledge the State of Israel's right to sovereign existence, and we oppose them....The rejection front in Israel applies to all those forces which deny the natural right of the Palestinian people to establish its own state in the West Bank, the Gaza Strip and the Arab part of Jerusalem. Without mutual recognition there can be no solution. Unless the Arab countries and the Palestinian Arab nation and the PLO representatives recognize Israel's right to sovereign existence within the borders of June 4 there will be no peace, and similarly, without withdrawal from the territories occupied in 1967 and the determination of the borders of June 4 as the peace borders, the establishment of a Palestinian state and the signing of peace treaties, there will be no peace....

What the Prime Minister has proposed is not a just plan for everyone, it does not involve mutual recognition of rights and is not a peace plan....It proposes, in effect, that the Arab nations and the Palestinians should agree to abandon the very existence of the Palestinians. How can one even make such a proposal, which involves negating a nation's existence and perpetuating Israel's occupation of the territories?

The plan known as "autonomy," or "self-rule," proposes that the inhabitants of the West Bank and the Gaza Strip—not the Palestinians, which nation is not recognized—should manage their own medical funds, sewage arrangements, transportation, education, welfare, etc.... This means that it denies their elementary right to self-determination and an independent state. What it amounts to is a proposal to establish an Israeli colony with the approval of the Arab nations and the international community. Obviously, such a thing is impossible. No facade using the word "peace" can conceal the fact that this plan bears within it the seeds of a fresh war in the Middle East, one which we must prevent, for the sake of our children and the children of the Arab nations.

The Prime Minister spoke frankly. He said that sovereignty over the West Bank and the Gaza Strip is ours. And that we have the right, it is our country, it belongs to us. But since there is no agreement to that he proposes that the question of sovereignty should be left unresolved for the

moment. In other words, he is proposing that sovereignty should remain *de facto* in Israel's hands, with our military rule, our control of security and foreign policy, and the administration of secondary local issues by a tripartite committee where each side will have a veto. This means that the government of Israel will have the veto even as regards sewage in Nablus....Thus, the entire proposal is a pretense disguised as a so-called peace plan.

We are for peace...but peace can come only on the basis of respect for the rights of the two major parties to the conflict, the Israelis and the Palestinians. There is no point discussing other plans because anyone may choose citizenship in the West Bank. Will anyone choose to be an Israeli citizen under Israel's Citizenship Law when even thousands of Israeli Arabs born in Israel do not have citizenship because this has to be granted approval? The talk of mutual settlement and purchase of land cannot be serious when even an Israeli Arab cannot rent an apartment in Carmiel, inside Israel. And if we retain military control of the West Bank and the Gaza Strip, will Arabs from there be permitted to buy land in Israel? Or is the intention to make use of another fifteen years to transfer the maximum number of settlers to the West Bank and the Gaza Strip, determine *faits accomplis* and turn Israeli sovereignty from being *de facto* into being *de jure*...?

We must not rely on the fact that we have a little more American arms, and everything depends on strength. The Prime Minister bases his claim on Israel's right, not its strength....The balance of power in the Middle East can change over the years, as has happened in the course of history....Will we allow someone with more power than us to conquer Israel and deprive us of our sovereignty...? We will not. Why do you fail to understand that the same applies to the Palestinians...?

In 1973 the Foreign Minister said that he preferred to retain Sharm el-Sheikh and do without peace, than to have peace and lose Sharm el-Sheikh....We said in the Knesset that what he and the government were saying would lead to war. And war came, to our regret. Today we say that you are not fooling anyone, except yourselves. You are being unrealistic. You are detached from the reality of the Middle East and the world. We appeal to you to rethink your position, not to hide your negative attitude and your opposition to the existence of the other nation in this country, but to be wise and realistic.

S.J. Gross (Aguda): You want an Arafat state, that's clear. An Arafat state will save the Middle East...!

M. Wilner (Democratic Front for Peace and Equality): The Palestinians, like Israel, must have their rights...and when the time comes they will elect their own representatives, as is their right....It is not for Israel to say who will represent the Palestinians....I conclude by saying that peace is Israel's highest interest...but it can only come on the basis

of justice for all, and above all for the two nations in this country—the Israelis and the Palestinians.

...
Arieh Eliav (Sheli): Mr. Speaker, distinguished Knesset Members, Sadat's descent on the Knesset, the government and the nation has scrambled the practical and political thought systems of us all. Each and everyone of us has to stop and take stock....Those who claimed in the past that there was no one to talk to have to admit that now there is. Those who contended that there was no Palestinian problem must now take its centrality into account. Those who said that there could be no peace between us and the Arabs, or only in the distant future, must now retract and concede that it is within our grasp.

There is nothing wrong in changing one's mind in view of new circumstances. On the contrary, stubborn conservatism, insisting on the status quo, obtuseness and lack of imagination are what brought the previous government to its wretched policy of inaction and blindness.

The Prime Minister has presented a new plan and policy...which, although it is not mine and my party's, contains bold, new elements.... We will be the last to criticize and the first to praise any step, however small and inadequate, on the long and difficult road to peace.

There are those who castigate the government and the Prime Minister for abandoning the principles on the basis of which they were elected....The main complaints come from the religious camp, to which I would like to address a few words. Jewish religion and philosophy has placed truth at the pinnacle of its values....The only thing higher than truth for Jews is peace....For peace, according to Judaism, it is even permissible to lie, both in the minor matters between husband and wife and one human being and another, and in the major issues of peace within Judaism and between the Jewish people and the rest of the world....

I believe that when the Prime Minister coined new political expressions regarding the Palestinians and their right to self-rule, free elections and the cancellation of military rule in the territories, he did that for the sake of peace, in the best tradition of Judaism....Despite the fact that the Prime Minister has made some important changes for the better on the path to peace, that path is not ours, and although we will never do anything to obstruct any move which could bring peace nearer, we have serious reservations about the plan.

I have no intention of stressing once more the centrality of the Palestinian problem....I think that by now both the Prime Minister and this House know that without proposing a solution for that problem there can be no peace between us and the Arabs....Such solutions can and must be found....The Prime Minister proposes giving the Palestinians autonomy, and we claim that they must be granted the elementary right to self-determination....By doing that we will be fulfilling the highest

ideals of Zionism without ruling another nation. The Zionist Jewish national movement demanded the right to self-determination and obtained it after a struggle and suffering. It implemented that definition in the Declaration of Independence and proclaimed its existence as the State of Israel.

There will be no peace until the Palestinian national movement receives that right in the areas occupied by Israel since the Six Day War and which contain more than a million Palestinian Arabs. There is no argument as to our historic right to the entire Land of Israel, but we must not deprive those for whom it is also the heritage of their forefathers of that right. The Palestinian Arabs of the territories should decide their fate, whether they wish to establish an independent state or a federation or confederation with Jordan, or any other course. All that is provided the entire leadership of the Palestinians recognizes Israel and announces its intention of living in peace alongside it, and provided maximum security precautions are included in any peace arrangement with them, including demilitarization with supervision, guarantees and stages for implementing peace agreements with them.

The security arrangements—which must be rigorous and thorough—will not contradict the right to self-determination which will include sovereign territory, a flag and a national anthem, a parliament, passports, currency and ambassadors. Such things have happened in the past, and temporary restrictions regarding security areas have been imposed on newly-independent nations, gradually being removed with the passage of time and the dynamic of peace. That is what happened with Austria and Japan, and that can be the case with the Palestinian Arabs. In our opinion, only by separating ourselves politically from the territories can we attain agreement and cooperation with the Palestinians....

The Palestinians living in the territories and the Palestinian diaspora will accept nothing less than the right to self-determination. I am sure that many of them are aware of and agree to temporary security restrictions and that on that basis it is possible to oblige them to find leaders among them, but on the basis of the administrative autonomy proposed by the government they will not agree to sit down with us and discuss peace.

If we are indeed embarking on the beginning of the long and difficult road to peace, we will have to make a supreme effort to mobilize all our spiritual, physical and mental strength. I am convinced that no one among us will oppose it, and we must all share the burden of attaining peace after the bloody war between us and the Arabs which has continued over five generations....

We must begin setting up a team of people who will devote all their time to thinking deeply and imaginatively and devising ways of cooperation and joint development between us and the Arabs. Israel must

begin to prepare planning and implementing frameworks for tackling the regional rehabilitation of the Palestinian refugees. Israel must also prepare plans for cooperation with Egypt in such spheres as water, agriculture, food technology and, primarily, regional development in desert areas, as well as industry and tourism, which offer unlimited possibilities once there is peace. Israel must also indicate ways of cooperation in the areas of health, education, science and culture between Israel and the Arab nations. Here, too, there can be tremendous crossfertilization between the two civilizations which could benefit millions of people in the developing world around us....All these subjects, and many others which will develop in the course of making peace, require the maximum concentration and coordination of mental and physical abilities in Israel and the Jewish people, so that we can offer wonderful plans, prospects and challenges to our Arab partners and our friends in the world.

Finally, I call on all the moderate Arab leaders with whom we have met, including Palestinian Arabs, not to miss the boat of peace and to board it before it is too late....We appeal to the government of Israel not to relax its endeavors for peace for a moment, for the sake of the nation in Israel, Zionism and the Jewish people, and to go towards it wholeheartedly and with the best of its abilities.

...

S. Aloni (Citizens' Rights Movement): Mr. Speaker, distinguished Knesset, I would like to begin by objecting to the fact that the government's plan was not brought before us in writing, and by thanking the Prime Minister for permitting me to study his personal copy....

(From the floor: They are afraid of leaks.)

Possibly. There is no doubt that today, despite the differences of opinion in the past and at present, the Prime Minister is to be congratulated for several things....The first is his intuitive feeling, perhaps deriving from his adherence to the teachings of his mentor, Jabotinsky, that the historic moment for embarking on negotiations has arrived and that the iron wall has been completed, to use Jabotinsky's expression. We are the majority here, and consequently it is time to conduct negotiations with our neighbors and break through to peace.

The second thing for which he is to be congratulated is his courage in doing something, not merely recognizing the need for it. Those of the Prime Minister's colleagues who claim that he has deviated from his principles are wrong. The main weakness of the plan brought before us is in the Prime Minister's adherence to the teachings of Jabotinsky. Anyone who reads Jabotinsky's articles written in 1928 and 1933 will see how loyal the Prime Minister has been to the idea of: "The land of Israel is the land of the Jewish people, but another nation lives there."...

If I had the time I could read out many more such quotes...but the essence is that once we are a majority in our land we can conduct nego-

tiations with the Arabs and recognize their rights, and that the Arabs will accept us only if we are strong and a majority "because they are not a rabble but a living nation, which will make concessions only when there is no other way of solving the problem and there is no opening in the iron wall, and extremist groups which deny our rights will lose their influence to more moderate elements, with whom it will be possible to establish guarantees and relations of good-neighborliness."...

What Jabotinsky was talking about was not granting national rights as the Arabs express them and as we have attained, but enabling them to obtain education, culture and the autonomy the Prime Minister has proposed and which it is doubtful whether the Arabs will accept....Because it is impossible today to annex territory, the Prime Minister has in effect turned the wheel back to the situation which prevailed in 1947, when there were Arabs in Palestine, the historic home of the Jewish people, and the problem of the nation had to be solved....That is the rationale for according them autonomy. The danger of doing this is that we may find ourselves going towards a country along the lines of South Africa, where a certain kind of autonomy was prepared for the blacks and developed into a third country. I am not a proponent of a third country or of any annexation which will lead to a binational state, with all that that implies. I do not think that there is a majority in Israel or among the Palestinians today which wants a binational state....But there is hope, and the plan states that after five years the subject will be reviewed. But because of the return to the Greater Land of Israel, the Prime Minister has, in my view, been too hasty in relinquishing territory which was not part of Palestine, promising to return the Sinai, the Rafah area, Sharm el-Sheikh, etc. to Egypt already at this stage.

Let us remember that this international border is by no means sacred, and has existed since the First World War....Let us remember that the Sinai is a white stain on the map, and that passport control to Egypt was at Kantara, not Rafah. If we remember those things it is not clear why we are leaving what has been defined as a basic defense need, whether it is Sharm el-Sheikh or the settlements of the Rafah area....I would like to hear from the Prime Minister whether they will be offset by anything else in an agreement with Egypt....

And so, with all the breakthrough and the dynamic we and the world and the neighboring countries have entered, I have serious apprehensions that we are going towards an interim agreement in which we will give Egypt everything which is not Palestine, after which it will agree to some general formula which will allow Sadat to get out of his promise to the Palestinians gracefully, and we will remain saddled with the problem, in the forefront of the public eye, with Palestinian rejection of autonomy and with an increased conflict....Syria will follow Egypt's example and obtain the Golan Heights, while the central problem will still remain unresolved....

The problem is not merely that of the Palestinians, but of our way of life, whether we want a binational state or development towards a Palestinian state, or a third possibility which I think none of us desire—rule over another nation, as is the situation in South Africa. We must foresee that eventuality before embarking on our grand closing sale of everything for some kind of arrangement, whether with the Egyptians or in the Golan Heights, and it is important that the Prime Minister clarify the situation for us on those scores.

Political Situation and Reply to Sadat's Speech

Introduction

Early in January 1978, President Carter, en route from the Far East, met with Sadat at Aswan in Upper Egypt. They devised a formula relating to a solution of the Palestinian problem in all its aspects, the granting of the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people, including participation in the determination of their future. On 15 January 1978 the Egyptian weekly *October* published an interview with Sadat including a sharp personal attack on Begin.

Three days later the Political Committee convened in Jerusalem; the Egyptian delegation was recalled to Cairo within a day of its arrival, using remarks made by Begin in the course of a dinner speech as a pretext. As a result, the Israel government decided to postpone indefinitely the departure of the Israel delegation to the meeting of the Military Committee scheduled to take place in Cairo. In effect, negotiations had reached an impasse, and a sense of crisis prevailed.

Sitting 71 of the Ninth Knesset

23 January 1978 (15 Shevat 5738)

The Prime Minister, M. Begin: Mr. Speaker, Knesset Members, permit me to congratulate Israel's house of representatives on its twenty-ninth birthday. I am one of the three or four Members sitting here today who remember that day, the inception of Israel's democratic life. We held elections twenty-nine years ago in a time of war and bloodshed....At the founding meeting our hearts were uplifted, because only a few months previously we had emerged from servitude to freedom, raised our flag among those of the nations and proclaimed our independence. On the day of the elections to the Knesset we proclaimed our civil liberty.

I remember that great day. Since then, throughout the period of the Knesset's existence, on the basis of my experience and observation of what is happening throughout the world, it has been one of the most democratic parliaments, with a spirit of amity pervading even the fiercest arguments....It is a democratic parliament in the fullest sense of the term....I wish the Speaker and all the Members of the House that this august body may long continue to debate the issues of the day, reach wise and important decisions and serve as an example of liberty, freedom of speech and mutual respect....

On 8 November 1977 President Sadat told the Egyptian National Assembly that he was ready to go to Jerusalem and appear before the Knesset, stating that he demanded two things of Israel: withdrawal to the borders prior to the Six Day War and the establishment of a Palestinian state. The next day I responded to his unexpected speech by issuing the following statement:

"I must make it clear that upon taking office I announced my readiness to meet with the President of Egypt anywhere, including Cairo, in order to discuss bringing peace to the Middle East. Israel completely and utterly rejects the President's demands, namely complete withdrawal to the borders of 4 June 1967 and the establishment of a Palestinian state. Those demands endanger Israel's existence. But President Sadat may express his views at the Geneva Conference, as we will express ours. Let no side turn its views into necessary conditions for participation in the peace conference. If it is no mere empty phrase, if President Sadat is really ready to come to Jerusalem and the Knesset—we welcome that readiness."

After additional exchanges during the course of nine days and the despatch of a written invitation from me to President Sadat, he arrived in Jerusalem, appeared before the Knesset, paying the important visit to our country of the president of a country which was still in a state of war with us. In other words, when President Sadat decided to visit the Land of Israel and appeal to the Knesset, and thereby to the entire nation, and in effect to many countries throughout the world, he knew full well what we were and were not prepared to accept.

We met in Jerusalem. In our long talk during the night President Sadat assured me that with regard to the Sinai the Egyptian army would not cross the line of the Gidi and Mitla passes....To this day there has been no denial of that presidential statement. On the contrary, when we met at Ismailia I repeated that assurance and submitted it to the President in writing. There was complete silence from the other side....On the basis of that statement we built our peace plan for the Sinai peninsula.

The distance between the line of the Gidi and Mitla passes and the international border, between the Land of Israel and the Sinai, is between 180 and 200 kilometers. But when General Gamasi gave the demarcation and demilitarization line to the Minister of Defense, Ezer Weizman, it transpired that the Egyptian line was only forty kilometers from the international border, a difference of between 140 and 180 kilometers.

I must point out that for us that difference is crucial. No verbal acrobatics can change the fact that the Sinai Desert was the basis for aggression against Israel five times in thirty years....That is why we made up our minds that in any peace treaty between Israel and Egypt the Sinai

should be demilitarized. I said as much to President Sadat, and he gave me the assurance I have just cited....

I remember the argument at Yalta about the future of Poland. On one side were the Russians, on the other the U.S. and the British. The Russians convinced the U.S. President by saying that Poland had been an open corridor for Germany's aggression against Russia twice in this generation and several times in the past, and that that corridor had to be closed....The reference was to an inhabited country, not a desert, and that view was accepted.

No country should be turned into a base for aggression. Five times we fought in the Sinai Desert because Egypt attacked this tiny nation. Particularly in 1948, one day after the proclamation of our independence, when we had virtually no weapons, when our sons had hardly anything with which to defend this small nation, when we were in danger of physical annihilation by the armies which were approaching its heart in the south, the north and the east; the Egyptian army was only twenty kilometers from Tel Aviv in 1948. We encountered it at Zarnuga, it was situated outside Ramat Rachel, on the southern outskirts of Jerusalem the capital, together with other armies. And we were standing at the edge of the abyss, on the verge of destruction. All that happened because the Sinai Desert had become what the French call *place d'armes*. On no account will we permit a peace treaty to leave open the possibility of making the Sinai Desert a base for aggression again. I therefore appeal to President Sadat from this podium to instruct the Egyptian army chiefs to submit to us a plan for the demilitarization of the Sinai in accordance with his assurance....

On the basis of that assurance Israel's delegation—the Foreign Minister, the Minister of Defense and myself, plus our advisors and aides—went to Ismailia. At that meeting President Sadat and I decided to establish two committees to continue the negotiations....As I recently informed the House, the meeting at Ismailia gave rise to agreement between Israel and Egypt on several important issues, and the statement issued by President Sadat at its conclusion, and to which I agreed, did not conceal the fact that certain differences of opinion still prevailed between us, primarily on the subject of the Palestinian Arabs of Judea, Samaria and the Gaza District....

The points upon which the two delegations agreed were as follows:

1. The Governments of the Arab Republic of Egypt and Israel are determined to continue their efforts to reach a comprehensive peace settlement in the region.
2. Within the framework of such a settlement, they express their willingness to negotiate peace treaties on the basis of the principles envisaged in Security Council Resolutions 242 and 338.
3. The two sides agreed that the establishment of the just and lasting peace requires the fulfillment of the following: To act in accordance

with Resolution 242: A. Withdrawal of Israel armed forces from territories occupied in the 1967 conflict. B. Termination of all claims or states of belligerency, and respect for and acknowledgement of the sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence of every state in the area and their right to live in peace within secure and recognized boundaries free from threats or acts of force. C. Guaranteeing freedom of navigation through international waterways in the area. D. Achieving a just settlement of the refugee problem. E. Guaranteeing the territorial inviolability and political independence of every state in the area through measures including the establishment of demilitarized zones.

Since the meeting at Ismailia articles appeared in the Egyptian press referring to me as "Shylock," in a rabidly anti-Semitic sense.... Peace negotiations are being conducted between us. President Sadat came to the Knesset, stood on this very podium and said that he had come here to knock down the walls of prejudice between us. And in the course of those negotiations one of his aides refers to me in anti-Semitic terms, thereby rebuilding the wall once again....

Elsewhere in the Egyptian press our peace plan has been described as "an invitation to Egypt to commit suicide." The Knesset has been made privy to all the details of the plan. Is it an invitation to Egypt to commit suicide? The object of statements like the one I have just quoted and others, such as the one defining Jews as "a nation of haggling moneylenders"—a phrase we have heard already in our time—is to make the Egyptian nation hate us.... And all this at a time when peace negotiations are being conducted between our two countries.... Voices have even been heard threatening renewed war against Israel....

On January 14 an interview with President Sadat appeared in the weekly called *October*. I have read it more than once and can only say that it astonished me greatly. I asked myself if this was the same Anwar Sadat who came to us, spoke to us, talked with me until three in the morning, and concluded with the heart-warming words: "You are my friend"? What has happened in between...? In the interview he accuses us of harboring dishonest and malicious intentions behind the facade of our peace plan.... And all this is embellished with anti-Semitic expressions, in the midst of peace negotiations, after Israel has displayed goodwill....

Two days ago President Sadat addressed the Egyptian National Assembly, and said the following, amongst other things: "We have heard official Israeli statements saying that the peace negotiations will take five years." As the House well knows, no one in Israel has said any such thing. We suggested that they should take a few months. Of course time is needed. Important details have to be worked out. Someone chooses to see that as Jewish haggling and arrogance. What is there to haggle over? After all, they must do my bidding because I, the President of Egypt, went to Jerusalem....

"Moreover, they wanted to make that into a national issue within Israel, making use of the psychological makeup of that nation, which immigrated to the Palestinian lands and imposed its existence on it year after year by establishing settlements on it and making it a base for imposing its continued existence." That, it appears, is the history of Zionism, we imposed ourselves on the Palestinian lands.

With all due respect, I would like to say once more to President Sadat that that is not the way things were. We returned to the Land of Israel. We did not take anyone's land away from him. We returned to our land by right. We had to build it, that is true. We had to make the desert bloom, as the Bible says. We returned to it and built it and fought for it by right. That is the true history of Zionism, the liberation movement of the Jewish people....

President Sadat also said that I apologized for what I said at what is known as the incident at the dinner at the Hilton. There is nothing to be ashamed of in apologizing. It is my conviction that if one makes a mistake, one should apologize. But the point is that I did not apologize, because I had nothing to apologize for. The Egyptian Foreign Minister came to the Knesset. I welcomed him warmly, of course, as is customary in Israel. I chided him for all those anti-Semitic remarks. He apologized to me, particularly for the reference to Shylock. He told me that when he was tried in Egypt in 1956 he was defended by a famous Jewish lawyer, to whom he is grateful to this day. We concluded on a friendly note, saying that each side must refrain from making inflammatory statements which spoil the atmosphere.

The truth is that for ten days we restrained ourselves. As the House will recall, we did not react to the term Shylock nor to various other things that were said. We did not argue with Sadat about his interview in *October*.... The Egyptian Foreign Minister agreed that we would both refrain from making inflammatory statements in the future. It did not occur to me to assure him that I would not make a political speech at the dinner.... It has happened to me on my visits abroad—to the U.S., Romania and London, for example—that heads of state said things with which I did not agree. When appropriate, I replied, giving our point of view, as was my right....

What did I say at that dinner? It should be remembered that upon arriving in Lod and after having been welcomed warmly by our Foreign Minister, the Egyptian Foreign Minister stated that Israel must withdraw to the borders of 4 June 1967 and give back the Old City of Jerusalem.... It was my national duty to respond to that statement at the appropriate occasion, making it clear that Jerusalem will not be divided again, that we will not withdraw to the borders of 4 June 1967 and that we will not permit the pernicious use of the phrase "the right to national self-defense." I did not apologize. There was nothing to apologize for. No agreement was broken. On the contrary, it was kept. But that is what

President Sadat told the Egyptian National Assembly....He also claimed that it was arrogance on my part to say that we have never asked Egypt for recognition of our right to exist.

At the conclusion of his address to the Knesset, President Sadat said that he had not come to ask us to withdraw from the Arab land which was occupied in 1967, that it was obvious that Israel would have to withdraw from all of it and that there could be no argument on that point. My reply is that, with all due respect, it is not taken for granted, it is not acceptable to us, and we will give no such undertaking to anyone. We must not give it. We will not mislead anyone, and we have made our position on that score perfectly clear....

The Six Day War was a defensive war, and as such affords two rights: first, in the absence of a peace treaty, the armed forces remain where they were when the ceasefire came into force or on the basis of signed agreements, and I would like all concerned to understand that no Israeli soldier will move away without there being a peace treaty.... Secondly, it is well-known that territorial changes come in the wake of a defensive war. They are legitimate under international law and practice, as we saw occur in Europe after every war. It is true that such changes are subject to a peace treaty, and derive from right rather than might, but the right exists and we will insist on what is rightly ours....

In conclusion, I would like to clarify the government's position regarding the events of the last few days. Without any justification, taking us completely by surprise, President Sadat instructed the political committee to return to Cairo. As the U.S. Secretary of State announced, in the negotiations we had progressed to a new joint statement of principles, not the one we had agreed on at Ismailia....We were then asked to send our delegation, headed by the Minister of Defense, to Ismailia, to continue the deliberations of the military committee. The government decided to delay the departure of our delegation.

Statements like the ones I have quoted to the House which are being made in Cairo, do not create the appropriate atmosphere for Israel's Minister of Defense, Chief of the General Staff and senior officers to go there and negotiate....Our decision also states explicitly that we will resume the talks if the atmosphere improves and the statements which are offensive to the Jewish people and the Jewish state cease....For it is also our bound duty to defend the honor of the Jewish people....We respect the Egyptian nation, and did not write or say anything which was insulting or offensive about it, but we will not brook any disrespect to the Jewish people....

We have left the door wide open for the renewal of the negotiations, within the frameworks of both the military and the political committees, as well as the bilateral relations between Egypt and Israel. If we see that in the next few days there are no further insults there will be no reason

for our military delegation not to go to Cairo and participate in the deliberations of the military committee.

We expressed our views regarding the settlements at Ismailia.... Naturally, we are aware of President Sadat's opposition to the existence of settlements between Rafah and El-Arish, and it is his right to oppose them....At Ismailia I submitted our two-part peace proposal to him which contained a clause to the effect that the settlements should benefit from our defense, since the experience of our generation has taught us that no Jewish settlement can be left undefended. I added that, just as we respect his principles, we ask him to respect ours....

At Ismailia President Sadat explained to us why he could not accept our viewpoint. That is why negotiations were held. But did they stop at Ismailia because of that Israeli demand? On the contrary, the meeting ended with friendship and understanding and a joint decision to continue negotiations within the framework of the two committees....There was no ultimatum, no demand, quite the contrary, everything was on an extremely amicable level and concluded with a joint press conference....

Before submitting our peace plan at Ismailia, we showed it to the President, Vice President and senior officials of the U.S., former U.S. President Ford, well-known senators and the Prime Minister and Foreign Minister of Britain. All of them, without exception, were full of praise for it, using such phrases as "there is a great deal of flexibility," "a long step forward," and "a notable contribution," to mention but a few....That, Mr. Speaker, was the general opinion expressed about Israel's peace plan, and that is what it will remain.

M. Pa'il (Sheli): What has the Prime Minister said? That's what I'd like to know.

S. Peres (Alignment): Mr. Speaker, distinguished Knesset, as I sit here I ask myself whether this debate is being held because of the weighty need to respond to the objectionable statements uttered and printed in Egypt or with the object of reopening the gates to peace, which parted but a crack and are now being assailed vehemently. In the final event I believe that the object supersedes the need. We have heard harsh words in the past, yet nonetheless it is the hope of peace, in which the House is united, that overrides everything....

The Alignment will support every effort leading to peace today and in the future. I say this without being unmindful of the intolerable setbacks which have befallen the negotiations and the incomprehensible difficulties which accompanied them. The entire Jewish nation, and all of Israel, cannot ignore the really insufferable attacks on the Jewish people, its accredited representatives and the Prime Minister emanating from the Egyptian press and certain Egyptian spokesmen....

Neither our press nor our official representatives have insulted the Egyptian nation, its leaders or President Sadat...When he was here President Sadat said that a great part of the problems on the path to peace were of a psychological nature and that it was necessary to overcome the psychological barrier. I think that those statements recreate that psychological barrier.

But when differences are discovered during the course of negotiations, making general accusations and hurling insults is not the way to deal with them. Differences of opinion are not a tragedy, they are a subject for negotiations...In his interview in *October*, President Sadat launched the attack, claiming: "Begin has given nothing while I have given everything." Sadat can claim that he has not received everything he demanded, but it cannot be said that the Israeli proposal to restore Egyptian sovereignty up to the international border, over the whole of the Sinai, with a plan of one kind or another for Judea and Samaria, is nothing....

President Sadat says that we have not "relinquished anything" because the territory belongs to Egypt anyway. When he says that he has "given us everything," what does he mean? Normalization? Is normalization something so abnormal? Does not every nation deserve to live in normal conditions...? President Sadat claims that he has given us security. I would rather say that he has given security through peace to the Egyptian people and the State of Israel, and that Israel has done the same thing for the two nations. But the President cannot claim to guarantee that security on behalf of Syria, which has as many planes as Egypt and which, together with Iraq, is trying to turn the rejectionist front into a military threat.

President Sadat has given us an undeserved compliment by saying: "I know that the Jews are clever merchants." I fear that he has not studied the budget submitted by the Minister of Finance, Mr. Ehrlich, and is ignorant of what is happening in our Treasury and our stock exchange....

We may deserve compliments as a nation of pioneers, builders and defenders. Were we not, no one would be able to give us dubious compliments today which we do not deserve. Our nation is free and democratic. It contains differing views. I do not know if it will help if I assure Sadat that the coordination of which he has accused the Prime Minister and the leader of the opposition does not exist...We are proud of the fact that in this House different opinions can be expressed, but the House is united in its sincere desire for peace, its firm decision to defend ourselves and the vehement rejection of baseless general accusations which derive from the lexicon of prejudice and make no contribution to peace....

I have no doubts concerning the government of Israel's desire to attain true peace, but it is just for that reason that I feel it my duty to criti-

cize it for its actions and mistakes. That is the content of democracy: one must learn from one's mistakes.

The first mistake, and it is constantly repeated, is to encourage unfounded optimism, creating the optical illusion that all the difficulties can be overcome with the greatest of ease, that negotiations are a wedding tour—shorter even than a honeymoon. And so, when difficulties emerge the finger is pointed at us. I believe that an agreement can be reached in a short period of time, not years, but it is permissible to point out the difficulties confronting us...We and Egypt started out with many serious differences of opinion. We have overcome some, but not all, of them. One of the government's mistakes during the negotiations has been in the sphere of the settlements....I fail to understand why it was necessary to send tractors to embark on earth works in the Sinai, at a site where no settlement is planned...There were statements and denials while negotiations were in process and the Egyptian delegation was here...That is incomprehensible to me...Where is the logic...?

I agree that it was necessary to reply to Sadat, although I do not think that everything that was said by us was essential...I do not want to embark on long arguments now, since the object of this debate is, after all, to help reopen the peace negotiations. Just as we were not deterred by a difficult past which was beset by wars, we will not recoil—despite the verbal attacks—from seeing the future rise above the horizon of damaging and unnecessary statements.

I see two main problems confronting us in the immediate future—differences in the negotiations with Egypt regarding the south and the lack of a significant partner in the east. I gather that we are prepared to return 98 percent of the Sinai to Egypt with no condition other than demilitarization, which is self-evident, and a buffer area, which is essential for peace. What remains in dispute is 2 percent or 3 percent of the area, which is very little considering the differences of opinion which existed between us in the past. But the problem for us is not one of percentages or prestige but of security. On that area Jewish settlements were established and airfields were built, constituting a security buffer, as it were.

I know of no Israeli who wishes to murder Egypt, as President Sadat has claimed...We have no interest in insulting Egypt or harming it or depriving it of 2 percent of the desert. That is not the point. We must talk logically on this point...In my view, we are insisting on this security buffer for two reasons. The first is our experience in Gaza between 1951 and 1956, when the PLO's predecessor, the Fedayeen, made it its base for murderous excursions into Israel...When we compare what has happened in the last ten years in Gaza on the one hand and in Lebanon on the other, and see Lebanon crumbling under the burden of terrorism while Gaza is open and flourishing by virtue of its cooperation with us, one can understand the logic of Israel's desire that Gaza remain an

Arab place living an Arab life, with refugees returning to a normal life, one which contains no threat to either Arabs or Jews....

The second reason is the fact that Iraq and Syria have more than 1,000 offensive planes today. They constitute a threat to Israel's existence. President Sadat cannot guarantee anything on behalf of Iraq and Syria. President Sadat knows that the Land of Israel is a very small country on all its borders. As long as there is a genuine threat to its skies there is genuine temptation to attack it. When such a threat exists it is essential for Israel to keep its defensive option open. I believe that it was for that reason that the settlements were established in the Rafah area, with the airfields near them.

Israel has not asked Egypt to give it "part of its sovereignty so that it can defend its own sovereignty." That is not the point. Israel is requesting an arrangement which will enable it to defend itself in view of the experience of the past.

Because the differences of opinion concern 2 percent or 3 percent, we must ask quietly, can they be overcome or not? My reply is that they can be overcome in a variety of ways, whether by leaving the dispute unresolved for the moment or by reaching a territorial arrangement which injures neither Egypt's sovereignty nor Israel's security....I see that the government has itself said that in another few years there should be a review of the arrangements in the region. There is no hurry with regard to the Sinai, and it will be perfectly feasible to leave the decision open on a few kilometers of that vast desert, which will be demilitarized. Those kilometers will be crucial not only for our peace but for that of the region, because the Syrian-Iraqi temptation to attack Israel will endanger the peace of all the countries, not only ours....

It seems to me that on the issue which appears to be the most difficult to reach agreement, there has been progress in the negotiations. I am referring to the subject of self-determination in Judea, Samaria and Gaza. I am basing this on the U.S. compromise formula which was published and which says that the inhabitants of Judea, Samaria and Gaza will be partners in the definition of their future. This formula rests on previous Israeli agreement to include representatives from those areas in a four-sided conference comprising Egyptian, Jordanian and Israeli representatives....

From my point of view there is no dispute as to the need to resolve the problem of the Palestinians or the Palestinian Arabs or the inhabitants of Judea, Samaria and Gaza. I do not share the Prime Minister's semantic sensitivity as to what to call those people, for it is not for us to decide what name people should go by....That is not the point. In my view, however, the problem regarding Judea, Samaria and Gaza at this moment is one of finding a partner rather than of semantic definition. The Alignment's position is that King Hussein, who rules the historic half of the historic Land of Israel, already today represents a considerable

part of the Palestinians....He should become a party to the negotiations, especially after President Sadat has said that the Rabat decisions do not exist, because the rejectionist front has cancelled them. King Hussein should be the principal partner in the debate on the future of the Palestinians living in Judea, Samaria and Gaza, so that a solution may be found within the framework of the Jordanian-Palestinian responsibility.

What the Knesset must do is, in our view, to refrain from adopting the opinion which is gaining increasing currency in some of the media, namely, that the gates to peace have been shut....On the contrary, they are open and must be opened wider....We must make it clear to Egypt that it is possible to find a way to assure Egypt's honor as well as Israel's security with regard to the Sinai. We have already seen in the past that unexpected solutions may be found in difficult situations. Where Judea and Samaria are concerned, we must complete the work of formulating a proposal and reach serious negotiations with a serious partner who has expressed readiness to negotiate with Israel in the past but stood alone then....

I think that President Sadat's demand that Israel take a stand now as regards the Golan Heights is irrelevant. Since Assad is not prepared to take part in the negotiations, what is the point of raising the subject? I am convinced that there is also a large camp on the Arab side which can rescue the Middle East from war and its horrors. Saudi-Arabia, Egypt and Jordan, which are supported by Tunis and Morocco and encouraged by the U.S., together with an Israel which desires peace, could change the situation basically. In our view, the negotiations could be conducted in any way and via any channel, including a military committee in Cairo, a political committee in Jerusalem, active or passive American mediation and a calm dialog, in order to reach an agreement which will open a new era in the Middle East.

Anyone who looks to the future will see the difficulties ahead of us. But anyone who looks to the past must also admit that we have progressed. And by virtue of that progress we can go on to an agreement for full peace....In view of what I have said, we will submit our own proposal and vote for it. We will not vote for the government's proposal because it simply states that we approve the Prime Minister's statement, which we do not do in full....We will not vote against it either, because we have said that we will support the efforts to attain peace, and in our opinion an imperfect peace plan is preferable to the perfect failure of the negotiations....

...

D. Golomb (Democratic Movement for Change): Mr. Speaker, distinguished Knesset, throughout the negotiations we must preserve an overall view of the picture, seeing its past, present and future, rather than focusing on the one part in which we happen to be situated at any particu-

lar moment. First of all, we must remember that Israel's demand for direct negotiations with the Arab countries, which we have been voicing for the last thirty years, has been met by Sadat....Secondly, there has been substantive progress during the negotiations, and on vital issues....At present we are at an impasse, Sadat has stopped the negotiations in the political committee, thereby endangering the dialog, and we must all unite in condemning that step....

At the beginning of the negotiations we knew that apart from times of exultation we could expect difficult times, like the one which currently besets us. The question is, what should we do now? Our task is to serve the best interests of the State of Israel. That guideline must lead us to careful, clear and moderate thinking. Our objective must be to utilize all the opportunities of the negotiations, to revive them, sustain them and attain either the establishment of peace or the knowledge that we have done everything that was in our power to attain it. If we do that we will also attain other objectives. The principal aim is the essence of the thing, the object of the exercise, the supreme goal of the State of Israel—a life of security and peace.

We must realize that careful and moderate thinking will lead us to achieve two additional objectives: true pride in ourselves, enabling us to stand straight and say that we have done our utmost to achieve peace, and strengthened international support....We need it today and will need it in the future too....Several grave doubts have arisen in the wake of Sadat's serious step. I envy anyone who is convinced that we are in the throes of a specific process and will doubtless return to the normal channels of the negotiations and go forward. That is not the case. There is no certainty that the process will develop as we wish it. At the moment matters are teetering on the brink, and just as we all hope that the talks will be revived, we must fear a process of agitation and detachment. If that process takes place it will clearly be the fault of the President of Egypt....

Our response to that grave step must be clear, serve Israel's interests and reflect the nation's desire for peace and security. First of all, Israel must not be dragged into squabbling. What is important is not how we react to what one journalist or another, or one politician or another, writes or says, but how we advance towards the achievement of our goals, the supreme one being peace....

My party group perceives the government's decision as a controlled, short-term reaction whose function is to inform Egypt that Israel will not be dictated to. After that we will continue exploring all the possibilities and tools for continuing the peace negotiations, including the military committee....We hope that the brief setback in the negotiations will be used for learning lessons, and examining ourselves to see whether we have done everything we should have done....The main thing, however, is to learn our lessons as regards the future, trying to foresee what

the other side will do....We must reassess Israel's response to every possible step. We owe it to ourselves to learn the lessons of the past and apply them to the future, so that we may reassure ourselves that we have done and are doing everything in our power to attain peace....It is in that spirit that we support the government's position.

Y. Ben-Meir (National Religious Party): Mr. Speaker, distinguished Knesset, my party group supports yesterday's cabinet decision as presented here by the Prime Minister. It is a wise, good and timely decision. If there is any chance of renewing the negotiations with the government of Egypt, which stopped them in the middle, it is by the government of Israel standing firm, aspiring towards peace and preserving Israel's security and vision.

It must be stated unequivocally from this podium that the responsibility for the break in the negotiations between us and Egypt is entirely and solely President Sadat's....And I regret to say that I have heard Knesset Members and public figures try to say—for what reason I cannot tell—that both sides are equally to blame....The basic truth which we must not lose sight of is that the blame for the Arab-Israel conflict belongs one hundred percent to the Arabs....It may not sound so liberal and enlightened, but it is the truth....That truth goes back many decades, but it certainly begins the day after the U.N. resolution on partition, when the Jewish people decided to accept a small part of the Land of Israel, because of its desire for peace, while the Arabs began to kill Jews....

Today, too, the blame for the interruption of the talks belongs entirely to the President of Egypt and no one else....I would like to tell President Sadat from this podium not to delude himself with thinking that he can drive a wedge between the nation and its government or between the Prime Minister and his ministers....I know that that is what he is trying to do....It should be asserted once again that this government has acted with admirable consistency, and the Prime Minister has constantly stated that we have no wish to cause disunity among the Arab countries, even though most of them have condemned Sadat's initiative....President Sadat is making a big mistake by trying to sow discord within Israel....

I think that this government has gone much more than halfway towards President Sadat. It has gone 90 percent of the way, but even that is not enough for him....How can anyone say that the government of Israel is being obdurate...? The government has submitted a peace plan which contains inordinate concessions to Egypt, even going to the limit of Israel's security borders....The Alignment's Yigal Allon has claimed that the government's proposal endangers Israel's security. I would not go so far as to say that, but it does contain great risks regarding Israel's security....Can anyone doubt the Prime Minister's and the

government's fierce desire to attain peace, and to go towards Sadat for that end...?

I attended the dinner in question and heard what the Prime Minister said....What could be more natural...? He spoke politely, in a friendly spirit. What was wrong in presenting the government of Israel's position...? All he said was that peace could not be attained on the basis of the borders of 1967 and the repartition of Jerusalem. Is there anyone in this House who disagrees with that...? I see nothing wrong, nothing offensive, about saying that....It is folly to say that that speech was the reason for what happened. We know that Sadat planned it in advance....

President Sadat has said that he is now prepared to recognize Israel, but I do not think that he is ready to go all the way yet....The implication of his various statements is that he wants to turn Israel into a country which is protected by the U.N., the Powers or even the Arab countries themselves. He, Sadat, is prepared to guarantee us our security....Does he really believe that any government or individual in Israel will accept anything of that nature?

In conclusion, I would like to appeal to President Sadat to become once more what he was when he visited us here, and to try and annul the clear change in the atmosphere, which has evidently been engineered by the Egyptian government during the last two weeks....Sadat had better not make the mistake of confusing this nation's fierce desire for peace with fear....No, we are not afraid....The Jewish nation recoils from bloodshed, but in the long struggle with our neighbors we have always prevailed, and we are not afraid....

Consequently, we support the government's proposal. It is the best and most appropriate course, and the Prime Minister has certainly left the door open....Let us hope that the President of Egypt will respond to the Prime Minister's sincere appeal and enable our two nations to speak to one another as civilized nations do....Let us continue with the genuine negotiations between sovereign states which we want with all our hearts. Only by negotiations and mutual concessions, not ultimatums, can peace be attained. We have gone a long way towards him, now it is his turn to come towards us.

...

T. Toubi (Democratic Front for Peace and Equality): Distinguished Speaker and Knesset, ever since President Sadat's visit to Israel and the start of the process which has currently come to a standstill we have been saying in the clearest possible way that without a basic change in Israel's official policy, without readiness to withdraw to the borders of June 4 and to recognize the legal right of the Palestinians to self-determination and an independent state alongside Israel, it will be impossible to progress towards peace. We have said that any attempt to sidestep the peace conference at Geneva and disregard the other parties to the

conflict, and first and foremost the Palestinian people and its representative the PLO, while seeking the shield of the U.S.—the joint master of Israel and Egypt—a comprehensive, just and stable peace will not be attained. At the most it will be possible to hatch a plot, a separate agreement, which will bring neither peace nor security nor stability....

Even before President Sadat came to the Knesset Prime Minister Begin made it clear that there had been no change in his policy. To his credit it should be said that his adherence to the Greater Land of Israel and aspiration to annex the occupied territories, especially the West Bank and the Gaza Strip, has been consistently clear and unequivocal....

What happened for two months during the separate Egyptian-Israeli-U.S. talks was that the Likud government demonstrated the line which has guided all Israel's governments, namely, that annexation and the denial of the rights of the Palestinians are preferable to peace. The wave of settlement activity in the occupied territories, also including the Sinai, on which the government decided during the course of the talks, and the provocative demand to retain military bases and airfields in the territory of a sovereign state, Egypt, proved that neither peace nor good-neighborliness are what the government wants but more and more annexation by a policy of force.

What happened during the talks is that the Begin government demonstrated more clearly than ever through its "autonomy" plan that the continued occupation of the West Bank and the Gaza Strip and the denial of the Palestinians' right to live as a free nation in their own land were preferable to peaceful coexistence and cooperation with the neighboring Arab countries. It is funny when the Prime Minister seeks to support the supposedly constructive and wise nature of the autonomy plan by quoting President Carter....How could it have been possible to expect a just peace to emerge from the maneuvers of the governments of Israel and Egypt, under the aegis of the U.S., the sole common basis being not concern for the Israeli and Arab nations but loyalty to the strategic interests of American imperialism and the American oil and arms moguls, and against the U.S.S.R. and the independence of the nations of the region...?

Those who do not seek the real reasons for the failure of the Sadat-Begin-Vance talks latch onto all kinds of feeble excuses, such as the involvement of the mass media....All that is an illusion. For more than ten years the representatives of Israel and King Hussein held secret negotiations—King Hussein himself has revealed this—and did not get anywhere, because the government of Israel insisted on perpetuating occupation and annexation....

And now the Begin government has conducted the negotiations, all smiles and fine words, not in order to attain peace with the mutual respect of rights but in order to dictate conditions from positions of

strength. That is what the Foreign Minister meant when he said that President Sadat came to Jerusalem because he could not get what he wanted by military means....The Foreign Minister also uttered veiled threats regarding the renewal of war if Israel's terms were not met....

Today one thing is clear, the government of Israel was offered peace, recognition and security in return for withdrawal and respect for the rights of the Palestinians. The Begin government rejected that, and thus Israel is once more taking responsibility for the deterioration of the situation, a reckless policy for which the Israeli and Arab nations may well pay in blood and tears. We therefore call on the Knesset and the nation to express their lack of confidence in the Begin government....

...

A. Eliav (Sheli): Distinguished Speaker and Knesset, if anyone here would have imagined only four months ago that we would be arguing in the Knesset about whether Israel should send its Foreign Minister to Cairo to renew the talks within the framework of a joint committee with the Egyptian Minister of War, after the President of Egypt had come to Jerusalem and addressed the Knesset and the Prime Minister of Israel had visited Ismailia, I think we would all have pronounced him mentally unstable....

But reality exceeds the bounds of imagination, and we find ourselves within a play which began as a great international drama and which might become, if it has not already, a surrealistic theater of the absurd, or a Pinteresque non-dialog of non-communication....Now people are saying that all Sadat did was come to Jerusalem and recognize Israel's existence, albeit within the 1967 borders, and why should we give him the territories in return..?

For years my friends in the Alignment told me not to bother with the territories and the Palestinian problem because the real problem was that the Arabs had not acquiesced in Israel's very existence in the Middle East....Again and again I was told that if ever an Arab leader were to openly declare recognition of Israel's existence the problem of the territories would soon be resolved....I am sure that that message was transferred to the Arab leaders in a variety of ways....President Sadat said openly and clearly in this House, through this microphone, that he recognized Israel's existence....That does not mean that as his prize he deserves all the territories on a silver platter, without any negotiations....I am sure that neither he nor anyone else in the world believed that that would happen....Everyone knew that negotiations would begin and that they would be long and difficult....We are now at one of the low points of those negotiations, the Egyptians blame us and we blame them, all of us playing the ugly game of "you started."

We, my colleagues and I, will not permit this House to be divided according to who is a prouder Jew and who has done more to defend Israel's honor. Among people like myself, who think that the negotiations

with Egypt should be renewed immediately and the Foreign Minister should go forthwith to Cairo in an attempt to revive the talks, there are some who made the supreme sacrifice for Israel's honor, for the lives of Jews and their right to live in freedom and pride, like every other nation....

The unfortunate expressions like "Shylock" which certain Egyptian media have used offend me and my colleagues just as much as they do those who seek to make use of this Egyptian psychological slip to cut off the talks, and we condemn unequivocally those Egyptians who have said as much in the last few days....But is it unknown for hostile parties to condemn one another while negotiations are being conducted...? The Chinese media continued to castigate the Americans while Kissinger was trying for months and years to get talks going....I even go so far as to say that those statements in the Egyptian press were not entirely without provocation on our side....

The talk and action regarding the establishment and expansion of settlements undoubtedly harmed the process....Someone saw to it that all the bulldozers and earthmovers were widely publicized and televised....The Minister of Agriculture spoke about that provocation in the Knesset last week, and I did not understand anything and to this day I do not grasp why all that was necessary....In his speech at the Hilton the Prime Minister said things which were unnecessary and provocative, for reasons which escape both me and others closer to him....

Why did the Foreign Minister find it necessary to say on television that the Egyptians do not have the military strength to wage war on Israel? That statement is reminiscent of the complacency and arrogance which preceded the Yom Kippur War....I know that the Egyptians have annoyed us, but that does not mean that we have to cut off all communication with them....What is at stake is the lives of our children and their children, after all....Will we have to tell our children that because of prestige we failed to seize every opportunity of attaining peace with our neighbors and enemies? Will we be able to say that we did everything to prevent war? How many bloody wars began because of misunderstandings, lack of communication, alienation and prestige...?

Is there anyone anywhere in the world who doubts that the Jews of Israel are brave? Have we not proved that to ourselves and the world repeatedly during the last thirty years...? Do we have to prove it to ourselves each day anew by dubious plays for prestige? We request and demand that the government renew the talks immediately and send the Minister of Defense to Egypt forthwith. On the long and difficult road to peace let us be slow to anger and quick to be appeased....

...

S. Aloni (Citizens' Rights Movement): Mr. Speaker, distinguished Knesset, in recent weeks we have been dealing with something this country has been hoping for for many years, the subject of peace. We are

facing great difficulties because there are several myths which are part of our essence and which we must overcome....We must suppress and overcome the myth that every settlement which is on the other side of the Green Line is an indispensable guarantee of security. The myth that the land is sacred—and President Sadat is guilty of using the same terminology—is marginal to the sanctity of life and the value of peace must be abandoned....If we do not remember that we will not advance towards peace....

We have heard the Prime Minister cite passages from the Egyptian press. It is very easy to quote similar passages from the Israeli press. I hope that the President of Egypt and his associates will not do so and thereby lead us towards a press war. The time has come to stop talking and start communicating.

The government finds itself in an uncomfortable position from which it must extricate itself and overcome the expressions of the prestige and honor raised here. We do not have the time nor can we afford to postpone the peace negotiations, and certainly not to close the channel of communication. There is very little likelihood of our being able to obtain more from the Arabs in another five years than today, as everyone acknowledges....Let us remember that in 1948 there was a refugee problem, then there was a Palestinian problem and now there is a Palestine problem. The demands will only increase, and the situation is not as it was in 1930 or 1933, on which the Prime Minister bases his case, in accordance with the teachings of Jabotinsky.

Consequently, without standing on ceremony or holding out for reasons of prestige, because we have sufficient national pride, honor and history, we must turn down the volume and work so that the process may continue....What good is honor to us...? Take a look at our society and the damage which war has inflicted on it. On the one hand we sanctify land, settlements and the continuation of war for those objectives, even being prepared to stop the peace process today, while on the other our society is deteriorating and we do not even have the time to deal with it. The newspapers are full of reports of violent crime....In order to be able to establish the society we aspired towards here we must turn down the volume, swallow our pride and continue the peace process....Let the other side adopt the style which best befits it, we will not descend to the level of exchanging insults or let ourselves be led aside from the goal of peace because of the stupidity of one journalist or another....

I regret the government's decision, although we have been led to a certain constellation....We should have been in a position to say that provided certain conditions are met we will continue with the negotiations because, as President Sadat and Prime Minister Begin said from this podium, peace is a supreme value. We saw and heard them both say that there would be no more war, no more bloodshed. So that there will be no more war we must keep the channels of communication open, and the

negotiations must continue, subject to criticism of what is said on both sides....This generation and the generations to come will not forgive us if we let peace slip through our fingers today. Historical developments indicate that we will never have a better opportunity for peace. We must not miss it.

...
The Foreign Minister, M. Dayan: Mr. Speaker, Knesset Members...since we have been conducting open and less open negotiations with the Egyptians for some time, from the little I have heard from them, in my view the chance of their agreeing that even the smallest part of the Sinai should pass to Israeli sovereignty is infinitesimal. There is no chance of that happening. I am not saying that there is much chance of their accepting our plan, either, but there is certainly not the slightest chance of their agreeing that Sharm el-Sheikh or Rafah should remain under Israeli sovereignty or even to an exchange of land....

We were initially given to understand that our plan could be regarded as a basis for negotiations, but now Sadat has changed his tune and rejects it entirely....With regard to Judea, Samaria and the Gaza Strip, we can only make proposals regarding Arabs or land which are under our control....In the working paper agreed on by us and the U.S. we proposed that when a peace agreement is discussed and the subject of Judea, Samaria and the Gaza Strip comes up, Egypt, Jordan, Israel and representatives of the Palestinians should participate....In my view our proposals regarding administrative autonomy are the best possible, not merely as a kind of administrative independence or as the maximum we can give but also as the basis for any further negotiations....That does not mean that they agree to our proposals, but I am using them as a basis for comparison with other bases, such as partition....

The best interpretation of the difficult problems confronting us now with Egypt was given by President Sadat....He has himself said that he put a stop to the talks because Israel would not undertake to withdraw from the Golan Heights, the West Bank and the Gaza Strip before the Sinai. I do not want to say that the question of our settlements in the Rafah area is not a difficult one, but Sadat does not perceive it as such or even refer to it....The root of the problem in the negotiations with Egypt is the direct differences between us and Egypt. We might not reach agreement on them either, but the root of the trouble is that Egypt says that it does not want to make a separate agreement with us and consequently wants Israel to undertake to meet the conditions which will enable other countries to participate. Sadat knows what he is doing when he says that Israel must withdraw from the Golan Heights, the West Bank and the Gaza Strip and agree to the establishment of a Palestinian state before leaving the Sinai, and that is why he instructed his delegation to leave Israel. Because Israel was not prepared to undertake to do that....

If we are prepared to face reality tonight, we must acknowledge that that is the root of the evil. There is another difficulty. Sadat says that he is not prepared to make a separate agreement with us, and is hoping that Jordan will join the talks....But King Hussein has stated quite plainly that his condition for joining the talks is that Israel must undertake to withdraw from all the territories, including East Jerusalem, agree to a Palestinian state, allow the refugees from 1948, who are now in Lebanon and elsewhere, to return to Israel and accept immediate U.N. control of the West Bank and the Gaza Strip, after which there will be a referendum....

Till now the mediation and participation of the U.S. representatives has been constructive and effective. We do not accept everything they propose, but the main thing they want is the continuation of the talks and progress towards a peace agreement....The U.S. generally makes proposals which are realistic and constitute a compromise, and although they are not always acceptable to both or either sides, the U.S. is playing a central role in the process....I doubt whether the discussions of the political committee will resume in the near future, and if they do, whether this will be in the same form as in the past. I do believe, however, that the subjects with which the political committee was concerned will continue to be discussed in informal talks between us and the Egyptians, with U.S. mediation. I hope that the government of Israel sees fit to enable the military committee to renew its activities in the near future.

...

The Vote

Those in favor	59
Those against	9
Abstentions	19

(MK Corfu's proposal that the Knesset note the Prime Minister's statement is adopted.)

Camp David Accords

Introduction

The crisis in the negotiations between Egypt and Israel dragged on, President Carter's efforts notwithstanding. In an effort to prevent any agreement, which perforce would restrict it to the sidelines, the PLO, stepped up its operations in and against Israel, reaching their climax on 11 March 1978, in the massacre on the Coast Road, in which thirty-five people were killed and eighty wounded. A few days later, in the Litani Operation, massive IDF forces attacked and temporarily occupied a strip in southern Lebanon, from which the PLO had launched many of its operations.

In the course of an official visit by Prime Minister Begin to Washington at the end of March 1978, the relations between him and Carter, and—by implication—between their nations, reached a nadir. President Carter openly attacked the government of Israel, publicizing the six noes which in his judgment prevented a peace settlement. At the end of April Begin returned to the U.S. for a private visit aimed at reconciliation with Carter. On 15 May 1978—by coincidence the thirtieth anniversary of the establishment of Israel and the beginning of the first Egyptian invasion—President Sadat declared that his patience had been exhausted and that the October War would not, after all, be the last one.

Early in July Egypt presented to the U.S. an alternative peace plan, involving a precise return to the *status quo ante bellum*, including the return of the West Bank to Jordan and of the Gaza Strip to Egypt. The U.S. government, anticipating outright rejection, did not transmit the plan to the government of Israel.

Later that month the Foreign Ministers of Egypt and Israel convened at Leeds Castle in England. Dayan agreed that the definitive status of the West Bank should be decided upon after five years of autonomy. Beyond this there was no noticeable progress. A half-hearted promise by Kamal, the Egyptian Foreign Minister, to meet again at Foreign Minister level was not honored by Sadat.

President Carter, however, deduced from the very fact of the meeting at Leeds Castle that both sides wished to continue the peace process and, at the very least, were loth to assume public responsibility for its interruption. Moreover, it appeared to the U.S. that whereas in Egypt President Sadat was more amenable than his closest advisors, in Israel the opposite was the case, with Begin more unbending than his closest advisors, Foreign Minister Dayan and Minister of Defense Weizman. A meeting including all of them, with the active participation of the U.S. President, seemed the best, possibly the only, way of saving the peace

initiative. The White House had to go back seventy-three years to find a precedent for such a procedure—in 1905, at Portsmouth, New Hampshire, then President Roosevelt had convened and presided over the conference which put an end to the Russo-Japanese War.

On 5 September 1978 the three leaders, with their entourages, arrived at Camp David, the idyllic White House retreat. They were to remain there, practically isolated from the outside world, particularly from the media, in a “gilded cage,” for the following twelve days. The ups and downs, proposals, counter-proposals, compromises, crises and denouements of those twelve days have been described by several participants.

On 17 September 1978, in the East Room of the White House, the three leaders signed the final document, the Camp David accords. Although under no constitutional obligation to do so, Begin presented them, one week later, to the Knesset for approval.

The sitting at which this issue was debated proved to be the longest in the history of the Knesset, lasting without interruption for seventeen and a half hours, from 10 a.m. to 3:32 a.m. of the following day. (The previous record had been set in 1973, in a debate concerning the elections—though there the motivation was a filibuster by the smaller parties in the House.) In this case, in addition to the manifest importance of the subject, one may assume that the fact that for the first time a Knesset sitting was to be transmitted live in its entirety by TV contributed to the multiplicity of participants: eighty speakers. Only a fraction of these, selected to reflect all relevant viewpoints, are reproduced.

Sitting 145 of the Ninth Knesset

25 September 1978 (23 Elul 5738)

The Prime Minister, M. Begin: Mr. Speaker, distinguished Knesset—

G. Cohen (Likud): I call on the Prime Minister to resign before the Knesset approves the Camp David accords.

The Speaker, Y. Shamir: Please be quiet. Will the Prime Minister kindly continue.

G. Cohen (Likud): —the commander of the IZL.

The Prime Minister, M. Begin: Mr. Speaker, Knesset Members, I bring before the Knesset, and thereby before the entire nation, the tidings of the establishment of peace between Israel and the largest Arab country and, in the course of time, inevitably, with all our neighbors. The documents which were agreed upon at the Camp David conference, and which were signed by me on behalf of the government of Israel—

G. Cohen (Likud): Not on behalf of the nation in Israel.

The Prime Minister, M. Begin: —are in front of you. Therefore I will not take up the Knesset's time by reading them. However, I am unable to disclose the contents of two other documents, the Egyptian one which was submitted to President Carter and myself at our first meeting at Camp David on the first day of our talks, and the American one—

G. Cohen (Likud): Why can't you disclose it? Tell the nation.

The Prime Minister, M. Begin: —which was submitted to us during the course of the talks—

G. Cohen (Likud): Mr. Prime Minister, tell the nation what's in it. Stop deceiving the nation.

(From the floor: That's going too far. Have some respect.)

I have respect for Israel, not for you....

The Prime Minister, M. Begin: Will the Speaker kindly protect me from MK Cohen.

G. Cohen (Likud): I am trying to protect the Land of Israel from the Prime Minister.... We sent people to die for the Land of Israel....

The Prime Minister, M. Begin: ...One day it will be possible to publish the two documents, today it is not, for reasons which I will call psychological-political....

G. Cohen (Likud): You cannot bring a statement of that kind before the nation....

The Speaker, Y. Shamir: MK Cohen, I call you to order.

G. Cohen (Likud): I'm in order. It's the others who aren't.

The Speaker, Y. Shamir: MK Cohen, kindly be quiet.

G. Cohen (Likud): The Prime Minister has already been removed from this Knesset because—

The Speaker, Y. Shamir: MK Cohen, I call you to order for the second time....

G. Cohen (Likud): The performance isn't here, it was at Camp David.

The Speaker, Y. Shamir: I call you to order for the third time.

G. Cohen (Likud): I heard you. I'm telling you that I will not let the Prime Minister tell the nation things which are deceptive and misleading—I was elected by tens of thousands of Jews to continue—It was not because of Begin that I was elected but because of the love of Israel which Begin once shared....

The Speaker, Y. Shamir: MK Cohen, I am calling you to order for the last time....

G. Cohen (Likud): Settlers have already been removed from the Land of Israel. You can remove me by force from the Knesset too....

The Speaker, Y. Shamir: Under clause 69 of the Knesset rules of procedure the Knesset will vote without a debate on the proposal to remove MK Cohen from the Chamber.

(The proposal to remove MK Cohen from the Chamber is adopted.)

The Speaker, Y. Shamir: Will MK Cohen kindly leave the Chamber.

G. Cohen (Likud): I'm going. I respect the Knesset. I don't respect the Prime Minister....I think that he is bringing us neither peace, security nor honor. He is bringing the repartition of the Land of Israel.

The Prime Minister, M. Begin: ...When the two documents I referred to are published one day everyone in Israel and the world will realize what we did and did not achieve, what we prevented, what we postponed, what we received and what sacrifices we made for peace, to prevent bloodshed, for the welfare of our nation and the nations around us.

First of all I would like to thank all the members of the team, without whom the accords would not have been attained....We worked as a team, round the clock, consulting and being consulted, and everyone contributed his share, regardless of rank and position....I would also like to thank President Carter of the U.S. for his initiative in holding this unprecedented meeting....President Carter organized and ran the talks, investing countless hours of tireless efforts, contributing his original ideas, proposing compromises, listening to our suggestions and displaying endless patience in dealing with both the larger ideas and the minutest details....

There were inevitable difficulties. There were crises, which were also unavoidable. The U.S. President did not despair for a single moment, always believing that things would turn out well in the end, and doing everything in his power to ensure that this was indeed the case....From this Chamber I would like to express our deep gratitude and appreciation to him....

The crucial importance of the agreement with Egypt is that this time we are committed to signing a peace treaty. No more partial or interim agreements, but a peace treaty on the basis of similar international agreements, usually beginning with the phrase: "The state of war between the two countries is terminated." That is the difference. It is extremely important. It means the complete normalization of relations, including the establishment of diplomatic, economic and cultural ties, the end of the economic boycott, the free passage of goods and people....

Defense experts verify that we have obtained adequate and sufficient security conditions for Israel by determining demilitarized zones, as well as areas with a minimal military presence and early-warning systems. It is true that there is a problem with the airfields, re-

garding which there is a change from the original agreement reached last December, and our three airfields in the Sinai will be handed over to the Egyptian civil authorities. But our American friends have assured us that they will help us establish two airbases in the Negev, making very little difference in strategic and defense terms....We will not leave the present airbases until the new ones are ready and working....

President Sadat and I agreed to try and reach a signed agreement within two months, rather than the three in the official agreement, so that there is a possibility that we will sign the peace treaty between our two countries by the end of the year....The most painful feature concerns our settlements in the northern and southern Sinai. It has been said that we relinquished them even before President Sadat visited Jerusalem and in order to make that visit possible. I would like to say here and now that that is an unfounded accusation....We have written proof that this is not so....There are also those who claim that we did not fight hard enough for the settlements at the Camp David talks....

(Shouts from the floor.)

The interjections do not disturb me. I realize that in every party there are differences of opinion on that point today. Let us respect one another's views and afterwards each one can decide according to the dictates of his or her conscience....

Y. Allon (Alignment): Israel's delegation gave up the settlements before the negotiations began.

The Prime Minister, M. Begin: If it were possible to ask President Carter and one of his principal aides how Israel's delegation fought for those settlements—

Y. Allon (Alignment): Too late.

The Prime Minister, M. Begin: —you would receive a detailed reply. But that's not—

M. Shamir (Likud): Where was your "no"? A simple word, with no need to put up a fight or to beg Carter for anything. All you had to do was to say N-O, no....

The Prime Minister, M. Begin: It is very painful. Not only will I not conceal my pain, I will express it in every way I can.

M. Shamir (Likud): Apart from the way of action.

The Prime Minister, M. Begin: But today, as you know, we have to choose between accepting the proposal brought before the Knesset by the government and refusing to embark on negotiations for a peace treaty, which involves rejecting everything that was agreed upon at Camp David....

J. Rom (Likud): That is an ultimatum, sir.

The Prime Minister, M. Begin: Those are the alternatives....Professor Rom, when you are elected prime minister you can say different things. For the moment I have been elected by the Knesset to fulfill that function, and you will kindly hear me out patiently and respectfully. Those are the alternatives, there is no third way....I say here with a grieving heart but a clear conscience that I recommend choosing the alternative which we chose at yesterday's cabinet meeting, because that is the path which leads to peace. It is the supreme national interest, for my friends the settlers too. I therefore propose that the Knesset approve the Camp David accords, agree to conduct negotiations for a peace treaty with Egypt and authorize the government to remove and relocate the settlers from the Sinai....

The basis for the agreement regarding Judea, Samaria and Gaza is the autonomy plan we proposed last December, i.e., the abolition of the military government, including its civil branch, and the election of an administrative council by the Arab inhabitants. We will not interfere in the running of their daily affairs. As regards our national security, the main point is that the IDF will remain in Judea, Samaria and Gaza.

S. Arbeli-Almoslino (Alignment): Even after the autonomy ends?

The Prime Minister, M. Begin: Hear me patiently to the end. In the original agreement we said that there would be a withdrawal of Israeli armed forces and the redeployment of the remaining Israeli troops in specified security areas. In other words, we agreed to withdraw some of our soldiers, while the rest will remain in Judea, Samaria and Gaza. The redeployment will take place soon, and only Israeli soldiers will preserve our national security. Our army will remain in Judea, Samaria and Gaza after the transition period. That is the basic change in the discussions during the past two years....

Y. Allon (Alignment): That's not written down, sir....

The Prime Minister, M. Begin: We left no one in any doubt and made it quite clear that after the transition period of five years, when the question of sovereignty comes up, we will make our claim to sovereignty over Judea, Samaria and Gaza. If an agreement is reached against the background of conflicting demands, all well and good; if no agreement is reached, the upshot will be that Israel's autonomy and security arrangements will continue....

T. Toubi (Democratic Front for Peace and Equality): Is that what you call peace? The occupation will continue, the Palestinians will still be deprived of their rights....

The Prime Minister, M. Begin: Mr. Tewfik Toubi, I have read many articles from *Pravda*, and Moscow's position is perfectly clear to me, I have no need of you....What we have attained by these accords is that

there will be no referendum in Judea, Samaria and Gaza...and on no condition will there be a Palestinian state.

T. Ziad (Democratic Front for Peace and Equality): It doesn't depend on you. It depends on the Palestinians.

M. Wilner (Democratic Front for Peace and Equality): If there is no Palestinian state, all your talk of peace is meaningless....

T. Ziad (Democratic Front for Peace and Equality): There will be a Palestinian state in this region, just as Israel came into existence. The Palestinians will get what they want. It doesn't depend on you....

The Prime Minister, M. Begin: Thirdly, the murderous organization known as—

T. Ziad (Democratic Front for Peace and Equality): Which is the leader of the Palestinians, and is recognized by the Palestinian nation and the U.N.

Z. Atshi (Change and Initiative): What leader? For you, perhaps.

The Prime Minister, M. Begin: I would like to say to the mayor of the Israeli town of Nazareth that since the Nazis there has not been an organization so barbaric and inhuman as that known as the PLO.

T. Ziad (Democratic Front for Peace and Equality): That's what you say. That's demagoguery, that's not true. It is the recognized representative of the Palestinian people....

The Speaker, Y. Shamir: I call on the Knesset Members to refrain from any further interruptions, and on the Prime Minister to continue....

The Prime Minister, M. Begin: Of course I'll continue. Did you think I wouldn't? I repeat, the murderous organization known as the PLO is not and will not be a factor in the negotiations. We had the satisfaction of hearing the U.S. President compare it with the Nazis, because that organization seeks not only to overthrow Israel—which it will never do—but to make the civilian population the target of its attacks. And now it is in internal turmoil, and is beset by internecine strife. You know very well what is happening in Beirut. Observe it well and learn your lesson, gentlemen. One day you too may be the victims of that organization.

M. Wilner (Democratic Front for Peace and Equality): At the inter-parliamentary conference the Knesset's delegation heard the PLO representative agree to peace with Israel on the basis of the establishment of a Palestinian state in the West Bank and Gaza....

The Prime Minister, M. Begin: The subject of Jerusalem was also raised at Camp David. It was proposed that the flag of an Arab country be raised above the Temple Mount. We refused, and the flag was lowered

before it was raised....We made it clear that Jerusalem, the eternal capital of Israel, is under Israeli sovereignty and will never be divided again....

With regard to the settlements, we made it clear that existing settlements in Judea, Samaria, Gaza and the Golan Heights would be strengthened by the addition of more families....I promised President Carter that during the negotiations for a peace treaty, i.e., during the next two or three months, new civilian settlements would not be established....I have a letter from President Carter stating that wherever the terms "Palestinians" or "Palestinian Arabs" are used the reference is to what we call "the Arabs of the Land of Israel," and that wherever the phrase "the West Bank" is used the reference is to what Israel calls "Judea and Samaria."...

A. Linn (Likud): I would like to know what the phrase "the legal rights of the Arabs of the Land of Israel" means?

The Prime Minister, M. Begin: Everyone uses his own language. We say "the Land of Israel" and "Judea and Samaria." That is what we agreed, and that is what will be. Neither at Camp David nor at the White House did we sign a secret document. All the documents have been published and are in front of you....

I realize that at present we are going through a period of what might be called "birth pangs." This is a free nation, with differing views within it. This is a democratic parliament, with different parties, and differences of opinion within parties. But this is one of the major events of our generation. After thirty years, after five wars, bloodshed, bereavement and orphanhood, we have reached the moment when, by making great sacrifices, we can sign a peace treaty with an Arab nation numbering more than forty million people. After that there is hope, a basis for believing, that the day is not far off when we will sign a peace treaty with our other neighbors. It is a turning-point which can without a doubt be called historic. We pray that our course succeeds and that the peace we all long for comes. We have made every effort and sacrificed as much as we could so that that day may come.

We lay the documents before you. Each one of you must think the matter through, consult his conscience and vote as he thinks fit. I call on all the Knesset Members, irrespective of party group, to do this. I only ask that all the Knesset Members, the representatives of a noble nation which has suffered a great deal, fought a great deal, sacrificed a great deal, to appreciate the moral significance of this turning-point. For thirty years we hoped that the moment would come when we would sit down face-to-face to sign a peace treaty, with the complete normalization of relations, the cessation of wars, the assurance of life not only to our generation but to our children and our children's children. This is a great moment....

S. Peres (Alignment): Mr. Speaker, distinguished Knesset, at the meeting of the Labor Party yesterday a twice-bereaved mother, an example of heroism for the entire nation, Rivka Gruber, addressed the audience, saying: "The peace we all hoped for is within our grasp. Can we let it elude us? If we do there will be no justification for our existence. We must take risks for peace just as we must endanger ourselves in war."...That is a great Zionist truth. After all, we hoped to implement Zionism by peaceful means, not by war. It was the Arab side, not the Jews, which always refused to make peace. It was also that side which brought wars upon us, and had we not been victorious, even at a high price, there would be no Jewish side....

I congratulate the government and the Prime Minister unreservedly for the difficult but necessary decision to go towards peace, at a price which it had seemed would be too high for this government, to relieve itself of its commitments, preconceptions and ideology and progress towards a new direction in the history of the Middle East....I would like to express my appreciation of President Sadat who, with the support of his people and despite the vociferous opposition of the Arab world, came to Jerusalem, sought peace, offered peace and found a response to peace. I am sure the House is united in its gratitude to U.S. President Jimmy Carter, who displayed resourcefulness, a sense of timing and adherence to the objective, giving unsparingly of his time, efforts and prestige to bridge the gaps on the way to peace.

The birth of peace was accompanied by pain, its progress involved difficult decisions and the negotiations revealed grave mistakes whose repercussions are being felt still today and may have an adverse effect on Israel and its security. The peace treaty before us today also exacts a double price, the price of peace itself, which cannot be avoided, and the price of the mistakes made along the way, which could have been prevented. During the course of the negotiations the government established new settlements in the Sinai and the West Bank, causing damage to Israel, and then was obliged to stop the activities after the damage had been done....At first the government refused to apply Resolution 242 to the West Bank, then hesitated, and finally agreed, again after the damage had been done....It hesitated to sign a declaration of general principles, and then signed detailed and dangerous principles which were not included in the first document. It refused to answer the two American questions, but in the end answered copiously and far more extensively. It did not believe that Sadat would agree to an IDF presence in the West Bank, but erred once more and had to agree to a partial presence. We paid a high price because of those mistakes.

One fine Jerusalem evening this government relinquished all the Sinai. Then it conducted negotiations to try and get something back, but failed. In the Sinai this government crushed Israel's credibility. We had defensible borders with settlements and airfields....The Prime

Minister's arguments for abandoning the airbases, namely, that nowadays a few miles make little difference, were neither credible nor consistent with what the Prime Minister has said in the past....We relinquished a territorial strip from Sharm el-Sheikh to Eilat.

Some people say that this plan is reminiscent of the Rogers Plan. With regard to the Sinai it is worse than the Rogers Plan, which left room for negotiations regarding the fate of Sharm el-Sheikh. We abandoned Sharm el-Sheikh. We relinquished artillery in the Yamit area. That is what we said to one another. That is what we told the settlers. The Prime Minister called that national consensus....The national consensus has sunk in the sands of the Sinai. We have returned to the 1967 borders. We have abandoned a defensible border and airfields, and now the government is saying that the U.N. will constitute the barrier....That is a precedent for the Golan Heights and elsewhere....

We have to come to grips with the grim truth of yesterday and tomorrow, and face the settlers, who were the emissaries of the nation, many of them idealists and new immigrants....Can the Knesset give them an answer which embodies honor, security and credibility?

The situation with regard to the future of Judea, Samaria and Gaza, is no less serious. It now transpires that the autonomy plan is not a substitute for Resolution 242 but a supplement to it, and that the principles contained in that resolution will apply to all the territories. A joint Jordanian-Israeli committee with the elected representatives from the territories will have to decide on the basis of Resolution 242 "the position of the borders and the character of the security needs." We will still have to decide on the border together with security needs. For publicity purposes it is autonomy, in actual fact and in the not too distant future it is withdrawal....The military government will be cancelled, the inhabitants will have the authority to govern themselves and full autonomy. You may choose not to call that a Palestinian state, that is mere semantics, for it will have all the trappings of independent rule, apart from the IDF presence....

In presenting the document at the White House, President Carter read out: "The framework document proposes a five-year transitional period. It also provides for Israeli forces to remain in specified locations during this period to protect Israel's security."...The Authority will decide how things are to be run in Judea, Samaria and Gaza....I do not imagine that it will beg the IDF to stay on there after the five-year period is up. It will be an elected and independent body with an administration and a police force and, most important, with aspirations and the ability to announce them from a formal platform, as regards both the IDF's remaining there and the possibility of self-determination.... What is most amazing is that it is precisely this government which has agreed to recognize "the legitimate rights of the Palestinian nation and its just needs." That puts an end to the historic debate among us. We

have recognized the existence of the Palestinian people. It is not difficult to guess what are the legitimate rights of a nation which constitutes an overwhelming majority on the land where it lives.

It is true that in the exchange of letters the Prime Minister said that the reference was not solely to the inhabitants of Judea, Samaria and Gaza....But it is impossible to state one attitude in a public document and whisper another in a private letter....The position of the Labor Party is that a compromise must be reached....We acknowledged the existence of a Palestinian problem...and advocated resolving it within a Jordanian-Palestinian framework, warning this government that the alternative to this would be a Palestinian entity....

The government has played with definitions of sovereignty, and in my view has lost the chance of attaining defensible borders. It has lost, Israel has lost and peace has lost, because this time the Palestinian people comprises not only the inhabitants of the territories but also, according to the government of Israel, all those who left the territories after 1967. A Palestinian nation with the right of return. The supposed consolation that we can buy land is merely verbal, because in order to buy there must be a willingness to sell, and that does not exist....

This plan does not make our hearts sing, and the responsibility for it is solely this government's. Israel had to accept it or be accused of being responsible for breaking up the Camp David Conference, leading inevitably to Israel's isolation....It would also have harmed our relations with the U.S. and injured President Sadat, the first Arab leader who came to speak frankly about peace. It would have jeopardized the chances of peace in this generation and possibly in generations to come, too.

It is easy to guess what Menahem Begin would have said today had he been in opposition. Geula Cohen said it for him, though not for me. We did not do that because our movement is a responsible one....We did not take the easy course and, although cognizant of the risks and dangers involved, chose to support peace, the only available chance of peace....I know that by expressing support for the Camp David accords we are also indirectly taking upon ourselves the government's mistakes in the past and difficulties in the future....

The expected burden is heavy because if Jordan joins the negotiations it will obviously set new conditions, and if it does not Egypt will make no concessions, and if neither of them do a Palestinian entity will be formed, and if nothing is done the unresolved problem will weigh on the world, on peace and the U.S., strengthening the rejectionist front and leading to the reconvening of the Geneva Conference....

The shaky peace which is now in the process of being born is threatened on all sides, but is on the verge of becoming a living, breathing thing which will change our lives....We have become accustomed to concerning ourselves with Israel's defense. That will not cease. But for

the first time Jewish and Arab parents, the ancient Egyptian and Jewish nations, may experience something new. Fine phrases about vision may become reality. Instead of a Middle East of barbed-wire fences, one of open borders may emerge. Arid battlefields may become fertile wheat fields.

On the basis of our national economy we may erect a second storey of a regional economy; a region criss-crossed by waterpipes, so that ancient deserts may be made fertile; roads which will reveal to all the antiquities of our nation and the changes wrought by hard work, heroism and vision; seas which will support fishermen and holiday-makers; an economy which can produce energy from the light of the sun and the depths of the sea.

We appeal to all the nations of the Middle East to bring peace to the entire region, enabling us to wage the one just war against poverty, sickness, desolation, ignorance, corruption and discrimination. Peace offers new opportunities to the Jewish people. We owe the attainment of peace to those who have fallen in Israel's wars, with the hope of a revival of immigration to this country. The Alignment, the Labor Party and Mapam, will take a part in the efforts for peace, doing everything we can to forge an Israel which is not dependent on the generosity of others or on stock exchanges but lives by the labor of its own hands, one which cultivates its fields rather than living from speculation, a state without masters and servants, one which looks to the future and takes care of its needy....Zionism is not solely a movement for changing the nation's location, it is also a movement for changing the structure of the nation....We will face the dangers the future holds for us with open eyes. I have described them without embellishment. We are aware of the mistakes which have been made and cannot be changed. We believe in the hope of peace. That, in the final event, is what we are all striving for....

M. Arens (Likud): Mr. Speaker, Knesset Members, I would like to raise the painful subject of the settlements in the Rafah area and the Gulf of Eilat, and the Egyptian President's demand—which can be called an ultimatum—that we decide to dismantle them before he will conduct negotiations with us....The demand to remove families from their homes, to uproot farmers from their villages, is unprecedented in modern history and in the relations between civilized countries and peaceloving leaders.

M. Wilner (Democratic Front for Peace and Equality): Civilized countries do not establish colonialist settlements on occupied land....

M. Arens (Likud): In my view, those who represent those settlements and settlers as an obstacle to peace are also in the wrong. That is a distortion of the facts. Only a few days ago they represented the Prime Minister as an obstacle to peace, and that was a distortion of the facts, too....The principal aspect to be taken into account in discussing

whether or not to dismantle the settlements is their value for our security....In this day and age, when the Arab armies possess tanks, planes, artillery and other weapons commensurate with that controlled by all the NATO armies together, what can the settlements do to bolster our defense...? The answer is that they are there, in Judea, Samaria and the Golan Heights, and because they are there, the IDF is also there. In other words, their presence immunizes us against pressure to withdraw the IDF from the territories. That is the tradition of Jewish settlement activity in the Land of Israel ever since Tel-Hai. I think all here are agreed that if we take out one stratum of that wall, if we remove the settlements from the Sinai, that wall will never be as stable and strong again....

As for the actual agreements, we would all have been surprised had there been no differences of opinion between us on such a complex and difficult subject....We all want the basis of our considerations to be objective, uniform and correct. The leader of the opposition, Mr. Peres, has said that that is the painful price we have to pay for peace. Are we really talking about a predetermined problem, as if we were in a store and all we had to decide was whether we were prepared to pay the price for the item and withdraw half our savings from the bank to cover it? That is not the case....

It is true that the Prime Minister has also said that this is the price we have to pay, this is the path to peace, this is the way to assure the lives of our children and our children's children....Which of us can really speak with such confidence about future events...? That is precisely our problem. The part concerning the price is clear, the results are not.... The first rule of decision-making in conditions of uncertainty is to be aware of the uncertainty. Omitting to do so is certain to lead to failure. We learned that the hard way on the eve of the Yom Kippur War, when the decision not to mobilize the reserves was made while ignoring the uncertainties and the various possibilities....

What is certain at this stage is that the Camp David accords oblige us to make concessions. I will refer solely to those with direct security implications....First of all, we will have to return to the Eilat-Nitzana-Yad Mordecai border, abandon the airbases, remove settlements and return to the 1967 border. Secondly, IDF forces will have to withdraw from Judea and Samaria and redeploy, in reduced numbers, in "specified security locations." Thirdly, the security forces will be limited in maintaining law and order in Judea and Samaria in combating the terrorists and a "strong" police force will be established there....

What will happen? The Prime Minister has said that Jordan and Syria will follow in Egypt's footsteps and we will have peace on all our borders, describing that as an inevitable process....I do not think that that phrase is justified, though it is not impossible....The future may be less rosy, however, and Jordan and Syria and the other Arab countries

might not follow in Egypt's footsteps. We will have a separate peace agreement with Egypt, driving a wedge between it and the other Arab countries, and although we will be threatened on our eastern front, our southern front will be quiet....Another possibility is that despite the fact that we have signed a peace treaty with Egypt, when the specter of war looms on the horizon, Egypt will be drawn into the fray....

The future may be even less rosy still. We sign an agreement, withdraw to the Eilat-Nitzana-Yad Mordecai border, start negotiations with Jordan, these break down, there are sufficient causes to threaten war, tension develops between us and Egypt, the caricatures we have seen in the past depicting our prime minister as Shylock start appearing in the Egyptian press, we sever ties and find ourselves in the same situation as we were in May 1967, with war threatening Ashkelon and Eilat and with 6,000 soldiers trapped in strongholds in Judea and Samaria.

S. Aloni (Citizens' Rights Movement): Can't your imagination work in the direction of peace?

M. Arens (Likud): None of us can say that all that is unlikely. The problem confronting us is that we do not know what the future will bring. Our problem is not one of buying a product but of taking risks, I would even say gambling, buying a lottery ticket....Should a country which is facing a security problem act on the basis of its rival's assumed intentions or its known capacity...? The lesson that world history has taught us is that a country which acts on the basis of another country's assumed intentions without taking its assumed capacity into account is liable to make a very grave mistake....

Israel's defense strength consists of the IDF, the men, the equipment and the defense borders we reached and which the whole world has agreed we need....Now the Camp David accords say that we must return to the borders of 1967 in the south, and possibly on the other borders too, eventually....

The Prime Minister, M. Begin: How can you say that we are returning to the borders of 1967 when Egypt is not entering the Gaza Strip?

M. Arens (Likud): We are returning to the Eilat-Nitzana-Yad Mordecai border. As regards the Gaza Strip, our position will be very similar to what it was in the past....I would like to remind the House and the Prime Minister that he cited Mr. Eban in calling the 1967 borders "Auschwitz borders." He has also said that the 1967 borders are an invitation to wage war on us, and that is the danger. Thus, the question every MK must answer today is, after assessing all the hopes and hazards, to which borders should we commit ourselves? We have made far-reaching concessions in the peace plan....We have agreed to withdraw to positions which seemed to us to be the last line in the Sinai and in

Judea and Samaria. Concessions more far-reaching than those, such as are proposed by the Camp David accords, impose unreasonable risks on us and could constitute an invitation to wage war on us in the future instead of paving the way to peace. I oppose them.

...

Z. Warhaftig (National Religious Party): Mr. Speaker, gentlemen, I would like to begin by thanking the Prime Minister, the Foreign Minister, the Minister of Defense and the Israel delegation to the peace negotiations at Camp David and all those who had a hand in the efforts to attain peace....I must admit to being concerned about the sacrifices this peace obliges us to make. I would have been surprised if the need to uproot settlements had not led to consternation. That decision will inflict educational damage and weaken the pioneering spirit....

It gladdens me to know that after approximately one hundred years of the Zionist revival, after thirty years of the Jewish state, there is a basis for peace with the largest Arab country at present, but with the hope that other Arab countries will follow suit, and there is a chance that warfare will end. Zionism and the State of Israel have done a great deal to liberate the Middle East from the yoke of foreigners, servitude and colonialism....The time has come for the Arab countries to repay Israel the moral debt they owe it and for Israel to be able to live in peace with its neighbors....

Despite all the hesitations and doubts, I am in favor of taking the long and painful road which leads to peace, for the road of war is longer and more painful....The recognition of Israel's right to exist by Egypt and the beginnings of this by Jordan and Syria, even within the 1967 borders, is a great victory for the Zionist idea and practice....

The tidings of peace are like a rose among the thorns, however, and the thorns are very manifold. The greatest fear is that the abandonment of the settlements will be regarded as a precedent to be applied elsewhere, though the sanctity of the Sinai for Jews is not like that of Judea and Samaria....There is no need for us to be too anxious, however, for we are still strong enough to insist on our settlements remaining in Judea and Samaria....

Another apprehension is the mistrust of the Arabs' sincere desire for peace. I do not know why we should have those doubts....We may be witnessing cultural and psychological changes among the neighboring countries, and in Egypt in particular. Egypt is also weary of war and seeks peace....And if they want peace, they will reach the conclusion that just as there is no war without sacrifices, neither is there peace without sacrifices. We see that there is an ever-widening rift within the Arab camp....Although there are some among them who believe that the conflict will be decided only by the sword, there are others who wish to put their weapons away and strive for economic and cultural development, with peaceful relations with Israel. Why should we not try that

course after decades of the other? Let us not be those of little faith, let us try the other course and hope that it succeeds.

Although there are differences of opinion within the party I represent, I would like to commend the Prime Minister for bringing the subject *en bloc*, i.e., calling on us to approve the Camp David accords as well as the dismantling of the settlements....The agreement which has already been signed by our Prime Minister states that we recognize Egypt's sovereignty over the whole of the Sinai....How can we expect Jewish settlements to remain there against their will...? To separate the two subjects would be dishonest and would involve sidestepping the basic issue of agreeing to peace and accepting Egypt's condition....We are taking a difficult course, let us pray that it succeeds and peace comes to Israel.

M. Shamir (Likud): Mr. Speaker, distinguished Knesset, Mr. Prime Minister, I have no confidence in you, in the path you have chosen, in your policy or in you. I do not know if someone has cheated us, I have been cheated and I think that the nation has been cheated. I was told that the settlements in the Sinai would not be uprooted, but yesterday attempts were made to put pressure on the Likud party group....First we heard that getting the Soviets out of the Middle East was the main point as far as the Americans are concerned. Now we hear that the Americans are trying to bring the Soviets back into the picture. We were told that the Camp David conference and the peace plan and the meetings with Sadat relieved us of the dangers of the Geneva Conference. Now the Americans are trying to get us to the Geneva Conference again.

We were told that the Americans would help us build airfields in the Negev, and now we hear that they are delaying approval for the necessary funds until the issue of the settlements in Judea and Samaria is clarified....Was territorial compromise an obstacle to peace? Of course it was, because it meant that the Arabs would have to give something up, and from this plan it is evident that the Egyptians will give nothing up....

Let us stop beating about the bush and go straight to the simple facts....Sadat will be prepared to sign the so-called peace with us on the model of the Sinai, namely, if we withdraw completely from all the territories and uproot all the Jewish settlements. Only yesterday that was against the national consensus in whose name you spoke, Mr. Prime Minister, representing what you termed "the irrelevant fringes of Israeli public opinion."...Today it is the center of Israeli policy....

When I say that I do not believe, I do so with pain, Mr. Prime Minister. If you may speak of your pain regarding the uprooting of settlements, I may also do so with regard to you, your government and the Likud. I do not know how to believe that Jerusalem will not be similarly relinquished. In my view, the die has been cast. All that is left are my words here....Mr. Prime Minister, your policy is based on the assump-

tion that there is no basis for the Zionist enterprise in the Land of Israel....

(From the floor: There's a limit to stuff and nonsense!)

At Camp David you succumbed to the pugnacious and narrow-minded pressure of that evil man, Sadat, which was intended to humiliate us, saying that he would not even begin talking to you if you did not dismantle the settlements....Why did you give in to him...? For Sadat that means that wherever we are it is not by right, that we are occupying Arab land....At Ismailia you still had the wisdom and pride to say that land taken in a defensive war belonged to the victor by right....By uprooting the settlements you legitimize the Arab contention that we have no right to the land....

I have no confidence in a policy which confuses what it regards as certain with what has been promised, agreed on and signed. On the subject of Jerusalem the government presents its position and the Knesset's decision as if it were something certain. But there is Sadat's demand and Carter's letter reminding us of the American position that the annexation of East Jerusalem is illegal....

We have heard examples. We have heard how the Israeli delegation approved the concept of the legitimate rights of the Arabs of the Land of Israel, the Palestinians. But we opposed that. Because of that we were on the verge of a crisis in the past, and now we have suddenly accepted it.... It is evident that the argument is with you, Mr. Prime Minister. Though it grieves me to do so, I will give you another reason why I do not believe you. There was a time when the Likud was fiercely opposed to the "Peace Now" movement and accused its supporters of misleading the public.... I think that those who suggest that we approve this agreement are misleading the public.

I have no confidence in principles which demand that we deal such a heavy blow to settlers, farmers, land that has been settled by Jews.... Zionism is not a matter of formulae and decisions. Zionism is people. It is people who are prepared to make the greatest sacrifices, endure the severest trials....The blow which has been struck at the settlements in the Sinai is a blow to the human element in us, a blow to the Jew who has stood up straight and been prepared to fight back....I have the impression that by making this decision this government has returned to a state of receiving the charity of others, of begging for handouts, of bowing one's back to those who are one's benefactors.

Finally, this peace for which everyone is demanding that we make such great sacrifices is false. Peace based on Israeli submission is not peace....It will not bring us tranquillity. In its wake will come a rise in terrorism and constant unrest....We are being sold false illusions.

Z. Wertheimer (Movement for Change and Initiative): What does your peace look like?

M. Shamir (Likud): My peace is one with a strong Israel which insists on its demands and the justice of its claims—

S. Aloni (Citizens' Rights Movement): From the Euphrates to the Nile.

M. Shamir (Likud): The Israel of Tel-Hai, Mishmar Ha'Emek and Negba. An Israel of settlements which have not been uprooted from the Negev. An Israel which keeps its word. I would like to appeal to the Knesset Members to examine their consciences carefully....We are jeopardizing our existence, we are beginning a descent from which there is no return, we are endangering the desire of our younger generation to live among us. Let us prevent this injustice, this disaster....Let us not be led astray by delusions, by forgeries, by words. The Knesset must appear as the backbone of the nation, must show that it will not swallow this fraudulent scheme....A new formula can be found....We must refuse to accept this poisoned potion....

H. Grossman (Alignment): Mr. Speaker, distinguished Knesset, Israel's citizens are divided today into those who are glad, those who are mournful and those who are apprehensive. I am not one of those who are mournful, I am one of those who are happy but are also apprehensive. The agreement is still very fragile, and what was achieved at Camp David can easily be lost....I am sure that the Prime Minister knows that most of the nation wants peace and is aware of its price....There is nothing to fear from the nation, and there is no need for the Prime Minister to continue with his customary high-flown rhetoric about honor and straightening backs when the situation is painful. There is no honor greater than telling the nation the truth, no courage higher than facing it and convincing it that the most painful peace is infinitely preferable to the pain of bereavement of the most successful war.

My joy is mixed with sadness because of the necessity of uprooting settlements....The settlement activists who are engaged in vociferous protests, and for whom the Prime Minister has inexplicable affection, do not impress me....The creature you fashioned has risen up against you, tying down the IDF and using up its resources after having become accustomed to being permitted to go against the government, the Knesset and the law....

We members of the agricultural sector are particularly sensitive to abandoning land which one has plowed, sown and harvested....That might be one of the reasons why we could not usually countenance the supplanting of farmers of the neighboring nation from land which they had plowed and sown and planted....We wanted to see the settlements in the Rafah area as a defense belt from El-Arish to Sharm el-Sheikh, cutting Gaza off from Egypt. We never regarded the Rafah area as a purely territorial achievement....We advocated border adjustments for security purposes in the Rafah area and the West Bank. In the final

event, however, the Zionism of "not one inch" has gone bankrupt, and the founding fathers of Zionism who advocated settling the maximal number of Jews on the minimal possible area of land were right. The situation we have reached eleven years after the Six Day War is a minimal number of Jews on the maximal area of land. That is not true Zionism and does not embody security for our state. Perhaps the time has finally come for the nation to discover Galilee, the Negev and the Arava, which are almost empty of Jewish settlements. Once peace comes I hope that many Jews will immigrate to Israel, and that is the greatest Zionist vision for me.

The Prime Minister and the Foreign Minister sought to put the responsibility for the dismantling of the settlements in the Sinai on the Knesset. The only person who said straightaway that the choice was between an agreement or settlements in the Sinai was the Minister of Defense. That is the sad truth which a brave leader has to face fairly and squarely, or be accused of cowardice and failure to accept responsibility....Egypt is the most important Arab country with the greatest military potential. Taking it out of the circle of war against us makes the greatest contribution to our security, despite all our pain over the settlements in the Sinai....There is no security greater than peace itself.

I do not begrudge the fact that the agreement with Egypt has been attained during the rule of the Likud under the leadership of Menahem Begin, provided the Prime Minister ceases trying to confuse the issue, using linguistic trickery and flights of rhetorical fancy. I presume that this was the only peace that could have been attained in the political circumstances obtaining at Camp David. We will not cast aspersions on what was achieved, but we will criticize the continuing demagoguery....It's time the Prime Minister began calling a spade a spade, acknowledging that "Palestinian people" means just that and "legitimate rights" means precisely what it says....There's nothing to be ashamed of. Did you promise President Carter to freeze settlement activities for the three months of the negotiations or the five years of the transition to autonomy, as the President announced...? I understand that there can be no negotiations with the inhabitants of the West Bank in the shadow of new settlements. There is a political connection between the two parts of the agreement. There's no reason to hide that. The nation will understand, even though the Prime Minister and the Minister of Education incited Gush Emunim to act against the decisions of the Knesset and the Alignment government. Even though the Prime Minister promised that during his term in office many new settlements would be established. But this is a democratic country, and the majority will decide, not a handful of fanatical extremists.

When you brought the plan for autonomy in Judea and Samaria plus Israeli sovereignty as the solution to the Palestinian problem we criticized you fiercely, advocating a territorial compromise. We claimed

that your plan was evasive and dangerous, embodying the delusion of ruling one million Arabs forever in exchange for the Sinai. With President Carter you reached the formula of autonomy as a transition stage....In the final event you both came up against a blank wall. Your movement has always preached totem and taboo, while mine has advocated attaining defensible borders. Your slogan of sovereignty was offset by our demand for border adjustments for defense purposes. We do not wish to rule one million Arabs.

I suggest that we refrain from spoiling what has been achieved by idle chatter. Perhaps the government is relying on the Arab rejectionist front, because the Palestinian leaders have always had a special talent for spoiling their own chances....They still adhere to the path which the Prime Minister has only recently abandoned of all or nothing. The Camp David accord was attained by virtue of the previous stages and the process of the conclusion of the war. There was the separation of forces. There were the interim agreements of the Alignment government and which the leader of the opposition of the time termed "Munich agreements."

I suggest that we refrain from boasting. The Palestinians on the West Bank and the Gaza Strip deserve to be allowed to express their national yearnings. The Palestinian tragedy derives primarily from a leadership which thrives on working itself into a frenzy of enthusiasm and fanaticism, but that tragedy does not serve Israel's interests....We are walking a tightrope between Jordan and the Palestinians....We do not want Israeli sovereignty over Judea and Samaria, but neither do we want a separate Palestinian state. We believe that the Palestinians should implement their right to self-determination through association with Jordan. In the final event, however, the Palestinians will decide for themselves....

M. Wilner (Democratic Front for Peace and Equality): Mr. Speaker, Knesset Members, the positive aspect which emanates from the Israeli public at present is the fierce desire for peace. This has been a test. It transpires that the major part of the nation gladly accepts peace and is ready to slaughter the sacred cows of both the Likud and the Alignment. We have always advocated peace, peace with the Arab peoples, and first of all with the other nation which dwells in this land with us, the Palestinians. By doing so we expressed the true feelings of the entire nation, it now transpires. Such phrases as "no more war," "no more bloodshed," "no more widows and orphans," "no more bereaved parents," are sacred and we will do our utmost to see that they are fulfilled.

Peace is the supreme interest of both the Israeli and the Arab nations. Peace is the key to security, for without peace there is no security....Our assessment of the Camp David accords is based on its contribution to a genuine and just peace....We are forced to conclude that they have not led to a substantial change in the policy of the Likud gov-

ernment and its leader Begin. They have not led the Begin government to abandon the idea of the Greater Land of Israel. He signed the Camp David accords under American pressure. He is prepared to return the Sinai to Egypt and apparently also the Golan Heights to Syria in order to hold onto the Greater Land of Israel. That is nothing new, really. We all know that the National Unity Government of the Alignment and the Likud decided already in July 1967 to hand the Sinai back to Egypt and the Golan Heights to Syria if they agreed to leave the West Bank and the Gaza Strip in Israel's hands and abandon the Palestinians completely.

Now, at Camp David, President Sadat has signed the Likud government's "autonomy" plan....That is the significant change which Camp David has brought about. Sadat has agreed that the IDF should continue to rule the Palestinians in the West Bank and the Gaza Strip for five years and more, and the Prime Minister has said that we will continue to demand Israeli sovereignty over the territories....He has also said that existing settlements will be expanded and after three months the government will discuss establishing new ones. Is that a policy of peace? Is it not a prescription for renewed war...?

The main issue which should have been dealt with at Camp David is not the Sinai or the Golan Heights, it is an independent state for the Palestinians on the West Bank—including East Jerusalem—and the Gaza Strip, and it is unfortunate that Sadat seems to have forgotten things he originally said....The decision to establish a Palestinian state was made thirty years ago by the U.N....

E. Moyal (Alignment): They refused in 1947.

M. Wilner (Democratic Front for Peace and Equality): If a specific leader refused that doesn't mean that a nation is to be deprived of its basic right to self-determination and an independent state. At Camp David it was decided to deprive the Palestinians of that right, and it is strange that that has not been mentioned here. If it had been decided to leave that central issue open, that would have been marginally better...but Carter, Sadat and Begin agreed at Camp David that on no account would there be an independent Palestinian state, the Palestinian people would not be allowed to determine its own fate and that of its occupied lands, and only Palestinian collaborators would sit with Hussein, Sadat and Begin to discuss matters....

No one has the right to tell another nation it has no right to a state of its own....That kind of approach can have a boomerang effect. It is in Israel's own best interests, for the sake of its security, for the sake of its younger generation, to enable the Palestinian people to attain a state of its own....We are embarking on a dangerous adventure. Who empowered Sadat to conduct negotiations on behalf of the Palestinians? That is megalomania. He scarcely represents the Egyptians. There is widespread opposition to him in Egypt. All the Arab nations oppose the

Camp David accords. Most of the Egyptians oppose that dictatorial ruler, and everything he does is built on sand....

The Prime Minister has omitted to mention a secret clause in the Camp David accords, namely, that he has agreed to the establishment of an American naval base in Israel, as well as other U.S. military bases, if required, for the protection of the "free world."...In other words, Israel may be dragged into a global conflict which does not concern it....We oppose the Camp David accords and the establishment of U.S. military bases in Israel. We do not wish to replace British occupation with American occupation. We want an independent, peace-loving Israel with a foreign policy of non-alignment.

Genuine peace will come to us only by means of a comprehensive peace with Egypt, Syria and Jordan, and first of all with the Palestinians, through the Geneva Conference with the participation of all the parties concerned, including the recognized representative of the Palestinians, the PLO, with the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. in the chair....All the neighboring countries and the PLO are prepared to recognize the independent State of Israel within the borders of 4 June 1967. I propose that on that basis the Knesset sign a peace treaty with all the neighboring countries, including the Palestinian state, thereby bringing true peace and genuine security to the region.

...

S.J. Gross (Aguda): Mr. Speaker, distinguished Knesset, there is no doubt that we are facing a very difficult, even crucial and cruel, decision...."Peace" is a magical word. It is the word we use to greet one another each day. On the face of things it would seem that the yearned-for day has arrived and we are on our way to peace. Nonetheless, the hands of all of us will shake as we raise them to approve the Camp David accords, first because of the high and painful price we are being asked to pay, and second because we do not know how genuine Egypt's intentions are....No one can know the answer because the future is unknown and we need a great deal of Divine assistance to reach genuine peace. Nonetheless, my party group has decided to vote in favor of approving the Camp David accords....

For thirty years we have been awaiting the day when we could sign a peace treaty with our neighbors, or at least one of them....That day is now approaching, and we cannot reject the hand proffered to us in peace....We have known thirty years of war and tension, bereavement and suffering, and we must take the chance of peace, even though the price is high....Could we accept the responsibility for rejecting the opportunity being offered to us...? Apart from anything else, it would heighten still further our isolation in the world....

The U.S. President, Jimmy Carter, has jeopardized all his prestige in order to lay the foundation for peace in the Middle East. For that purpose he shut himself in at Camp David for almost two weeks, neglecting

all his other duties as leader of a Great Power, with the backing of the entire American nation. From the viewpoint of security, economics and global strategy, how could we turn our backs on the U.S. President and the American people? Neither the world nor the majority of the Israeli nation would have understood it had we refused to accept peace at the price of dismantling the settlements in the Rafah area, however close they are to all our hearts....

After two weeks of exhaustive and exhausting discussions at Camp David, the Prime Minister rose to the occasion and, out of a sense of the supreme responsibility of a leader who understands the heart of the nation and loves it wholeheartedly, he and his companions decided to sign the framework agreement....The Prime Minister was right to leave the decision about removing the Rafah settlements for the Knesset....We must take that difficult decision upon ourselves so as not to miss this historic opportunity of signing a peace treaty with Egypt and laying the foundation for peace with all our neighbors. The hopes and the hazards are intertwined. No one can predict what the morrow will bring and what developments may follow, but we must take the first step, and if not now, then when...?

Many people ask, rightly, how it can be that Menahem Begin, the member of the IZL and the underground, the great patriot, is prepared to make such far-reaching concessions....King Solomon, the wisest of men, gives us an explanation in Proverbs: "The king's heart is in the hand of the Lord, as the rivers of water: he turneth it whithersoever he will."...Thus, Begin the member of the IZL and of Herut, Begin the leader of the opposition, is not like Prime Minister Begin. The decision is not in his hands. We believe that it is the hand of Divine Providence that has brought Menahem Begin to power at this time and led him to sign peace agreements with Egypt out of the sense of responsibility of a leader who has had to abandon principles which were sacred in order to prevent war and bloodshed. The success of the peace agreements depends to a great extent on our unity at this fateful moment....To my religious colleagues and the members of Gush Emunim I would like to say that the Messiah has not yet come, and we must still pray for complete redemption.

We must make sure that settlement activity is stopped during the course of the peace negotiations, so that these are not jeopardized. I appeal to the members of the government to say as little as possible, because the various conflicting statements harm us....During the negotiations with Egypt every effort must be made to avoid dismantling settlements, possibly by offering other concessions....We hope that the peace treaty with Egypt will be signed in another two or three months, but we are concerned at the prospect of free and open communication between Israel and Cairo. This could lead to moral deterioration, the establishment of joint nightclubs and places of entertainment, assimi-

lation and the erosion of our unique Jewish character and values....This has happened in our distant past, and we must not let it happen again....

Consequently, once the peace treaty with Egypt is signed, the government of Israel must devote itself to tackling internal problems, improving the education system and heightening the sense of attachment of Israel's children to our holy places. The government must allocate more funds for welfare purposes, reducing social gaps and improving the work ethic. Internal peace and a good, healthy society based on the values of religion and morals will assure genuine and stable peace....

...

S. Hillel (Alignment): Mr. Speaker, Knesset Members, in all this government's policy statements and actions it is difficult to disentangle deception from self-deception, denial from denigration. By now everyone knows that this government has denied the traditional principles and positions of the Likud and the NRP, and above all Israel's defense needs. But worse still are the attempts to obscure the issue which have accompanied every step this government has taken. At first they denied having promised Sadat Egyptian sovereignty over the whole of the Sinai, claiming that the Prime Minister's "chemistry" had had its effect. After that they had to change their tune and explain that had they not said that Sadat would not have come....

When we said that the true significance of the government's plan for the Sinai was abandoning the belt of settlements which assured our security, the government denied that vehemently and even began selling plots of land in Yamit....Now that it is evident to everyone that the autonomy plan involves our complete withdrawal from the West Bank, the government is selling land there. This is a government with an ideology of land speculation. We have all heard the pathetic descriptions of the way our delegation at Camp David worked, what it worked so hard on and at what time its members went to bed. For that they are to be praised, but not for the result, which smacks of dictates, an imposed settlement and submission to an ultimatum. Otherwise how can one explain Israel's undertaking to build a road between Egypt and Jordan near Eilat...? For what purpose and why...? And that is just one example of many....

At Camp David our delegation walked about in an Americans' paradise, but its members knew perfectly well that they had to give President Sadat and President Carter what they wanted. Upon arriving in the U.S. the Prime Minister said that he regarded it as his duty to enhance the prestige of the U.S. President That objective was indeed attained in full, and the price is primarily the fate of the West Bank and the Golan Heights, because the Sinai was sold in advance. What was it President Sadat used to say? "The Sinai is not a problem." The Sinai with a road thrown in gratis.

At Camp David you walked about as if in wonderland—golf courses, bicycles, a rocking horse, colored balloons and the compliments flying. It was in fact Disneycamp. And you accepted dictates and decisions appropriate to the concepts of the world of Alice in Wonderland, playing "pretend" and "opposites:" granting autonomy and cancelling the military government—the only authority for issuing legislation, including the sequestration of land—holding elections, establishing an Arab police force and closing the IDF in camps, while at the same time saying that there would be no foreign rule and nothing had happened. Is that deception or self-deception...?

You have undertaken to remove settlements and to establish no new ones in the West Bank, while at the same time the Prime Minister speaks of expanding existing settlements....We are witnessing boasting, self-aggrandizement and a lack of realism. The Prime Minister has stated in public that the IDF will remain in the West Bank for more than five years....That is all very well and good, but until quite recently he was saying that the settlements in the Sinai under Egyptian sovereignty would be defended by "Israel's security forces." Now it transpires that it was just an empty boast, or perhaps deception....

Even before the negotiations began we had relinquished the West Bank, just as we had relinquished the Sinai....The autonomy plan will inevitably lead to the establishment of a Palestinian state....In the West Bank the government is repeating the mistake it made regarding the Sinai. We have maneuvered ourselves into a position whereby once Hussein and the Palestinians come into the picture we will appear as those who are unmindful of the great sacrifice they are making, of the risk they are taking, and because we have nothing to give we will doubtless throw a road in free....

Like everyone else in Israel, I pray for the success of the peace negotiations with Egypt, and together with my party group I will vote for the proposal to approve the Camp David accords....But I do not accept the government's course at the beginning of the negotiations and its concessions today. What we are talking about is not the "price of peace" which we are supposedly being asked to pay, but the precariousness of the peace which will not be based on defensible borders. Above all, I vehemently reject the distorted idea of autonomy, which is a sure prescription for the establishment of a Palestinian state and the overthrow of the agreement, especially if the policy of establishing settlements in the West Bank is adhered to....

The government's ideas and actions in the West Bank will lead either to a direct confrontation with Egypt, the U.S. and Jordan—if it joins the process by then—or to the daily deterioration of the situation and the weakening of our hold on the Jordan Valley, the Etzion Bloc and the Golan Heights. The deterioration will not only pertain to security, it will also be moral, and the latter has already begun, being a direct and

inevitable result of the government's policy....At Camp David Begin was in a cleft stick, caught between accepting dictates or being responsible for the collapse of the talks....He will drag us into that situation again with his policy of all or nothing, which always ends with nothing....

We would all be betraying our mission if we were to let things happen in the future as they have now. We must take steps to prevent a recurrence of what happened at Disneycamp—submission to dictates accompanied by verbal pyrotechnics and denials....We should have taken action ten months ago and since then....My colleagues in the opposition have not done enough to encourage a dialog with the Arab countries, perhaps because they failed to realize that those who demand everything vociferously relinquish everything off-handedly. The members of the coalition who are protesting today did not want to see the outcome of this process and work to prevent it when that was still possible, either because they still believed that their leader would not let them down and deny his statements, or because they hesitated to harm their young coalition.

Now they have woken up, but too late, and it is doubtful whether the damage can be repaired. But it is not too late with regard to the Golan Heights, the Jordan Valley, the Etzion Bloc and Jerusalem, if we act wisely and well, beyond party interests and coalition or opposition convenience. I appeal to all those who are concerned for Israel's security to act in partnership henceforth, to prevent the continuation of the path which involves pulling the wool over people's eyes, deception and self-deception, denial and denigration, and to prevent the end-of-season sale which will become a closing sale which we are currently witnessing.

...

Y. Sarid (Alignment): Mr. Speaker, distinguished Knesset, if the Prime Minister had returned from Camp David empty-handed, if the peace initiative had fallen by the wayside, I would have condemned him.

The Prime Minister, M. Begin: I would still have survived.

Y. Sarid (Alignment): But as you saw, it helped nonetheless. Our prompting during recent months was not in vain all the same, it seems.

D. Shilansky (Likud): If you think that your nagging had any effect, you don't know the Prime Minister and you're very wrong.

A. Rubinstein (Movement for Change and Initiative): Even the Prime Minister's party group thinks it had an effect.

Y. Sarid (Alignment): MK Shilansky, you're preventing me complimenting the Prime Minister. If you listen patiently you'll hear that too.

Now that the Prime Minister has returned with tidings of peace I say, render unto Begin that which is Begin's. Whatever his role in attaining the Camp David accords may have been, I will not detract from his achievement in any way. Anyone who brings peace to Israel will have the country's eternal gratitude. Nine months ago, when the Prime Minister first presented his autonomy plan to the Knesset, we supported him unreservedly....Had not the Foreign Minister made his speech about bayonets there would have been no doubt in our hearts about voting for the Prime Minister's plan and encouraging his efforts. Peace is at the forefront of our concerns, and we will not let any narrow party interests foil it in any way....

T. Eshel (Alignment): Who is "we"?

Y. Sarid (Alignment): A few minutes ago MK Hillel spoke here....I disagreed with a lot of what he said. I understand that he represents you, I am currently representing other colleagues....When the Prime Minister encourages peace he will find us at his side, and when he suppresses the chances of peace he will find us confronting him....

When some of our number said repeatedly over the course of many years that Israel had no interest in having sovereignty over occupied territories and that appropriate security arrangements there would suffice, we were accused of being public enemies. Menahem Begin relinquished the entire Sinai, making do with security arrangements, and he is not a public enemy, and that is his strength. When for many years we said that the price of peace might be the dismantling of settlements we were accused of being heretics. Menahem Begin is now dismantling settlements, and he is by no account a heretic, and therein lies his strength. When we said that the autonomy plan could not be a permanent arrangement and that the bayonets had to be removed from it, we were charged with being defeatists. Menahem Begin turned his plan into a transition plan and removed the bayonets from it, and he is not regarded by the majority of the nation as a defeatist, and therein, again, lies his strength.

When we said that it was necessary to recognize the legitimate rights and just demands of the Palestinian people we were described as traitors. Menahem Begin has recognized their rights and demands, and that is his strength. When we said that a separate and full peace treaty with Egypt was possible we were told that we were in error. Menahem Begin is bringing a separate peace treaty with Egypt before the Knesset today and he is not in error, and that is his strength....Menahem Begin has displayed courage and responsibility at the very last moment....

It would appear that Menahem Begin is about to sign a peace agreement with Egypt which is as good as any which could have been attained, though not because the Prime Minister is a past-master of the art

of negotiations, or because the process was devoid of grave mistakes, inexplicable oddities and unforgivable omissions. He will sign a peace agreement which is as good as any which could have been attained because a basically similar agreement would have been imposed on anyone who conducted the negotiations. Eleven years after the Six Day War there was no escaping a settlement which was imposed to a greater or lesser extent by mighty forces and circumstances which were virtually unalterable.

I have great respect for the Prime Minister for realizing that this is the fateful moment which should on no account be missed, otherwise Israel would be beset by a crisis. But I cannot respect the Prime Minister for continuing to delude the nation, as he has done for many years. When the Prime Minister proclaims with absolute certainty that there will never be a Palestinian state he is deluding the nation, and therein lies his weakness. When the Prime Minister says with complete confidence that what happened with Egypt will not happen with regard to the West Bank and the Golan Heights he is misleading the nation again, and that is his weakness. When the Prime Minister states that many more settlements will be established he is cozening the nation again, and that is his weakness. When the Prime Minister claims that with the Camp David agreement he did not abandon a single one of his principles, he is cheating the nation, and therein lies his weakness. Instead of telling the nation what the situation really is, in order to prepare it for the trials ahead, he gives it an overdose of tranquilizers....Some groups are addicted to those tranquilizers, gladly swallowing tales of the Greater Land of Israel, Israeli sovereignty over Judea and Samaria and endless settlement activities, but they will have to endure a rude awakening in the end....

People are saying that two people will go down in Israel's history, David Ben-Gurion as the founder of the state, and Menahem Begin as the leader who brought peace....Ben-Gurion's place in Israel's history is assured. He proved that it is not enough to have the courage to make decisions, one also needs the courage to see the situation as it really is and realize what its results will be. When he saw it he did not conceal it from the nation, he did not mislead himself or others. He saw the situation for what it was and decided to accept Partition. He was prepared to forego extensive territory and dismantle many settlements. I would like to conclude by quoting what Ben-Gurion said in defense of the Partition proposal: "We are aware of the limits of our strength and the spheres of our opposition. We do not exaggerate our strength and are not entitled to be intoxicated by the wonderful displays of heroism of our youth. We must realize that there are limits to our strength and that we need our might not only for resistance, because we utterly reject the anti-Zionist slogan 'might is right.' We need our might first and foremost for our efforts of construction and creation, for maintaining the

basis of our existence. We must use all our power, but our power is limited, and is required above all for settlement and immigration."

When Menahem Begin signs the first peace treaty and accompanies his action with words which are wise and true, without false visions and unfounded formulae, he will also have made a place for himself in the annals of Israel. When the Prime Minister speaks to his nation not only about might and power but also about the wisdom of strength and its limitations, and when he can distinguish the main points of Zionism from its incidentals, the gate of Jewish history will be open to him and he will go in.

A. Eliav (Sheli): Distinguished Speaker and Knesset Members, we will vote wholeheartedly for the Camp David agreements....This is not quite the peace we had hoped for, and it was not from this stable that we expected it to emerge, but that is no reason not to welcome it. We know what difficult birth-pangs accompanied it and how vulnerable it still is....I would like to paraphrase Shakespeare and say: I am a Jew, an Israeli and a Zionist, like my colleagues in my party. Do we not have eyes, hands, organs, dimensions, senses, affections, passions? You who seek to bring peace today attempted to quash and thwart them. If you prick us, do we not bleed? If you poison us, do we not die? For merely speaking about the legitimate rights of the Palestinians and the need to exchange territories for full peace did not some of you prick us until we bled? Did they not try to kill us politically and socially? Shylock concludes with the words: "If you wrong us, what should our sufferance be? Why, revenge." But I say, no. We will not take revenge. We will not demand our pound of flesh. We will ask only one thing of you and the nation, that you listen to us.

Seven years ago we spoke of the need to return the Sinai Peninsula to Egypt in return for peace, after having demilitarized it with mutual guarantees, and to return to the international border....During negotiations between our two countries our representatives may conclude that the Sinai Peninsula can be turned into a peninsula of peace, with local and international tourism passing through on its way to and from Cairo and Luxor, Tel Aviv and Jerusalem....Perhaps it sounds utopian, but it may yet come to pass....

From the outset we opposed the establishment of settlements across the Green Line, claiming that the territories should be occupied by the IDF, and by it alone, as a pledge against the day when peace came. We said that the young settlers had to be told the truth, namely, that one day, when there was peace, they would have to pay a very high price....

As a veteran settler and pioneer I would like to say that there is no joy for us in the discomfiture of the settlers of the Rafah area. We understand their distress and after today's vote will do everything we can to ensure that the government takes care of them and helps them rebuild their homes in Israel....

I would like to appeal to every individual in every sector of Israel to listen to what we have to say and take heed of the problem which still remains unresolved, that of the Palestinians. It is our duty to issue a Balfour declaration, as it were, for the Palestinians....This would have immense psychological and practical significance....We must take the initiative in this, and not wait for the defeated, confused Palestinians to be the first to express readiness to make peace with us....They are not yet ready for that. Their leaders are still trapped in the dream of revenge and destruction or are plunged into despair from which they cannot emerge without our help....

I believe that a declaration of that kind would have a tremendous effect on both the Palestinians and the entire Arab world....The whole world will regard it as a noble gesture which Israel is prepared to make for peace, after having been victorious in so many wars and despite its historic right to the land it has occupied....We must state our readiness to live in peace alongside a Palestinian state on the West Bank and in the Gaza Strip and whose special relationship with Jordan will be determined by its inhabitants. We must wait patiently until partners for a dialog with us arise from within the Palestinians. We must not be deterred by a lack of reaction or a hostile response to our declaration....

Our two nations, which are small in size but rich in human resources, can live side by side in peace, encouraging cooperation in commerce and trade, culture and science, and constituting a bridge to larger countries in the region and the world....We must do everything we can to bring peace nearer, and first of all by conducting a dialog with the Arabs in general and the Palestinians in particular....We must give the Palestinians in the territories the right to hold political meetings and exchange ideas freely....We do not want to live alongside a nation of sycophants and people with a slave mentality....We must help them to stand up straight, not by relaxing our war against those of them who seek to kill us, but by giving an imprimatur to their basic right to self-determination....

Z. Wertheimer (Movement for Change and Initiative): Distinguished Speaker and Knesset, I congratulate the Prime Minister and the team of ministers on their success in the negotiations at Camp David and their tidings of peace with Egypt. Unfortunately, I must add that I think the negotiations could have been conducted differently, that certain statements were unnecessary and that the timing of the settlement activities was unfortunate in the extreme. In my view, those things created a crisis atmosphere, preventing a dialog and leading to an impasse from which it was possible to emerge only by total and complete submission....We must learn from this experience. I ask the Prime Minister not to allow himself to be led astray by those who do not want this peace and to refrain from making superfluous statements....

We must give thanks today to all the fighters and commanders in the underground movements and the IDF who have enabled us to reach today's debate....It is no coincidence that the negotiations at Camp David were conducted by three senior military men, the former Commander of the IZL and hero of the War of Independence, a former Chief of the General Staff and hero of the Sinai Campaign, and a former Commander of the Air Force and the Military Intelligence Service and a hero of the Six Day War....

But now the turn of the commanders of peace has come, and they must be civilians, people with a new, civilian outlook. I hope the era of wars in Israel's history has ended or is ending. Only a new leadership, one which sees things differently, will be able to lead us out of the state of existence of a military camp. In economics a distinction is made between an entrepreneur and an administrator, one not necessarily being able to do the work of the other....It is incumbent upon the Prime Minister to improve the functioning of this government so that its emphasis will be on concepts of peace, with all that this implies....After fifty years of war this means extensive psychological and educational work with maximal faith and love....

This Knesset and all the leaders of the nation were held captive by the military concept. Throughout this Knesset's term, for over a year, no serious debate has been held on economic or social matters. The only thing it has been concerned with is foreign affairs and defense matters. The Knesset has become another military forum....

As someone who has struggled all his life for pioneering Zionist settlement outside the urban centers, my heart bleeds for the settlers of Yamit and its environs who dreamed of pioneering settlement, built their houses and developed their farms. But I regret to say that we appear to have a double standard, because thousands of people have been trying to settle in Galilee for years. They are Zionists and good people, too. Among the Members of this House there are dozens who have prevented this....Zionism means settling inside the Green Line and in Galilee, too.

Finally, I call on the Knesset and the entire nation to prepare itself for peace, to build it, to cultivate a peace leadership, to develop the economy and society and above all to finally implement the Zionist vision of living in peace and honor....This means being economically self-supporting and not relying on \$2.5 billion from the Americans....

...

S. Aloni (Citizens' Rights Movement): Madam Speaker, Knesset Members, I would like to congratulate the Prime Minister, the Foreign Minister, the Minister of Defense and MK Shimon Peres for having had the courage, after years of illusions, dreams, hopes and lack of realism, to come to their senses and put the situation before us as it really is, telling us that the way is open to peace today and that we have to pay a price for

it....I mention Shimon Peres because the Labor party was at least as responsible for creating illusions, and if there are settlers among us today who have a problem because they thought that they were the emissaries of the government, that misapprehension originated with Golda's government and the Galili document....

What does "uprooting people from their land" in the Rafah area mean? Do we own that land? Having a claim to land also involves a certain amount of time....Zionism never demanded the areas beyond the Rafah-Eilat line. That may have been a mistake, but it did not claim those areas as part of Israel....It did not even annex them. Nor did it annex Judea and Samaria....After the Six Day War the National Unity Government, which comprised almost all the parties, decided not to impose Israeli law on Judea, Samaria and the other territories which we occupied in war but to place them under military rule until peace came.

And now peace has come....Hardly any of the Knesset Members have expressed doubts about the genuineness of the Egyptians' intentions....Attempts have been made to sanctify the attachment to the Rafah area. There are people living in this country who were living in certain places not for eight or five or three years but from the day they were born, and their parents and grandparents had lived there before them, and they were uprooted from their homes. War and peace cause people to move from one place to another....After wars there have been population exchanges all over the world....

E. Olmert (Likud): Do you agree to population exchanges for non-Jews? Don't evade my question. You're always preaching only at Jews. Do you support population exchanges for Arabs too? What is this demagoguery?

S. Aloni (Citizens' Rights Movement): I'm not preaching, I'm simply noting facts....We never demanded that territory, we did not annex it and we did not impose Israeli law on it. We said that we would hold it until we had peace and security. And for someone who speaks about security to give up airfields so lightly is astonishing. But to say that this is the end of Zionism is going too far.

For nineteen years, until the Six Day War, we developed the Lahish and Ta'anak areas, Galilee and the Negev still remain empty, and we absorbed two million immigrants. Isn't that Zionism...? It is true that we suffer from traumas, but so do our Arab neighbors. Their trauma is that it is impossible to live in peace with us because of our expansionism and our dream of the Land of Israel extending from the Euphrates to the Nile....

I propose that we examine the possibility which has opened before us....I am not impressed by what MK Moshe Shamir said about national pride. Sadat also has a problem concerning national pride and sacred

land....There will be peace and with our national pride we will manage by building Israel.

I have heard that many people refuse to vote for the agreement because it hints at the cessation of settlement activity in Judea and Samaria. Where's the logic in that? Do you want additional settlements there, once again misleading people who will sit in the Knesset gallery and demand to be taken care of because the government sent them? Why entrench oneself in the heart of another nation which wants self-determination just as we did?

A. Lin (Likud): In Galilee too?

S. Aloni (Citizens' Rights Movement): No, because there is sovereignty there. The conclusion is to start settling Galilee.

E. Olmert (Likud): You support the agreement and regard it as a model for withdrawal to the 1967 borders.

S. Aloni (Citizens' Rights Movement): I regard it as the first step in extricating ourselves from madness and going towards peace, peace in which we will have a sovereign Jewish state where it will be possible to fulfill Zionism without exploiting others, to which it will be possible to bring large numbers of immigrants and where we will not have to live by the sword. That will not happen until we recognize the rights of others. For that reason we must support the agreement and realize that we are facing a difficult time. We must cultivate anew the dream of building things with our own hands.

The people who oppose peace have distributed a leaflet likening this government to that of Petain in Nazi-occupied France....I want the public to know who the adherents of the Land of Israel are. They say that if the Knesset votes for the breakthrough to peace it will be putting an end to Zionism. That is not so. What we are witnessing is a new message for the Zionist movement. I suggest that each and every Knesset Member examine his conscience and think independently, rather than relying on us, the opposition, to support the agreement. You must support it too.

...

G. Hausner (Independent Liberals): Mr. Speaker, distinguished Knesset, the eyes of the world are focused on the Knesset today and the hearts of the Jewish people beat anxiously in anticipation of what will be said and decided. We are at a crossroads unlike any in the history of the state, and must decide today not in response to the actions of others, not to defend ourselves from dangers, but choosing freely as a nation which is the master of its fate....Whatever decision is made will contain both good and bad, both hope and hazard, and that is why the nation is anxious, divided and thoughtful.

Because of the nature of the problem and because of the concessions we have been asked to make, it is inappropriate to praise the agreement

extravagantly...On the other hand, how can its opponents condemn peace...? This is a time for careful thought as we approach an historical decision and an attempt to foresee the future. The agreement has been brought before the Knesset to reject or accept, because that is the agreement which was obtained....There is no guarantee that this was the only agreement which could have been obtained....The relinquishment of sovereignty over the whole of the Sinai, which was done even before President Sadat came to Jerusalem last year, inevitably involved the dismantling of the settlements....Only history will judge whether that was absolutely necessary....

We are facing a cruel dilemma: everything or nothing, giving up the settlements with the chance of peace, or retaining a settlement and defense advantage with continued hostility. The Prime Minister, the architect of the agreement, is worthy of praise for having risen above party boundaries, shaking off the chains of political platforms and preferring the central national objective. Thus has Menahem Begin been revealed as a statesman and a leader and not merely as the head of a movement and a party.

There are three reasons for our concern. First, will the agreement with Egypt endure and justify the heavy sacrifice? Secondly, will the agreement constitute a precedent for the future determination of borders regarding other areas? Thirdly, we are being required to annul our splendid settlement efforts in the Sinai. No one can know what is in another man's heart. We cannot plumb the depths of President Sadat's mind and know what his intentions, and those of his aides, are. Egypt's agreement to abandon war as a solution to the situation is a political and psychological revolution. It would seem that this time the intention of bringing peace to our two countries is genuine, otherwise why would he have come to Jerusalem, gone to Camp David and risked the hostility of the Arab world...? Sadat could easily have waited for an imposed American solution, which would doubtless have achieved more where Judea and Samaria were concerned...?

There is no guarantee as to what will happen in Egypt after Sadat. It is to be hoped that if an atmosphere of peace prevails it will generate its own momentum and peace will continue. The memory of the destruction wreaked on the region by the wars of the past should also help to maintain peace. Nothing is guaranteed, but we must give it a try. The arrangement regarding the West Bank and the Gaza Strip also gives cause for concern. On no account can the Egyptian example serve as a precedent. Our long, dangerous eastern border will not permit us that....The details of the agreement with Egypt cannot apply to the West Bank, the Gaza Strip or the Golan Heights.

I agree to a Jordanian-Palestinian formula solution. For years my colleagues and I fought for the participation of the residents of the territories in a peace agreement, for without them there can be no permanent

solution. I am pleased to note that the Likud government is implementing that approach. This does not mean that we agree to withdraw to the 1967 border, which was never a recognized international boundary, or that we will agree to remove settlements from there. That will be anathema to us, not peace. We must say this clearly to President Carter, the Arab leaders and the world....There is a very real danger that the autonomy which will be applied in the West Bank and the Gaza Strip may eventually become a Palestinian state. The nation opposes such a state vehemently. We can prevent its emergence not by force but by a sage policy which will make it abundantly clear that the establishment of such a state opposes security and peace. The residents of the Jordan Valley, the Golan Heights and the Gaza Strip may therefore rest assured that they will remain where they are forever.

S. Arbeli-Almoslino (Alignment): Who guarantees them that?

G. Hausner (Independent Liberals): It is regrettable that the previous government, in which I participated, did not manage to establish more settlements along the Jordan Valley, which is the front line for defense, because I do not know whether future settlement activity will be possible in areas which will come under the autonomy arrangement....

The entire nation grieves over the necessity of removing the settlements in the Sinai...My movement has settlements there, too. The government must make another supreme effort to try and keep those settlements in place, possibly by an exchange of territory. But if every effort is to no avail and the dismantling of the settlements is unavoidable, it will be done for the sake of peace, than which there is no higher national interest....The central objective of our national enterprise is to dwell in peace, absorb immigrants, develop the state and advance national values. The opportunity to do that has come. That is genuine, fundamental Zionism.

Those who propose that we vote against the agreement must also see the alternative....Today, after Camp David, it is Israel's complete isolation, endangering our sources of supplies for the IDF and jeopardizing our national existence....The main lesson which emerges from the terrible Holocaust our nation underwent in this generation is that disaster overtook us when we were alone and isolated from the outside and split from within. We must not maneuver ourselves into isolation and internal dissension.

In 1947, when the Jewish nation had to decide whether to accept the partition of Palestine in order to establish a Jewish state, there were grave differences of opinion....In the event, history has proved that those who accepted the chance offered then by the political circumstances were right....Had we not seized that opportunity then it is doubtful whether it would have presented itself again for a long time. That is the situation today, too. The advantages of the agreement before us outweigh

its drawbacks...Consequently, despite everything, we will support the government and vote for the agreement, hoping and praying for peace.

...

G. Cohen (Likud): Distinguished Knesset, it is regrettable that the Prime Minister does not have the courage to stay and listen to what I have to say, but I hope it will reach him. Less than a year ago, when the Prime Minister presented his peace plan to the Knesset, I told him that he was mistaken. Today I tell him something far more serious, that he is misleading the nation, and possibly himself as well...

There is nothing worse than deception. The peace plan is a tissue of deception. My colleagues and I feel that we have been deceived, betrayed, cheated....Not just because the peace plan involves far-reaching concessions, but because the Prime Minister did not see fit to put the conception on the basis of which he has led this movement to the test....This means that we have to ask ourselves: were we really wrong all along, and historical Mapai right, or did our leader simply not have the strength to implement our course...?

There was another simple, democratic deception of the voters. The voters voted for something else, the opposite program to this one. If the leader cannot implement it, if he has been maneuvered into a corner, he should say so to the nation and resign. But he did neither one nor the other. And everyone feels cheated. There is a way back, he has been told to take it, but he refuses to do so....There has been a long series of deceptions, starting with statements about retiring to one of the Rafah area settlements and generally assuring the settlers in the Sinai that they could tend their fields and rest easy, that everything would be alright....Why should we believe him today when he tells us to rest easy, assuring us that everything will be alright...? How many promises have you broken? Why should we rest easy about Jerusalem? Where is your credibility...? You succumbed to pressure once....

For thousands of years this nation was told to give in a little, compromise a little, and the nation refused to do so, for if it had we would not be here today....I am not so naive as to think that compromises are not necessary when one is in power, but one compromises on things that are marginal, not on the central issue, not on the very heart of the Land of Israel....Where are the dozens of settlements which you promised? Why have you granted recognition to the Palestinians, with all that this implies...?

The Prime Minister has often stood here and claimed to speak on behalf of Zionism and love for our country....In my eyes, and not in mine alone, Zionism is readiness to sacrifice something now for the sake of the Land of Israel, and not to sacrifice the Land of Israel for something now. That is how we sent people to fight, to sacrifice themselves. That is how the Prime Minister sent people to the gallows....In all the movements people were prepared to sacrifice themselves for the

Land of Israel. There may be some for whom peace is worth confining Israel to within the Green Line. For us it is not, and for the Prime Minister it was not in the past.

I don't believe in this peace either. I think it is a peace of patches, of deceptions, of cracks. It will not come into existence....Not even for genuine peace am I prepared to give up Judea and Samaria, Bethlehem and Shechem....There are people who are prepared to give up those areas for peace but not Petah Tikva, Ramat Gan or Nahariya. But I am not prepared to give up Judea and Samaria. That is the true Zionist approach, in my view.

But first of all and above all it is the truth which matters. Saying today that the only thing that matters is peace is not the truth. Even the supporters of Peace Now don't believe that. Even they have some point or other which they are not prepared to relinquish for peace....But you continue deceiving us, you avoid answering the question as to what will be done with one million Arabs, and you take the steps which will lead to the establishment of a Palestinian state, without actually admitting it....Menahem Begin once said that the one million Arabs are a headache, but does one cut one's head off because one has a headache? No, one seeks medicines, solutions. The course you have taken is no solution....

If the Prime Minister has to say that he is being forced to withdraw, let him say it, with tears in his eyes, and the nation can decide whether to follow him or not. But without carnivals and celebrations....The Alignment is greatly to blame for the fact that this nation has lost its fighting spirit. It has not been properly educated, of that there is no doubt....But we expected the Prime Minister to keep his promise to the electorate to imbue this nation with vision, raise its motivation, inspire it....Under the Alignment the nation has become dreadfully materialistic, but the Prime Minister has done nothing to change that....If you want peace now, quickly, you have to pay the price, and the price is high....

People don't want to fight, people don't want to die. In order to fight you have to know what you're fighting for, as it once was in this country....I wish to bring the House regards from the settlements. I think the greatest damage has been done internally, not externally....A shadow has been cast over everything the Prime Minister said in the past about the necessity of establishing settlements throughout the Land of Israel, about there being no such thing as an illegal settlement in the Land of Israel, about there being no need to consider timing in settling the Land of Israel....

I would like to conclude by pointing out to the Prime Minister that the fact that the members of his own party oppose his so-called peace plan should be sufficient to make him think again. In the past I said to you, you are mistaken, go back, but now that is impossible, it is a trap from

which there is no escape except by the resignation of the government and holding fresh elections. If the Prime Minister intended from the outset to introduce this plan and make these concessions it was fraud. If that was not his intention and things have turned out as they have he has failed. In either case he should resign....I appeal to the entire House not to vote for the Camp David agreements, because I regard it as a vote against the Land of Israel.

...

Y. Allon (Alignment): Madam Speaker, distinguished Knesset, I heard from a friend from abroad that after the conclusion of the talks at Camp David President Carter phoned former President Gerald Ford to inform him of the success of the conference and congratulate him for his share in this arising from the part he had played in obtaining the interim agreement between Israel and Egypt....I was happy to hear that Prime Minister Begin also met with Dr. Kissinger and congratulated him on his share in attaining the agreement without which Camp David would not have been possible....

I did not really expect a similar display of civility from our Prime Minister, who phoned neither Mrs. Golda Meir to congratulate her on having achieved the interim agreement with Egypt nor Mr. Yitzhak Rabin....But it is as well that we should recall that we have reached this day by virtue of our thirty years as a state, not to mention several decades beforehand. And although Mr. Begin and his colleagues attacked that agreement bitterly and voted against it, that does not alter the facts.

For us, genuine peace is a necessary component of Israel's future security....In order to be genuine it must be based not only on signed agreements, diplomatic relations and normalization, but also on a reasonable balance of forces, one of the bases of which is the strategic territorial aspect, though this does not mean that we mistrust the Arab party to the agreement....

Since the Six Day War, I and many of my colleagues have maintained that peace will not be attained by holding on to all the territories, just as security will not be attained by relinquishing all the territories. When we spoke of the need for defensible borders which scarcely differ in length from the armistice lines of 1949 we did not do so out of any adherence to the principle of territorial compromise. Territorial compromise is not a principle for me. A defensible border is essential, and on certain fronts there is no substitute for it. There are situations in which modern military technology is not enough without the necessary territorial infrastructure. All we want, in effect, are those undramatic border adjustments which can give Israel those borders and leave broad options, allowing certain countries to regain the territory they lost—because of their own fault—and to provide a just solution for the Palestinian problem.

The Rafah area and the other districts not far from the old border in the Sinai were intended to serve as that defensible border. The settlers were directed there not in order to develop private estates or benefit from other people's property, but because we regarded them as a keystone of our political struggle to create a defensible border....I do not know how these negotiations would have ended had I and my colleagues conducted them....But one thing is clear, we would not have relinquished the Rafah area....When President Sadat left Jerusalem he had the whole of the Sinai in his pocket, according to interviews with the Vice President of Egypt, Mr. Tuhamy, which have appeared in the press....

One of the lessons the government must learn is that what happened with the Sinai must not recur regarding our eastern and northern borders....Just because our military capability in the south has been weakened, we must demonstratively strengthen our eastern and northern fronts....We did not conquer territory in order to settle it. We settled in certain areas so that they could serve us in our struggle....I congratulate the Prime Minister for having freed himself of the irrelevant doctrine concerning the Palestinian problem which has accompanied him all his life. It is good that he has acknowledged the existence of the problem, because without it there will be no peaceful solution. It is good that he has invited Jordan to negotiations, because Jordanian involvement in finding a solution for the future of Judea, Samaria and Gaza is a possible alternative to a PLO state in the Land of Israel....

The part of the agreement which concerns the West Bank and Gaza fills me with deep concern. Of course, autonomy will become an interim arrangement—not a permanent solution, as the Prime Minister claims—without enabling a single inhabitant of Judea, Samaria and Gaza to elect freely to accept Israeli or Jordanian citizenship. We must be aware of the danger involved when government is transferred from the military government to the autonomy institutions and extends throughout the occupied territories, because this means that the outlying security areas with their settlements will be under the autonomy institutions and Jordanian law has not been annulled there....That is something which will have to be negotiated....

I still do not know what the term "location" means regarding the re-deployment of our forces. I believe that our forces cannot be enclosed in camps or bases which are cut off from one another. As far as I am concerned, they can leave the inhabited areas and concentrate in the uninhabited mountainous area, with a territorial continuum of camps, bases and fortified settlements. That must be discussed in negotiations.

The Prime Minister, M. Begin: We will show you the map and listen to your advice.

Y. Allon (Alignment): Many mistakes were made in dealing with the conflict over the past year, both in words and in deeds, ever since Presi-

dent Sadat's unforgettable visit...To give just one small example: At about the same time as Prime Minister Begin talked about using one small word, no, in negotiations, President Sadat said "The peace negotiations will be conducted with the spirit of love." Both statements were widely publicized. The upshot was that at Camp David the man who had said "no" relinquished everything, and the man who had said "love" did not give up a single grain of sand....

To the settlers of the Rafah area I would like to say that their pioneering endeavors helped the negotiations. According to the plan, if it is implemented, the region in which they live will be evacuated only at the last stage. It has fallen to them to be the captain who is the last to leave the sinking ship, because their captain was the first to abandon them....

The opposition for which I speak, and which has been attacked so vehemently today by the unbridled speakers of the party whose doctrine has been smashed to smithereens before its eyes, will save the peace plan today, despite its failings. The Prime Minister does not have a majority without us. This opposition is worthy of being treated with greater respect. It certainly acts more responsibly than the oppositions of the past which were led by the present prime minister....

Like other party groups, we will also grant our members the freedom to vote as they choose today....I am convinced that in choosing between the two alternatives before us, between an agreement which has good and bad parts and chaos, there is nothing for it but to give the chance of peace a chance. Consequently, and because peace with Egypt and the normalization of relations with that great and important country may be an historical turning-point, the Alignment will vote for the agreement....

...

The Prime Minister, M. Begin: Mr. Speaker, Knesset Members, at this late hour I do not wish to give a speech, but prefer to talk to friends with whom I have worked for more than thirty years, regardless of party differences, and to this I will add some personal thoughts, for which I beg your indulgence. Why is this night different from all other nights...? Because on other nights we fought and signed armistice agreements, yet the state of war remained in force. Because on other days we signed ceasefire agreements, and the state of war remained in force. Because at other times we signed interim agreements, nonetheless the state of war still obtained. But this night we are discussing the signing of a peace treaty, the first sentence of which will read: "The state of war between Egypt and Israel is terminated." That is the first sentence of all peace treaties.

I would like to tell the entire House that we are fortunate in having lived to see this night. For the first time since the establishment of the state one of our neighbors will announce publicly that the state of war between us is terminated. Forgive me if I introduce a personal note. For

fifty years I have served the nation and its liberation movement, Zionism, and in my old age I have heard certain things which I will not repeat here as they are not worthy of being expressed in the Knesset, but certain things have also been said in the Knesset....Moshe Shamir has accused me of having lost my faith in the justice of Zionism....

M. Shamir (Likud): I didn't say that.

The Prime Minister, M. Begin: I would like to say that in my fifty years of service to the nation and Zionism my belief in the justice of Zionism has not become weaker by a single iota....

But to get to the main point, Camp David....For twelve days and nights we explained incessantly to the U.S. President and all his aides how vital the settlements were in security and moral terms, and how right former governments had been to establish them. President Carter was convinced and tried to persuade President Sadat, and I would like to thank President Carter for that....He tried twice and encountered complete rejection....I consulted our team, and we found ourselves unable to agree to remove the settlements, both because we believed that they should remain and because ours is a parliamentary, not a presidential, regime, and our task is to implement the policy which the Knesset has decided to undertake....But in that case the Camp David talks would have failed, no agreement would have been signed, the Egyptians would have returned to Cairo, we would have come back to Jerusalem and the Americans would have gone to Washington.

But as Prime Minister I knew in my heart of hearts that if Israel was responsible for the breakdown of the talks it would find itself up against America, Europe, U.S. Jewry and world Jewry....I know what it is to withstand pressure. I have no need to brag....During the past nine months hardly a single newspaper in Israel or the world has had one good word to say about me....That pressure had no effect, however....But I knew that if Camp David collapsed Israel would stand alone and would eventually have to submit, of that I am convinced....

And so, it was my responsibility. I proposed a third approach to my colleagues, neither saying yes nor no, but agreeing to bring the subject before the Knesset for its decision....I even considered not participating in the debate, so as not to influence the Knesset, but the Foreign Minister, my good friend Moshe Dayan, dissuaded me from taking that course....The precise wording of the proposal on which we decided together with President Carter, i.e., that the Knesset would decide on the issue of the settlements, was reached only after other, more binding, versions had been rejected by us....Upon returning to Israel and finding scathing attacks in the papers on our decision to vote on two separate proposals, one regarding the peace negotiations and the other regarding the issue of the settlements, indicating that the government was evading

responsibility for making a difficult decision, I decided to combine the two....

The choice before the House is, then, whether to embark on peace negotiations, with the attendant dismantling of the settlements, or not. There is no third possibility....As someone with a sense of responsibility, it is my duty to tell the House that this is the only practical way of attaining a peace treaty for the first time in thirty years. The peace treaty is virtually ready. What has been agreed concerning the bilateral relations between Egypt and Israel is almost the entire peace treaty....If you decide that the settlements should remain, all our efforts at Camp David will have been for nothing and the peace treaty will be lost....

Settlements are very dear to me....I make no distinction between party affiliation when it comes to settlements. Everyone knows that I love each individual settler....But as Prime Minister it is my duty to think of the consequences of this decision, when I know that a peace treaty is in our grasp. In making my calculations I am thinking of the sons of those settlers who will have to be uprooted. Those sons will not have to fall in battle, because we will have peace....For it is the duty of a Prime Minister to see to it that there is no more bloodshed, no more orphans and widows and bereaved parents, and that has been my approach throughout the decades of service to the nation, not since 1967 but since 1947....For four and a half years we fought against the British, and not one Arab injured any Jew, but after the U.N. resolution the clashes began, with the first casualties....Since then no one in Israel has wanted peace more than myself. This is a confession....For thirty-one years this man has dreamed of peace with the Arabs, has respected the Arabs and extended his hand to them, calling on them to build this country together and cease the bloodshed. Now the opportunity is within our reach, the document is all but ready, it just needs some minor revisions, and then, who knows, perhaps then the biblical verse: "and the land had rest forty years" will be fulfilled. A Prime Minister has a duty to concern himself with such things, does he not...?

And so, I had no choice. Those who abstain may have a choice. I had to decide, together with my colleagues....The peace treaty was on one side of the scales and the settlements on the other. According to every moral code to which I subscribe the scales tipped on the side of the peace treaty. There is no other way. With the pain, the insults, the shouts—no other way. To my dying day I will believe that this is the right choice. For the entire nation, for the people living in the Rafah area, it is the right choice. We made a proviso that the period must be fixed by an agreement between the two sides. After the peace treaty has been signed, over a period of between three and nine months, we must withdraw with our forces to the Ras-Muhammed-El-Arish line, where we will remain for another two years. We have time to think about everything and do everything. But one thing must be clear, it is a clearcut decision which

we are making today. We will not delude anyone. If the Knesset so decides, the decision will be implemented....

Minister Ariel Sharon has taken it upon himself to deal with the resettlement of the settlers, if that is what they wish, when the time comes. We will look after each family, no one will be neglected....I have brought before you, ladies and gentlemen of the Knesset, the choice with which we were confronted. You can accept it or not. But I am entitled to ask you whether I have put my message across to you clearly and whether you have understood what I have said? There is no evasion here, no flight from responsibility. The responsibility rests firmly on certain shoulders.

To the Likud I would like to say that you must decide and vote as you wish. Some of you wish to abstain, as do some of the members of the NRP....Abstaining on the proposal means leaving the dirty work of removing the settlements to others, to your colleagues in the Likud party, and enables you to wash your hands piously....To the Alignment, for which I have every respect, I would like to say that it is strange to hear its members attack the agreement vehemently, then conclude by saying that they will vote for it....It seems somewhat illogical....

Under the terms of the peace treaty the IDF will remain in Judea and Samaria, guarding the nation. The Suez Canal will be open, explicitly, to ships flying the Israeli flag. The Straits of Tiran will be an international waterway open to everyone. The Sinai will be demilitarized. There will be areas with a minimal military presence. Airfields will be built. A genuine peace treaty....

MK Allon made a certain proposal here. May I point out that I have a suspicion, not a certainty, that if a clearcut decision is not made here tonight someone will use it as an excuse not to start negotiations as the document says. Then there will have to be a special Knesset session to cancel it. Don't do it. We need a clearcut decision today. The Foreign Affairs and Defense Committee will supervise the negotiations constantly, but a clearcut decision is required so that the negotiations may begin, perhaps even next week....

The Egyptians have asked us, via our friends the Americans, to appoint a delegation without delay to be in direct contact with them, so that negotiations on a peace treaty may begin forthwith....I suggest that the House does not wait or impose delays, but works quickly and makes a clearcut decision, as the government has requested....Once the decision has been made and the negotiations for a peace treaty begin we will examine every eventuality by means of the Knesset's Foreign Affairs and Defense Committee. I would be grateful if you were to heed my advice....I beseech each and every one, for God's sake, vote as you wish but let a clearcut decision be made by the majority in the Knesset so that tomorrow we can begin the work of preparing the negotiations and, God willing, sign a peace treaty....

It is three a.m. It is enough....In the wake of that confession I want to say: the nation is in the throes of birth pangs. It is true to say that everything that is great is born through suffering. The greatest miracle in the universe—the birth of a baby—is accompanied by pain. What we are talking about here is the greatest turning-point in the Middle East, the possibility of signing a peace treaty between Israel and Egypt. I am not surprised by the pains. I am not complaining about the demonstrations, though I would prefer it if they were not held at night as my neighbors suffer, their children suffer....But I forgive everything, because there is pain. Peace is born, first and foremost, of our blood. For this peace we have sacrificed 12,000 of our best boys, in five wars, one war after another, one battlefield after another. We want to put an end to that. This is the opportunity, this is the chance. I do not know what difficulties still lie ahead of us, but it is evident that this is the opportunity....We want to preserve the lives of our children, who are the apples of our eyes, and the lives of our grandchildren. We don't want there to be war every five years. Can anyone be blamed for the fact that we have to make sacrifices? Can we be accused of making concessions on those grounds...? I do not think so, because this is something which we all want, something in which we all believe. One-third of our nation has been lost in this generation...; 12,000 of our best, most heroic and sacred boys; bereaved families; tears, pain and sorrow—we want to put an end to that. This is the moment. Now is the hour. That is why this is such a great moment and why I appeal to all the Members of the Knesset, irrespective of party group, to unite around the chance of peace, adopt the proposal and begin discussions. Perhaps, God willing, within the next year we will be able to say that peace has come to Israel....

...

The Vote

Those in favor	84
Those against	19
Abstentions	17

(The coalition proposal that the Knesset approve the Camp David agreements, authorizing the government to resolve all the attendant problems, dismantle the settlements in the Sinai and resettle their inhabitants, if this is necessitated by the peace negotiations between Egypt and Israel, which should be reflected by a written document, is adopted.)

German Statute of Limitations for Nazi War Crimes

Introduction

After a lengthy interval, an issue concerning Germany and its relations with Israel, a subject which had provoked some of the most tempestuous sittings in the past, appeared on the agenda of the Knesset once more. The issue was the application of a statute of limitations to Nazi crimes and genocide. After having postponed the time limit for prosecutions several times, the West German Bundestag was about to vote on a proposal preventing any further prosecutions for such crimes after a certain date. All Nazi criminals who had avoided prosecution thus far would then go free. After a brief debate, under a procedure permitting only one statement from each party group, in rare unanimity the Knesset adopted a resolution opposing the abolition of any time limitation with regard to Nazi crimes. Whether or not the position adopted by the Knesset reflected the outcome of the debate being conducted at the time in Germany, the final vote being held on 3 July 1979, as an obvious political compromise between supporters and opponents, the Bundestag decided to cancel the statute of limitations with regard to any first degree murder, genocide included.

Sitting 156 of the Ninth Knesset

20 November 1978 (20 Heshvan 5739)

The Speaker, Y. Shamir: The House Committee has decided to hold the debate on this subject in the form of ten-minute statements by the party groups....

The Minister of Justice, S. Tamir: Mr. Speaker, Knesset Members, in another year, at the end of 1979, a statute of limitations regarding crimes against humanity, war crimes, genocide and murder is due to come into effect in Germany. If that law is enacted all those Nazi criminals who have managed to evade even the minimal punishment imposed by the German courts will be able to hold their heads up high, boast of their infamous deeds and admit nostalgia for those days....Today they do that in semi-underground conditions, in German beer-cellars and in the distant lands of South America....If that law is passed that phenomenon will expand, together with others glorifying Hitler, *Mein Kampf* and neo-Nazism in general....If that law is passed Bormann and Mengele, who are still hiding in South America and elsewhere, can

emerge and walk about freely, knowing that they cannot be extradited to Germany....

Whatever one's general opinion on the various statutes of limitations obtaining throughout the world, they do not apply to war crimes in the Second World War and genocide. There is no restriction of accountability regarding the destruction of the Jewish people in Europe. It is horrifying to think that someone, that someone being the German Legislature, supposes that a statute of limitations can apply to those crimes. Genocide and a statute of limitations are diametrical opposites.

Eichmann, that war criminal and murderer of Jews, said once: I will leap into my grave knowing that the Jews will laugh no more. The Jews are laughing. The final solution, as planned by Hitler, Goebbels, Goering and Himmler, was not achieved. The Jews are laughing, laughing and singing in workshops, laughing and singing as they plow the soil of the homeland, laughing and singing as their sons and daughters in the IDF march along the lanes of the Land of Israel and take off in Israeli planes, laughing and singing in schools and playschools, on weekdays, Sabbaths and holydays. The Final Solution did not succeed....But the murderers' designs were partially implemented. We are a wounded nation, there is considerably less blood in our veins, our national body is scarred. Those dreadful crimes were perpetrated by Nazi Germany with a satanic efficiency whose effects are still evident on our nation to this day. The statute of limitations does not apply to those crimes.

When we speak of Nazi Germany we must remember that this refers to millions of German soldiers and citizens who participated gladly in that shameful war and all the events attending it, who willingly took part in the slaughter, who worked happily in the factories of death. Only a few thousand of all those have gone on trial. Their punishments were usually ridiculously light. Their trials were on the whole a mockery, and hundreds of thousands of them are walking about freely in and outside Germany today.

If the statute of limitations goes into effect it will not only accord retroactive immunity to the most despicable murderers in human history, but will also grant national amnesty by the Germany of today to that of the past....No formal legal claim will help Germany if it does not annul the statute of limitations for crimes of genocide. When it is done by the generation which is the contemporary of the criminals, at a time when the Hitler legend is being revived in Germany, when neo-Nazism is raising its head, it must constitute a warning signal for all civilized nations everywhere.

The crimes of Nazi Germany have not and cannot be wiped out. The Germany of today must at least not be blind to its blood-stained past or cynical in its attitude towards the surviving remnant of European Jewry....On behalf of the government of Israel, the Knesset and the na-

tion whose body was severely mutilated by Nazi Germany, we demand that the German government, the German parliament and the German people cleanse themselves of another stain on their record and repeal the statute of limitations....

D. Shilansky (Likud): Mr. Speaker, distinguished Knesset...to this day I still see before my eyes the tragic figure of a Jewish mother and the shocking moment as she struggled with the last vestiges of her strength against the German beasts who were cruelly tearing her young child out of her arms to send him on a journey from which there was no return....I can still hear the child's voice ringing in my ears: "Mother, I want to stay with you, I want to live."...The poet Yitzhak Katzenelson, who was in the Warsaw Ghetto and witnessed the murder of Jews wrote: "A dead Jew hangs on the neck of every German."...

And so we say to you today, don't give us money, don't do us any kindness, do justice. If you say that you have changed—and personally I do not believe that that is possible within one generation—and that this is "a different Germany," do not apply a statute of limitations to your worst criminals, but judge them appropriately and punish them....I say "your worst criminals" because all Germans are criminals, even those who simply "helped," or those who merely "agreed" without helping, and those who kept quiet, because silence was like assent, and that encouraged the continuation of the murder. We must not deceive ourselves and others, let us not delude the generation which did not know the Holocaust that it was just one small group, the Nazis, which perpetrated the crime. The entire German nation perpetrated it. Every German is guilty. Hitler rose to power in Germany by democratic means....

Some fifty million people—both soldiers and civilians—were killed during the period when Hitler ruled. Seven million civilians in the U.S.S.R., six million, mainly civilians, the majority of them Jews, in Poland, one million civilians in Yugoslavia, 90,000 civilians in England. This dreadful list includes six million Jews, including one million children. We were not a power, we had no state of our own, no army, and not only did we have no weapons, we were not practiced in their use. We were no danger to the German Reich. The terrible massacres by the *Einsatzgruppen*, which left behind them huge mass graves, the heinous crime which the human mind finds impossible to grasp, the iniquity of the gas chambers and the crematoria, were committed by you Germans with sadistic pleasure and out of a thirst for Jewish blood and suffering. And you, the supposedly "different" Germans, have found no more than two thousand criminals of the twenty thousand members of the Gestapo, the worst sadists of them all. So now you want to grant amnesty to the eighteen thousand who have been keeping low all this time, and let them emerge into the light of day and carry on where they left off....

Bezalel Mazevski, who was in the ghetto in Lithuania with me, was condemned to death by the Germans when he was found to have smuggled three sweets for his three children into the ghetto....As he stood with the noose around his neck he laughed in the Germans' faces, jumped off the table and thus took his life with his own hands....I remained alive, witnessed our redemption, became a Member of our Knesset and regard it as my moral and personal duty to bring that noble figure before you. I can still see his sarcastic smile and hear his mocking laughter in the face of all the German dignitaries who had come to witness the spectacle....By means of the German representative who sits here today I convey to the German nation which is about to pardon the people who hanged Mazevski the scorn and derision he displayed in his final moment!

U. Baram (Alignment): Distinguished Speaker and Knesset, anyone who is sensitive to what is happening in Germany today cannot ignore the atmosphere there with regard to restricting the accountability of people guilty of Nazi crimes....The purpose of the struggle to annul the statute of limitations is not solely to bring the guilty persons to trial, it is not being conducted solely for the sake of the infants and children who were massacred, it is ideological, complex and comprehensive.

The effort to forget the crimes of the Nazis is greater than the attempt to remember them. Whereas twenty years ago material purporting to reveal the "lie of the Holocaust" was given no credence whatsoever, a new generation has grown up, one which did not witness the Holocaust and which may be easily deceived and led astray. Not all Nazi criminals live under assumed names and identities. The man who organized the deportation of the Jews of France has said what Eichmann did not say, namely, that there was no Holocaust, and it is a piece of well-orchestrated Jewish propaganda....Thus, the anti-Semitism which led to the Holocaust is being used to deny it....

The attempts by the leader of the Christian Democrats in Germany, Helmuth Kohl, to introduce the statute of limitations, and the fight being put up by the Bavarian leader Franz Josef Strauss to introduce a law granting amnesty for Nazi crimes, are not detached from reality. They know that both Germany and the world is ready for that....Strauss speaks of the need for Germany to free itself finally of the crimes of the Nazis. He fails to realize that this is an evasion of responsibility and reflects wicked cynicism designed to gain the support of growing German nationalism....Former Nazis say openly now that they have nothing to regret, and their voices are echoed in the statute of limitations....Not one party in Germany dares to oppose the law openly and unequivocally....

I am not speaking here as someone who seeks revenge or justice at all costs. Unfortunately, we are still fighting the rearguard action of what the Holocaust cost us....The fight against the statute of limitations is a fight to preserve the memory of Auschwitz and Treblinka. The

Germans have made it clear that they are weary of trials involving Nazi crimes. They consider us to be petty and nosy....That is the reality of the 1980s against which we must fight.

In the Holocaust we lost one-third of our future generation, which could have changed the face of the nation. Pressure must be exerted on the German Bundestag, justice must be done by means of all the international organizations and sister-parties. The Knesset must throw all its weight behind the subject. It must demand the extension of the period of accountability for Nazi crimes lest the view that the Holocaust was a crime just like any other be legitimized and the perpetrators of an offense which is unparalleled in the annals of mankind be regarded as deserving pardon....The struggle against the statute of limitations is a struggle for our essence, for the way we see our past. If a nation does not fight for the significance of its past, its future will also be unclear.

P. Sheinman (National Religious Party): Mr. Speaker, distinguished Knesset, forty years ago this month, on 8 November 1938, 191 synagogues were burnt, 76 of them to the ground, on the night of infamy known as the Night of Broken Glass. That marked the start of the great and terrible Holocaust which befell our people. Forty years later, when we are still grieving for the murder of millions of our brethren, the Knesset is meeting in Jerusalem, our nation's eternal capital, to express its concern at the possibility that the statute of limitations may be applied to Nazi crimes, enabling former Nazis to hold their heads up high and admit to being proud of their Nazi past and their share in the destruction of the Jewish people....

The Nazi army conquered eighteen European countries and destroyed twenty thousand Jewish communities....Some one hundred thousand Nazi criminals participated actively in the murders and the implementation of the Final Solution leading to the almost total annihilation of European Jewry. Over the last twenty years the German Prosecutor-General has brought only about one thousand German criminals to trial. He claims to have insufficient evidence against another twelve thousand. Thus, approximately ninety thousand Nazi criminals are free, including twenty thousand former members of the Gestapo.... They will all probably emerge into the light of day once the statute of limitations comes into effect....The eagerness with which the German authorities are ready to accept the statute of limitations is astounding.... The German Minister of Justice quotes the Prosecutor-General as claiming that it is no longer possible to discover Nazi criminals. With all due respect, we beg to differ on this point, for between 1969 and 1978 another eleven thousand Nazi criminals were found....

The Jewish people has a long account to settle with the German people. It is regrettable to see what efforts we have to make to prevent the crimes of the Nazis from being forgotten. The main point of remembering the past is being able to prevent it from being repeated....The true

test of every German is not whether he is prepared to kneel in the Chamber of the Holocaust or lay a wreath on a Holocaust memorial site, it is in the recognition that for a long time to come the German people—until the third and fourth generations and perhaps forever—will have to bear the heavy burden of the mark of the murderer and pay the material and political price....It will have to do so not in order to compensate us for a crime for which there is no compensation but in order to give the German nation a minimal sense of having attempted to atone....

All the indications are, unfortunately, that not only is the German nation unwilling to do this, but that it is also eager to forget the shame of the past. There is no doubt that there are signs of regret in the Germany of today, but the regret is for the extent of the atonement, not the enormity of the crime....The Jewish nation will long continue to bear the marks of the suffering it has undergone and the losses it has borne. If the damage inflicted by the Holocaust can continue to be felt across more than one Jewish generation, there is no reason why only one German generation should be obliged to atone for the crime committed by that nation....Experts have calculated that the Germans have repaid less than 5 percent of the Jewish property they stole....

From this podium, which symbolizes Jewish resurgence, the representatives of the Jewish people appeal to their colleagues in the Bundestag to act so that the statute of limitations for Nazi crimes will not come into effect. As long as Holocaust survivors still live among us and hundreds of thousands of murderers are free there can be no limitation. It is one's human duty to hound them until their memory is wiped off the face of the earth. This is not in the interests of the Jews or of Israel alone, it is in the interests of Germany and the whole world. If the statute of limitations goes into effect those Nazis will spearhead the revival of the Nazi movement, the first shoots of which can already be seen....

At the Potsdam Conference in August 1945 the four Powers undertook not to introduce statutes of limitations for genocide. The U.N. passed a resolution to that effect in 1968. West Germany, which joined the U.N. in 1973, refused to sign that convention. In view of the displays of neo-Nazism both inside and outside Germany of late, the German government should reconsider its position. Although Helmut Kohl has said that for him and his country the past cannot be forgotten, he refuses to speak out clearly against the statute of limitations....

The pursuit of the Nazi beasts of prey must be a national mission of the government of Israel, rather than of a variety of uncoordinated organizations....We must always remember what Amalek did to us. Only thirty-three years have passed since the murder of European Jewry, and it sometimes seems as if it were just yesterday. Not one Jewish home was left unscathed....I thank the German ambassador to Israel, Mr. Klaus Schutz, who is sitting in the gallery now. Since he understands Hebrew he can bear witness to what has been said here today

and convey it to his government....In the name of the millions of victims and the million children whose blood was shed like water, we declare that we will erase the memory of Amalek from the face of the earth; we will not forget.

B. Halevy (Democratic Movement): [Former Justice of the Supreme Court; one of the judges at the Eichmann trial.] Mr. Speaker, distinguished Knesset, when Eichmann stood trial in Jerusalem we heard all the witnesses, the few survivors, and saw the Nazi documents with their official stamps. Before the world we pondered the dreadful questions bequeathed by Nazism to the generations which followed it. One of these was the issue of genocide....We saw how the U.N. was obliged to acknowledge the uniqueness of this crime, which was not merely the individual murder of millions, but an attempt to wipe out utterly the ancient Jewish people, leaving no trace, memory or heir....

Hence, it is a mistake for young people, whether Germans or others, who did not live through that time, to compare that crime with other war crimes or with other crimes against humanity, however grave....Malice is worse than the atom bomb on Hiroshima or other instances. They went from house to house, in an occupied city like Paris, Warsaw or anywhere else in Europe, to see if any Jew was left....In every German town they prepared the lists systematically in advance, so that no baby should escape, to ascertain who was only part-Jew, or had a Jewish grandparent, and destroy them too.

That was their unique crime, and they almost succeeded, as the criminal Eichmann boasted at the end of the war....Instead of leaping into his grave, however, he fled and hid, being helped by Italian monks, like other Nazi criminals, and passing through Syria and Egypt to reach South America under an alias. Argentina would not have allowed his extradition to Israel because of its own statute of limitations, amongst other things....The immediate result of the German statute of limitations will be to bring all the Nazis presently still in hiding out into the open to preach their bestial doctrine once more....

It is not the victims who should be ashamed. It is the murderers and the German nation, which is not prepared to detach itself from the murderers....If the statute of limitations is passed the nation among which the murderers are to be found will feel morally pardoned, since the entire German nation wishes to acquire a clear conscience and rid itself of the burden of guilt. It wants normalization....It is not for us to be ashamed but for those who wish to be cleared of the guilt of collective murder. It is for us to feel sad.

We cannot be glad and say that we are at least partly consoled by the fact that we have a sovereign Jewish state. Had the state been founded ten years earlier the tragedy would have been averted and a haven given to the millions before whom the whole world closed its doors....The state cannot bring the dead back to life....Our only conso-

lation is that we have had the last laugh, and the Jewish nation lives on, as those who went to their deaths hoped we would....

I believe that the Holocaust showed to what depths man is capable of sinking in our day and age....In an age of technological sophistication it is possible to commit the most terrible crimes, because the human conscience is dulled. Only someone who is not as weak as the Jewish nation was, who is not as innocent as our brethren were, being deceived into thinking that they were going to bathhouses, can hope that his fate is in his hands....That is the lesson of the State of Israel and Zionism, the belated answer to that crime: to defend ourselves, to fight, to know what awaits Jews all over the world, in every generation, including this one, and make sure that that tragedy does not happen again, because it can happen to any nation which is weak, as indeed happened to the Armenians and the gypsies....

But the Jews were singled out for attack and persecution even before Hitler and not only in the Middle Ages, but also in the time of the early Christians, who spurned Judaism. The seed of hatred was sown in the holy books. With his mother's milk every child took in the image of the Jew as the murderer of god, the idea of the Jewish people as bad, and all the other lies those children learn. It is the Jewish fate that even the hatred of Hitler, who did not believe in Christianity but used it as a tool with which to implement his schemes, was influenced by those prejudices.

The German statute of limitations is the internal concern of the German people, and we will not and cannot interfere in it....We cannot preach morality to the Germans....If someone has no shame, that is their own concern....We can act in the field of education, however.... For the sake of the next generation, children in Germany, here and all over the world must be taught what happened, what could happen, must be told the cruel and terrible truth....It must be made clear that if the anti-Nazi laws are annulled, if those people are permitted to preach their doctrines and distort history, that will affect those who stood idly by. One of the ways of preventing it is not to pass laws which cause the past to be forgotten, obscured or distorted....This is a matter for the future, to ensure that such things do not happen again, rather than for the past and the punishment of the criminals....

M. Wirshuvsky (Movement for Change and Initiative): Mr. Speaker, distinguished Knesset, I share MK Halevy's sadness, but I also sense the enduring vitality of the Jewish people because as a free people in our own state we can express our opinion vis-à-vis the German government, telling it with our heads held high what we think of its action in granting pardon for Nazi crimes. I say "pardon" advisedly, because no matter in what formal legal language it is couched, the upshot will be that persons who have committed unforgivable crimes will be pardoned....

I represent a stratum of the population which is prepared to maintain relations with the Germans....It is not that we are prepared to forgive and forget, but we are aware of the fact that life must go on, and that international reality permits a free Israel to have political, commercial and cultural ties with Germany. But those who hold this position cannot keep silent on the issue before us today, which will create an ever-widening gulf between us and the German people. Those Germans of good will—and there are such people—who really wish to establish good relations with Israel, must realize that if the statute of limitations comes into effect it will have an adverse influence on the delicate fabric of relations between our two nations....It is not a question of revenge or persecution. The point is that if the law is passed Nazi crimes will fall into the same category as all other crimes, making hundreds of thousands of German criminals all over the world free men who can emerge from their hiding-places. The statute of limitations makes Nazi crimes as pardonable as any other human peccadillo ever committed, and ultimately forgettable....

But we maintain that we must not forget and that the younger generation must be taught the facts. If that law is passed the tendency to forget will be legitimized....We should note that over the years a serious attempt has been made by Germany to become a country governed by law and one in which every effort is made to prevent a repetition of what happened in the past. But we must always be aware of the fact that there is neo-Nazism, a longing for the past, in Germany today....The moment that law comes into effect that movement will grow, because Nazi crimes will become just another category of criminal offenses....

I know that it is Germany's concern and I know how limited is our ability to influence, but that does not absolve us of the moral duty of voicing our protest....The people who were murdered cannot be restored to life, the wheel cannot be turned back, but one can say that those deeds will never be forgiven or forgotten. Those people must be tried and convicted and sent to prison even though it might be difficult to prove someone's guilt today....

We must appeal to all the countries of the world to tell the Germans that if they wish to be part of the family of nations they must not let this law be passed, and must continue to pursue and try the criminals of the past....As for ourselves, we must not keep quiet and must continue to act....I hope that once this House has passed a resolution, it will continue to issue appeals for the repeal of that law, calling on the German nation not to permit the past to be forgotten....

M. Wilner (Democratic Front for Peace and Equality): Mr. Speaker, Knesset Members, the subject under discussion is of the highest moral, political and ideological importance. It is important with regard to the past, in honoring the memory of the six million Jews who were killed by the Nazi tyrants and the many millions of other nations who were slain

by them. It is also important as regards the battle being waged today against neo-Nazi forces in West Germany which have branches in the U.S., France, England, South America and elsewhere. An association of former German soldiers is now claiming that "not one single Jew was gassed in the concentration camps"...and that anyone who believes that they were is "either an idiot or a criminal." If such organizations are permitted in Germany today, one can imagine what will happen once the statute of limitations is introduced....

I have before me a list of dozens of Nazi and neo-Nazi organizations all over the world which publish Hitler's writings, preach racism and anti-Semitism of the most rabid kind and justify the slaughter of the Slavs and the Jews in the Second World War....Recently a march of neo-Nazis was held in Chicago, with police protection, in the name of democracy....In the British municipal elections held in May 1977 the racist British National Front received 200,000 votes....Consequently, the point is not merely not to forget the crimes of Hitler Germany, which are unparalleled in history, but to wage war on neo-Nazism, on those who would have us fight another world war, and against those who advocate racism, rabid anti-Semitism and the genocide of supposedly inferior peoples.

It is not right to adopt a fatalistic approach and say that the battle is already lost and that the Bundestag will pass the statute of limitations....We are not alone in our struggle against it, just as we were not alone during the Second World War....It is true that powerful forces in Germany, led by Helmut Kohl, the head of the Christian-Democratic party, demand the adoption of the law. Franz Josef Strauss, the head of the Bavarian branch of the party demands not merely the statute of limitations but a general amnesty for Nazi crimes and criminals....That is serious and dangerous, but even within West Germany we have an ally....A great many communists in the Social-Democratic Party as well as outside it are conducting a campaign against the statute of limitations.

We also have very great allies in the world at large....The subject concerns us all. We are all victims of Nazi genocide in one way or another. There are MKs here who experienced it at first hand, there are MKs, like myself, whose entire families were killed by the Nazis, and there are MKs who, though not immediately affected by the Holocaust, feel a close sense of personal and national involvement....We must make sure that West Germany does not commit the crime of adopting the statute of limitations, thereby granting pardon to the terrible crimes and ideology of the Nazi beast.

Y.M. Abramowitz (Aguda): Distinguished Speaker and Knesset, the Jewish people is united today in the demand bequeathed us by the millions of our brethren who were murdered during the Holocaust: remember and do not forget. Since the dreadful time of the Nazis and their col-

laborators only a few thousand of the hundreds of thousands who took part in the greatest murder in history have been brought to trial, and now the German authorities wish to pass a statute of limitations for those crimes. In the name of our brethren we must cry out against this.... There is no pardon for the murderers....That is the approach of Judaism, an approach which is just, for there can be no statute of limitations for murder and the culprit must always be brought to trial. That is what we demand of Germany. That is the law which must be applied.

For several years the German leaders have been seeking to minimize the gravity of the actions undertaken by their fellow-citizens during the Nazi past. It is common knowledge that many of those who are demanding the statute of limitations today have a personal association with the subject. They hide behind supposedly legal arguments in trying to clear themselves. Tens of thousands of Germans took part in one way or another in the destruction of one-third of our nation....They all deserve punishment. They are living in peace today, nothing has been done to them....Now they wish to be completely free, to be able to live without the fear of being caught by the law, and that at a time when the brands snatched from the fire, the children, brothers and parents of those who were killed and burned, are still among us....

There is no forgiveness for those deeds, neither in this generation nor ever. The Jewish people has not forgotten and still remembers the Spanish Inquisition of five hundred years ago. The Jewish people has not forgotten the Crusades of one thousand years ago. So we will not forget or allow to be forgotten what was done to us in our own generation.... The advocates of Nazism are raising their heads once more all over the world, and in Germany in particular. Fascist nationalism is an attractive ideology, and both young and old are bringing out their brown and black uniforms and declaring that they are neo-Nazis. Today they are few, but if the statute of limitations is passed thousands will emerge from their lairs, seeking to return to what they regard as their days of glory, sweeping others on with them as they seek to return to power.... We are told that there is "a different Germany," but many people are still trying to find it. If the statute of limitations for Nazi crimes is passed, there will be no more need to look for it....The sign will be given for the crimes of the past to be erased and their perpetrators to take their place at the forefront of society once more....All that will happen if the Germans do not remember what their compatriots did....

German journalists are asking what right Israel has to interfere in Germany's internal affairs today. Our answer is that we represent the Jewish people, which was the victim of the most terrible crimes ever committed. The victim is entitled to demand that his assailants, the murderers of his parents and children, be brought to trial and not be granted forgiveness....That is our right and our duty to the millions of our brethren who perished at their hands....

The statute of limitations means the deliberate forgetting of crimes, and we must raise our voice against that. The Knesset must pass a unanimous resolution against the passage of the statute of limitations in Germany, and must appeal to parliaments throughout the world to join it in this....Dozens of leading Nazi criminals who escaped to South America and other countries are waiting for the day when they can return to their homeland....Just as we fought the murderers in the past, exposing many and bringing them to trial, we must continue to pursue the thousands of them who are still at large....Although I do not have great faith in the German authorities' earnestness about bringing the criminals to trial even when there was no statute of limitations, it is our duty to do whatever we can to prevent this law being passed, so that we and the whole world may remember and not forget....

A. Eliav (Sheli): Distinguished Speaker and Knesset, what we are dealing with today is a hydra, the most terrible hydra in the history of mankind, and no matter how many heads and arms one cuts off, more always grow. That hydra is the Nazi beast which grew in Germany and the depths of whose bestiality and infamy defy human language....As was only fitting, the free world united in an attempt to extirpate the hydra before it destroyed the whole world....It was to have been expected that that beast would have died in the ruins of the Nazi Reich, but that was not the case. Even as the Second World War ended, the teeth of that dragon were scattered and sown all over the world, where they remain and flourish to this day....

The Nazi criminals fled to the countries of South America, Asia and Africa, spreading their dreadful venom around them wherever they settled....Nazi-inspired groups are known to be at large in the U.S....Arab and Japanese terrorist groups make use of Nazi symbols....Nazi symbols and ideology are used by terrorist groups inside and outside Germany which call themselves socialist, which purport to be on the left—as if there were such a concept as left and right in terrorism....Woe betide us as Jews and citizens of the world if Germany fails to uproot the abomination within it and finally destroy the hydra. And woe betide Germany.

Like MK Wirshuvsky and others, I do not forgive the Germans but approve of having normal relations with them. But for their own good, for our own good and the good of mankind, the Germans must eradicate the evil that is within them. If they do not, our relations with them must suffer....We appeal to them from this podium, and on this subject we are all united, to do what must be done to prevent a single Nazi criminal escaping the justice he deserves, so that no head of the hydra may remain....

K. Cahane (Po'alei Aguda): Mr. Speaker, distinguished Knesset, I would like to express my shock at the basic fact that it is necessary to try

and organize international pressure to dissuade Germany from introducing the statute of limitations for Nazi crimes....That fact calls the sincerity of claims of there being "a different Germany" and the existence of regret for what happened in the past into question....

Those who support the statute of limitations rely on legal precedent. I will not bring up my concept of the validity of a statute of limitations, but how can legal precedent be applied to the horrors of the Holocaust...? Do the punishments to be meted out for those crimes against the Jewish nation and humanity exist in any legal code? They were so abnormal and unusual, so beyond the bounds of human imagination, that any legal norms, however well-founded, cannot apply. This is particularly the case when German law itself acknowledges that the statute of limitations cannot apply to the crime of genocide, though that law was passed in 1955 and cannot apply retroactively....Simple logic demands that a law be passed exempting Nazi crimes from the statute of limitations.

I regret to say that circles whose attitude to Israel is negative are particularly active in opposing the prevention of the statute of limitations. They care little whether Nazi criminals are rehabilitated, emerge into the light of day and preach their doctrine of hate and inhumanity once more....We appeal to the German nation to act accordingly if their expressions of regret are genuine, if they sincerely wish to prevent any recurrence of those dreadful crimes....In order to achieve this, the statute of limitations must be repealed....We, ourselves, must not forget the Holocaust, and ensure that it is engraved on our minds and those of our children. If we do not forget, the world will not forget.

S. Aloni (Citizens' Rights Movement): Mr. Speaker, distinguished Knesset Members, the question is not the German people and us, it is mankind and the terrible phenomenon of Nazism, of which we were the chief victims but of which others were victims too. Nazism is not a mutation. If it were it could be destroyed. Even if it were a hydra it could be annihilated by modern technology. But it seems to be the dark side of human nature revealed as the result of ideas of racism and superiority, of the desire to rule, of hatred, fanaticism, avarice and indoctrination, all of which produce ideologies which have an eager audience. Hence the excesses perpetrated by those groups, and which are suppressed by the majority. One of the things I find most difficult to grasp is how an entire society in which those horrors were inflicted can say: we did not know.

And so, as long as it is possible not to suppress things, as long as it is possible to point to living people, actions and facts, we must do everything to ensure that such things are not forgotten or expunged from human memory or brought under statutes of limitations. Because the statute of limitations will be followed by general exoneration and suppression and the rewriting of history....Already now, when there are still living witnesses to the slaughter, to the time when human beings regarded others as being less than human, there are attempts to claim

that it was all a figment of someone's imagination. In this way is it possible to cause something to be forgotten, to apply the statute of limitations, make it possible to suppress and distort the facts....The stories of the furnaces and the brutality disturb the neo-Nazis more than anything else. As long as the world knows that those things existed, it cannot accept people who take that symbol as their own, or so I hope, at least.... That is why the neo-Nazis are the first to claim that those things never happened....

To prevent them from doing that, to prevent the suppression of the problem, we and the whole world, including the German public, must do everything we can to ensure that that symbol of destruction continues to be regarded as an abomination and is not associated in any way with any other crime. I do not know whether the German ambassador, his associates and the German public which demands the statute of limitations knows that no one in Israel can imagine that there will ever be anyone else whom we will have to execute. Since Eichmann was the only person who was executed we do not want to be able to make that accursed man comparable with anyone else. The same applies to crimes of that kind, and so that they are not suppressed, so that they are remembered everywhere in the world where racism, violence, fanaticism, arrogance, hatred, destruction and the treatment of other human beings as less than human are found, everything must be done so that that phenomenon can be identified for what it is—something utterly unforgivable.

G. Hausner (Independent Liberals): [Former Attorney-General; prosecutor at Eichmann trial.] Mr. Speaker, distinguished Knesset, when the Dachau concentration camp was liberated at the end of the Second World War, the Allied Commander, General Eisenhower, ordered all the American photographers to hurry and photograph the dreadful sights, otherwise, he said, in another five or ten years no one would believe that such things had happened or were even possible. And so, had it not been for the stories of the survivors, the pictures and the documents which remained, it would be quite impossible to believe that in the heart of Europe, in the middle of the twentieth century, genocide had been implemented accompanied by brutality which beggars description.

When they saw that they were about to lose the war, the Nazis tried to obscure the extent of their crimes, setting up special units which removed bodies from mass graves and burned them, and also burned the official, incriminatory archives. But they did not complete their work, and considerable evidence remained. Anyone who proposes applying a statute of limitations to those crimes, that is, that routine, accepted, everyday norms should apply to them, is helping the work of obscuring the record....Such crimes should remain in human consciousness as a mark of shame and revulsion which is unparalleled in history and serves as an eternal warning. Only when future generations see the

crimes of Nazi Germany in that light, i.e., as unprecedented transgressions which human society cannot forgive, can there be any hope that they will not be repeated....

A human imprimatur must not be given to those inhuman crimes. The principle of the limitation of accountability is a Jewish one and derives from the Bible....Time heals wounds and justifies making peace with criminals. But this refers to crimes which fall within the bounds of human error, which are comprehensible and with which it is possible to live. Even murder, the most heinous crime, is a phenomenon with which human society has lived since ancient times....This does not apply to genocide. Those who have committed that crime have set themselves outside the pale of organized human society and have indicated that the normal rules do not apply to them. Our minds cannot grasp the depths of that crime. That is why we must close our hearts to our tendency to be compassionate and refuse to apply the customary principles of forgiveness, pardon and limitation where the crimes of Nazis and their collaborators are concerned. For if we do, it is as if we are saying that genocide is a crime which human society is prepared to tolerate....

Nazi Germany knocked down barriers which mankind had erected over a great many generations to protect its culture. Law has been used to punish the criminals and reestablish the barrier of prohibitions which must not be infringed. The statute of limitations will symbolize the conclusion of the rehabilitative process, legitimizing the new wave of Hitlerites in Germany....The Nazis' venomous hatred of their victims did not disappear with the fall of the Third Reich. They have their modern adherents, who use the same reason—a war of national liberation—to justify torture, murder, kidnaping, murder and terror. The Nazi cancer has not been expunged from the body of mankind, it has produced metastases from time to time in various parts of the world. The form might be different, but the content is the same—the Nazi justification of murder....Just as Nazism in its time endangered human culture, its modern proponents, the terrorists of various kinds, jeopardize organized society. They must also be shown that when they stand trial the customary norms of human forgiveness will not apply to them, either.

To our great regret, some of the trials being conducted against Nazi criminals have become farcical, the accused being released for lack of evidence or being given ridiculously light punishments. I must admit that I sometimes wonder, then, if it would not be better not to have those trials at all....But in the final event human society must demand two things: that the trials are held, and that they are held appropriately. For when all is said and done, every trial constitutes a reminder and a renewed confrontation by the younger generation of its country's yesterday.

The Jewish nation has a particular interest in the continued punishment of the execrable Nazis. Our brethren were their victims, we ourselves were their victims....This is not an internal German affair or something between Germany and us. It is a subject for all civilized people today, because Nazism is a threat to culture. It is in mankind's interests to warn Germany against the statute of limitations, because just as Nazism destroyed morality, forgiveness of its crimes could undermine the principles of justice. That would sully the memory of the millions of victims.

The Federal Republic of Germany would be taking an unimaginable responsibility on itself if it were to announce that the crimes of the Nazis belonged to the usual category of crimes to which the customary rules apply. We should remember that Germany has twice extended the period of limitation, but must now annul it altogether....Chancellor Helmut Schmidt said a few days ago that Germany must bear the political burden of guilt and accept the consequences....It is to be hoped, therefore, that despite all the internal party-political and electoral considerations which are driving the adherents of the statute of limitations, Germany will make it clear to itself and the world that there is no limitation and no forgetting....

The world which stood passively by while the Jewish nation was taken to the death camps is no longer entitled to be indifferent as the veil of forgetfulness and forgiveness is about to be drawn across the crime of genocide. That is why the State of Israel must appeal to Germany and the entire civilized world to prevent the legitimization of genocide in the inventory of human crimes....

S. Stern-Kattan (National Religious Party): Mr. Speaker, distinguished Knesset, on behalf of all the party groups in the House, I hereby submit the following concluding resolution...:

A. The Knesset determines that Nazi crimes are unparalleled in human history in their bestiality and brutality. Those terrible crimes cannot be treated in a routine manner and be made subject to a statute of limitations. It would be intolerable to have criminals accused of genocide becoming free men who can no longer be brought to justice.

B. The Knesset demands that Germany's government and its legislators take every step to ensure that the statute of limitations is not applied to such crimes, which are unforgivable.

C. The Knesset demands that the German government make every effort to track down the Nazi criminals and bring them to trial.

D. The Knesset appeals to the government of Israel to continue with its activities and endeavors to punish the Nazi murderers.

E. The Knesset calls on the parliaments of the world to join Israel's struggle to annul the statute of limitations and bring Nazi criminals to trial forthwith.

(The concluding resolution is accepted unanimously.)

Electoral Reform Proposal

Introduction

Electoral reform—replacing the prevailing, purely proportional system with a mixed regional-proportional one—constituted one of the planks not only of the electoral platform of most parties, but also an explicit commitment written into the Coalition Agreement. In fact, that Agreement included a promise that the following Knesset—the Tenth—would be elected under the new system. All the same, eighteen months into the Ninth Knesset no legislative measure designed to implement that promise had as yet reached the House. Both MK Yaakobi, now in opposition, and MK Halevy, from a coalition party, tabled private members' bills to that effect. At the behest of the government they were removed from the agenda.

Sitting 178 of the Ninth Knesset

10 January 1979 (11 Tevet 5739)

G. Yaakobi (Alignment): Madam Speaker, Knesset Members, the proposal to change the electoral system from the present one to a regional-proportional one has reached a parliamentary situation which could be called Kafkaesque, because the commitment to introduce this change appears in the platforms of parties represented by more than ninety Knesset Members....They thereby represent the desire of the majority of the nation to introduce a change which will make more direct and democratic representation possible, a change which will increase the Knesset's ability to fulfill its tasks, a change which will reduce the political fragmentation within the nation and enable the establishment of a stable government which does not distort the desire of the nation by inappropriate coalitionary arrangements....The coalition agreement between the Likud, the NRP, the DMC and Aguda states that the electoral system will be regional-proportional-personal, and that that system will be introduced within nine months after the establishment of a special committee....

Twice nine months have passed, and the infant we were promised has not yet emerged into the light of day....Thirteen months ago my party group proposed a motion on the subject and the Deputy Prime Minister, Yigal Yadin, the leader of the party on whose platform electoral reform held pride of place, proposed that it be removed from the agenda on the grounds that the government was preparing a proposal and would shortly appoint a committee to deal with it....Thirteen months have

passed and this morning, because our motion was placed on the agenda, the chairman of the coalition, MK Corfu, announced that a committee would now be appointed. Gentlemen, you can fool some of the public some of the time, but you can't fool all of the public all the time. I would not be surprised if even today the Democratic Movement did not vote for changing the system, thereby proving the axiom of Hegel and Marx that existence determines consciousness....I might add that it also determines the vote, or in other words, the coalition determines one's position....

On our parliamentary agenda today is the vital necessity of democratizing Israel's political life, improving government, opening public life to new forces and fresh growth, and tightening the link between the voters and their representatives....I hope that all the MKs whose parties' platforms advocate changing the electoral system will, now that eighteen months have passed, help to transfer this proposal to the appropriate committee, which will be able to discuss it in a thorough, serious and detailed way....

B. Halevy (Democratic Movement): Madam Speaker, distinguished Knesset, I personally supported the proposals for electoral reform submitted by MK Yaakobi and others in the previous Knesset....I have not changed my mind....As chairman of the subcommittee on Basic Laws I was instrumental in getting MK Yaakobi's previous proposal, which was identical with this one, to the committee....But I was unable to overcome the opposition and obstruction the proposal encountered in the Constitution, Law and Justice Committee, and so the proposal did not even have a first reading in the previous Knesset, and now everything has to begin all over again....

The Democratic Movement for Change went to the elections on the basis of a program of changing the electoral system to one based on personal and regional elections, and it was on that understanding that we joined the coalition....After seeing the fate which befell the previous proposal for electoral reform, my party ensured that this time the entire coalition, including those parties which initially opposed it, would support the proposal....With regard to MK Yaakobi's complaints regarding the length of time which has passed, I would like to point out that on a subject which is so controversial it is difficult to reach agreement....The committee will submit a proposal to the government, which will then bring it to the Knesset, and I will meanwhile submit a proposal for electoral reform on behalf of my party group.

Our proposal is similar to MK Yaakobi's, seeking to replace the existing system with a relative and regional one, but with certain differences. The opposition to the reform pertains to the issue of proportional representation, as exemplified by the widespread loss of parliamentary seats by the Liberal Party in England, despite the millions of votes cast for it, because of the extreme regional electoral system there....

Our proposal combines the personal regional election of the majority of the Knesset Members, constituting two-thirds of their number, with the national election of the remaining third....Thus, we would benefit from the best of both systems, one complementing the other....

Minister M. Nissim: Madam Speaker, distinguished Knesset, MK Yaakobi is consistent on this subject. For a long time he has advocated electoral reform, making every possible parliamentary effort to achieve it. Many Knesset Members share his views, though there are also many who disagree with the need for electoral reform and do not regard it as a panacea for the ills of democracy....But because MK Yaakobi chose to attack the coalition rather than advocating his cause, I have no choice but to bring the true facts before the Knesset....

In the previous Knesset the Likud and the Alignment agreed to work out a joint proposal for electoral reform, but for whatever reason, partly the pressure exerted on the then Prime Minister, Yitzhak Rabin, by certain members of the coalition, including the NRP, Mapam and the Liberals, who feared their reduction or destruction, the implementation of that plan was delayed....As the elections approached a binding agreement on the subject was signed by the Likud and the Labor Party within the Alignment.

In that agreement we, the Likud, demanded that the proposal be brought for a first reading before the Eighth Knesset so that it would be possible to continue discussing it in the Ninth Knesset....But this was rejected by the Alignment's representatives on the grounds that they did not wish to have their hands tied in the forthcoming Knesset....

G. Yaakobi (Alignment): We are not dealing with history here....The question is, are you prepared to start this reform today?

Minister M. Nissim: Certainly....The Alignment representatives failed to attend the meetings of the Constitution, Law and Justice Committee, despite my explicit warnings that this would lead to the failure of the proposal, while all the Likud members came regularly....That is why the proposal was not adopted at its first reading by the previous Knesset and why the agreement between the parties is not valid today....

In October 1977 a coalition agreement was signed by the Likud, the NRP, Aguda and the Democratic Movement for Change which contained an undertaking to introduce personal, proportional, regional elections by which the Tenth Knesset would be elected after a coalitionary committee had been set up to discuss the details of the change....The time allotted to the committee to do its work was nine months, and there were to be between six and sixteen constituencies....

That committee was appointed some ten months ago and has held six or seven meetings....It has discussed all the seminal issues associated with electoral reform, although that subject has not been foremost on our agenda because of various other more pressing matters, and will

continue to meet and hold deliberations, eventually preparing a proposal....In order to do that one must prepare the ground thoroughly, and gain the agreement of all concerned....MK Halevy was correct in stating that for the first time the NRP and Aguda have agreed to electoral reform, provided that votes are not lost....

A. Rubinstein (Movement for Change and Initiative): In other words, you are destroying the system....

Minister M. Nissim: That was agreed when you personally signed the coalition agreement.

(From the floor: When the DMC existed you agreed in order to join the government.)

A. Rubinstein (Movement for Change and Initiative): I was against it.

Minister M. Nissim: There was understanding and agreement between the parties. One cannot dispute that today.

G. Yaakobi (Alignment): Everything was decided, that's true. But nothing was done....

Minister M. Nissim: MK Yaakobi's original proposal, which I helped to formulate, would have meant the loss of votes by small parties. It is correct that we agreed to relinquish that principle to enable small parties to support electoral reform....And so today, after you were instrumental in undermining the agreement between the Likud and the Alignment and preventing the passage of the proposal at its first reading, that agreement has fallen by the wayside....

A. Rubinstein (Movement for Change and Initiative): Is it a personal matter?

Minister M. Nissim: It is a matter regarding which there is a coalition agreement today, and we will honor that agreement....Since MK Yaakobi's proposal involves the loss of votes by the small parties and opposes the coalition agreement, I propose that it be removed from the agenda. MK Halevy's proposal is more positive, but the coalition committee has not yet completed its labors.

M. Amit (Movement for Change and Initiative): Has it begun them?

Minister M. Nissim: It has met several times, but because it has not yet completed its labors and produced a proposal, I cannot, unfortunately, suggest that his proposal be transferred to the committee....I have no alternative but to ask that his proposal be removed from the agenda too, in the hope that electoral reform will be attained in accordance with the coalition agreement....

(The proposals submitted by MKs Yaakobi and Halevy are not adopted.)

U.S. President Carter Addresses the Knesset

Introduction

Prime Minister Begin's optimistic statement that a peace treaty could be signed within two or three months after the conclusion of the Camp David accords proved to be unfounded. Six months later negotiations were still being conducted. Some points believed to have been settled at Camp David cropped up once more; new issues were being added, including that of the precedence of the peace treaty over obligations ensuing from other instruments, specifically, mutual defense treaties which Egypt had previously signed with other countries. Once more in a situation of deadlock President Carter decided to play a personal role. In the first half of March 1979 he visited both Egypt and Israel. President Nixon had visited Israel before him, but Carter became the first American president to address the Knesset. Most of his time he devoted to discussions with Prime Minister Begin and members of his cabinet. Both Carter and Begin took care to emphasize that no pressure was being exerted or intended, yet the very fact that the President of the U.S. waited patiently at the King David Hotel in Jerusalem while nearby the Israel government met to decide and vote on several issues still pending spoke for itself.

Sitting 203 of the Ninth Knesset

12 March 1979 (13 Adar 5739)

The Secretary-General of the Knesset, N. Lorch: Their honors, the Presidents! (A fanfare is played as the U.S. President, Mr. Jimmy Carter, and the President of Israel, Mr. Yitzhak Navon, enter.)

The Speaker, Y. Shamir: I hereby open the Knesset sitting. It is an honor for me to welcome our distinguished guest, the President of the U.S., Mr. Jimmy Carter, who has come to Jerusalem, the eternal capital of Israel, to bring peace more speedily to our region. Israel's citizens feel a deep friendship for the American nation and pray for its welfare, success and prosperity. They know that Israel's welfare and security as a free and democratic nation in this part of the world are indissolubly linked with the strength and leadership of the greatest democracy in the world.

The nation in Israel desires peace with all its heart, knowing that true peace means the recognition by the neighboring countries of the

Jewish nation's right to its land and the acceptance of a free and independent Jewish state in the Land of Israel. Many people in Israel, the region and the world congratulate the U.S. President today on the tremendous effort he is making to bring that moment nearer. I hereby call on the U.S. President to address the nation. (Applause.)

The President of the U.S., Mr. Jimmy Carter: (In English) Mr. President, Mr. Prime Minister, Mr. Speaker, distinguished Members of the Knesset and friends, for the last twenty-four hours I have been writing different versions of this speech (laughter). I have discarded a speech of despair. I have discarded a speech of glad tidings and celebrations. I have decided to deliver a speech of concern and caution and hope. I am honored to stand in this assembly of free men and women, which represents a great and ancient people, a young and courageous nation.

I bring with me the best wishes and the greetings of the people of the U.S. who share with the people of Israel the love of liberty, of justice and of peace. I am honored to be in Jerusalem, this holy city, described by Isaiah as a "quiet habitation," in which for so many of the human race the cause of brotherhood and peace is enshrined. I am here in a cause of brotherhood and peace.

I have come to Cairo and also here to Jerusalem to try to enhance the bold, brave and historic efforts of President Sadat and Prime Minister Begin and to demonstrate that the U.S. is as determined as these two leaders are to create lasting peace and friendship between Egypt and Israel and to put an end to war and the threat of war throughout the Middle East.

No people desire or deserve peace more than the Jewish people. None have wanted it so long; none have spoken of it more eloquently; none have suffered so much from the absence of peace. Pogrom after pogrom, war after war, Israel has buried its sons and its daughters. Yesterday morning at Yad Vashem I grieved in the presence of terrible reminders of the agony and the horror of the Holocaust. Modern Israel came into being in the wake of that historic crime, the enormity of which is almost beyond human comprehension. I know that Israel is committed and determined above all that nothing like it must ever, ever be permitted to happen again on earth. Americans respect that determination and we fully share that determination with you.

And Americans recognize that for Jews over the centuries, as for Israel since its independence, caution and wariness have been a practical and a moral necessity for survival. And yet in these past months you have made enormous sacrifices and you have taken great risks for peace. This sacred dedication to peace, born and fostered in Jerusalem and in Cairo, has given to men and women everywhere a renewed sense of hope that given reason, goodwill and faith you can succeed, you can break down barriers between peoples who in our lifetime have only known war.

As Prime Minister Begin said after the Camp David summit, the agreements reached there prove that any problem can be solved if there is some, and he repeated, just some, wisdom. Those are truthful and also reassuring words. I know from my intense personal involvement in these negotiations that President Sadat and Prime Minister Begin have not wavered from their often expressed commitment to peace. President Sadat told me in Cairo that he will let nothing stand in the way of our shared goal of finishing the treaty of peace between Israel and Egypt and of making it a living testament of friendship between the two neighboring peoples.

I believe him, and I know in my heart that Prime Minister Begin and the government of Israel are no less fervently committed to the same noble objective. But we have not yet fully met our challenge. Despite our unflagging determination, despite the extraordinary progress of the past six months, we still fall short. It is now the somber responsibility of us all to exert our energies and our imaginations once again to contemplate the tragedy of failure and the legitimate exultation if we bring peace.

In this effort, the support of the Members of the Knesset will obviously be crucial. Our vision must be as great as our goals. Wisdom and courage are required of us all, and so too are practicalities and realism. We must not lose this moment. We must pray as if everything depended on God and we must act as if everything depends on ourselves.

What kind of peace do we seek? Spinoza said that peace is not an absence of war; it is a virtue, a state of mind, a disposition for benevolence, for confidence, for justice. Americans share that vision and will stand beside Israel to be sure that vision is fulfilled. In Egypt I saw vivid evidence of this deep longing for peace among the Egyptian people. Millions of them. But like you, they worry about the uncertainties of that first crucial stage in the broad task of pounding Middle East swords into plowshares. Like you, they hope to banish forever the enmity that has existed between the neighbors, the permanent neighbors, of Egypt and of Israel. Like you, they want this peace and like you they want it to be real and not just a sham peace.

My friends, from my own experience as President of the U.S. I understand all too well that historic decisions are seldom easy, seldom without pain. Benjamin Franklin, who negotiated the Treaty of Peace between England and America, after our own War of Independence, once said that he had never seen a peace made, even the most advantageous, that was not censured as inadequate.

Throughout the peace process both Israel and Egypt have understood that no treaty can embody every aim of both nations. What a treaty can do, what it can do far better than the fragile status quo, and infinitely better than the insidious tensions that will build up if our efforts are further stalled or fail, is to protect the vital interests of both Israel and

Egypt and open up the possibility of peace for all the states and all the peoples of this troubled region.

Doubts are the stuff of great decisions, but so are dreams. We are now at the very edge of turning Israel's dream of peace into reality. I will not pretend that this reality will be free from further challenges. It will not. And better than most, the Jewish people know that life is seldom easy. But we must make this beginning. We must seize this precious opportunity.

Fifty-seven years ago the U.S. Congress committed itself to a Jewish homeland. Twenty-six years later President Harry Truman recognized the new State of Israel eleven minutes after your nation was born. Seven presidents have believed and demonstrated that America's relationship with Israel is more than just a special relationship. It has been and it is a unique relationship. And it is a relationship which is indestructible because it is rooted in the consciousness and the morale and the religion and the belief of the American people themselves.

Let me repeat what I said to Prime Minister Begin last year on the lawn of the White House on the anniversary of the founding of the modern State of Israel: "For thirty years we have stood at the side of the proud and independent nation of Israel. I can say without reservation, as President of the U.S., that we will continue to do so not just for another thirty years, but forever."

We recognize the advantages to the U.S. of this partnership. You know that America deeply desires peace between Israel and Egypt and that we will do everything we can to make peace possible. The people of the two nations are ready now for peace. The leaders have not yet proven that we are also ready for peace enough to take a chance. We must persevere. But with or without a peace treaty, the U.S. will always be at Israel's side. Meeting in this hall of liberty reminds us that we are bound more than in any other way by instinctive common ideals and common commitments and beliefs. This Knesset itself is a temple to the principle and the practice of open debate. Democracy is an essential element to the very nationhood of Israel as it is to the U.S. You have proven that democracy can be a stable form of government in a nation of great diversity and at a time and a place of danger and instability.

But Israel and the U.S. were shaped by pioneers—my nation is also a nation of immigrants and refugees—by peoples gathered in both nations from many lands, by dreamers who: "by the work of their hands and the sweat of their brows transformed their dreams into the reality of nationhood." We share the heritage of the Bible, the worship of God, of individual freedom, and we share a belief in cooperative endeavor even in the face of apparently insurmountable obstacles. In nations around the world where governments deny these values, millions look to us to uphold the right to the freedom of speech, freedom of the press, the right to immigrate, the right to express one's political views, the right to move

from one place to another, the right for families to be reunited, the right to a decent standard of material life.

These are the kind of unbreakable ties that bind Israel and the U.S. together. These are the values that we offer to the whole world. Our mutual dedication to these ideals is an indispensable resource in our search for peace. The treaty between Egypt and Israel that we hope may be placed before you for approval promises to be the cornerstone of a comprehensive structure of peace for this entire region. We all recognize that this structure will be incomplete until the peace can be extended to include all the people who have been involved in the conflict. I know and I understand the concern you feel as you consider the magnitude of the choices that will remain even after a peace treaty is concluded between Israel and Egypt.

As the time for these choices approaches, remember this pledge that I make to you again today: the U.S. will never support any agreement or any action that places Israel's security in jeopardy. We must proceed with due caution. I understand that. But we must proceed. As recently as two years ago, after all, these present steps that have already been taken seemed absolutely unthinkable. We know that confrontation magnifies differences, but the process of negotiation circumscribes differences, defines the differences, isolates them from the larger regions of common interest and so makes the gaps which do exist more bridgeable.

We have seen the proof of that in the last sixteen months. At Camp David Prime Minister Begin and President Sadat forged two frameworks for the building of that comprehensive peace. The genius of that accomplishment is that negotiations under these frameworks can go forward independently of each other without destroying the obvious relationship between them. They are designed to be mutually reinforcing with the intrinsic flexibility necessary to promote the comprehensive peace that we all desire.

Both will be fulfilled only when others of your Arab neighbors follow the visionary example of President Sadat, when they put ancient animosities behind them and agree to negotiate, as you desire, as you have already done with President Sadat, an honorable solution to the differences between you. It is important that the door be kept open to all the parties to the conflict, including the Palestinians with whom above all Israel shares a common interest in living in peace and living with mutual respect.

Peace in the Middle East, always important for the security of the entire region, in recent weeks has become an even more urgent concern. Israel's security will rest not only on how the negotiations affect the situation on your own borders, but also on how it affects the forces of stability and moderation beyond your borders. I am convinced that nothing can do more to create a hospitable atmosphere for those more distant forces in the long run than an equitable peace treaty between Is-

rael and Egypt. The risks of peace between you and your Egyptian neighbors are real, but America is ready to reduce any risk and balance them within the bounds of our strength and our influence.

I came to Israel representing the most powerful country on earth and I can assure you that the U.S. intends to use that power in the pursuit of a stable and a peaceful Middle East. We have been centrally involved in this region and we will stay involved politically, economically and militarily. We will stand by our friends. We are ready to place our strength at Israel's side when you want it to ensure Israel's security and well being. We know Israel's concern about many issues. We know your concern for an adequate oil supply. In the context of peace, we are ready to guarantee that supply. I have recommitted our nation publicly to this commitment, as you know, only in recent days in my own country.

We know Israel's concern that the price of peace with Egypt will exacerbate an already difficult economic situation and make it more difficult to meet your country's essential security requirements. In the context of peace we are prepared to see that Israel's economic and military relationship with the U.S. takes on new and strong and more meaningful dimensions even than already exist. We will work not only to attain peace, but to maintain peace, recognizing that it is a permanent challenge of our times.

We will be ready to rededicate ourselves to the ideals that our people share. These ideals are the cause not only of our strength, but of our self-respect as nations, as leaders and as individuals. I am here today to reaffirm that the U.S. will always recognize, appreciate and honor the mutual advantages of the strength and security of Israel and I am here to express my most heartfelt and passionate hope that we may work together successfully to make this peace.

The Midrash tells us: "Peace is a wisp of straw that binds together the sheaf of blessing." But the wisp of straw we know is fragile and easily broken. Let us pray to God to guide our hand. Millions of men, women and children in Israel and Egypt and beyond, in this generation and in generations to come, are relying on our skills and relying on our faith. In the words of a Sabbath prayer, May He who causes peace to reign in the high heavens let peace descend on us, on all Israel, and on all the world.

The Speaker, Y. Shamir: I thank the U.S. President. I call on the Prime Minister to address the House.

H. Druckman (National Religious Party): Mr. President of America, you are a religious man and know the Bible. The Almighty determined that the entire Land of Israel belonged to the Jewish people, and if our country is not ours there is no peace, consequently: "Take counsel to-

gether and it shall come to naught; speak the word and it shall not stand; for God is with us."

T. Toubi (Democratic Front for Peace and Equality): Without the Palestinian Arabs, without recognizing their rights, there will be no peace.

The Speaker, Y. Shamir: I ask the MKs to refrain from arguing among themselves. I call on the Prime Minister to address the House.

The Prime Minister, M. Begin: Mr. Speaker, Mr. President of the U.S., our distinguished guest, Mr. President of Israel, Knesset Members, we welcome the President to the Land of Israel. In the words of the sweet psalmist of Israel, we may say today: "Our feet shall stand within thy gates, O Jerusalem. Jerusalem is builded as a city that is compact together."

Mr. President, the Knesset of Israel is before you. It has within it different parties and divergent viewpoints. As you see, our democracy is beautiful. Knesset members of every side did not interrupt your speech by a single word, but they have decided to interrupt mine.

M. Shamir (Likud): Sadat does not want peace. Sadat is deceiving the world and you know it. Reveal the truth.

The Prime Minister, M. Begin: But they have interrupted my speech. I want to say that it is perfectly legitimate to interrupt the Prime Minister while he is speaking in this House. I only hope they will let me have my say and that the Speaker will protect me....

G. Cohen (Likud): Mr. Prime Minister, I will not let you speak. Go to prison and visit those whom you have incarcerated in honor of Carter's visit, the splendid youngsters whom you sent to demonstrate against Rabin and Kissinger. It is morally scandalous. You are turning this country into a police state....

The Speaker, Y. Shamir: I ask you to stop, MK Cohen.

The Prime Minister, M. Begin: (in English) You see how beautiful is our democracy, Mr. President.

(MK G. Cohen shouts from the floor.)

Mr. President, a deep friendship binds our two peoples, your great nation and mine. There is no written pact between us, it is engraved on our hearts.

M. Shamir (Likud): He didn't say that Jerusalem was the capital of Israel....

The Prime Minister, M. Begin: The vast majority in this House loves and admires your people for being a free nation....And I have heard you say that your people loves Israel because it is a free nation. It is that

awareness of freedom in our hearts which has bound us ever since we gained independence, and it is that which will continue to bind us, so we believe, forever.

M. Shamir (Likud): This is not the behavior of a free government....

G. Cohen (Likud): Mr. Prime Minister, you demanded fresh elections of the previous government before every decision....

The Speaker, Y. Shamir: I will allow you to make no further interjections, MK Cohen.

G. Cohen (Likud): This entire decision is illegal.

The Speaker, Y. Shamir: I will permit no more interruptions....

The Prime Minister, M. Begin: Mr. President, ever since your arrival, for the last twenty-four hours, discussions have been held by the American and Israeli delegations. Those talks were important and serious and were conducted in a spirit of friendship.

G. Cohen (Likud): Serious....

The Speaker, Y. Shamir: MK Cohen, I call you to order for the first time....

(MK Cohen shouts from the floor.)

I call you to order for the second time.

(MK Cohen shouts from the floor.)

MK Cohen, I call you to order for the third time.

G. Cohen (Likud): Mr. Prime Minister, this is what you did (tears a sheet of paper). That is what will become of the agreement. There will be no peace and no oil. Jerusalem—Munich.

The Speaker, Y. Shamir: I have called you to order three times....

The Prime Minister, M. Begin: We discussed serious matters, and we spoke as free men. When we agreed we did so gladly. If there were differences of opinion between us we expressed them respectfully and frankly. That is how free friends speak, and I believe with all my heart that it is this basis which will always underlie the relations between the U.S. and Israel. We have dealt with two principal topics since your arrival, Mr. President.

M. Shamir (Likud): Two days ago you said: we will not move one molecule....

T. Toubi (Democratic Front for Peace and Equality): You dealt with everything except peace.

The Speaker, Y. Shamir: MK Toubi, I call you to order. I have said that there will be no more interjections.

T. Toubi (Democratic Front for Peace and Equality): You are trying to deny the rights of the Palestinians, without which there is no peace. A Palestinian state alongside Israel, that is the way to peace....

The Speaker, Y. Shamir: Please be quiet. I ask you not to interrupt.

G. Cohen (Likud): This is not a theater and we are not props. You are living in a theater, Mr. Prime Minister, but we are living in reality.

The Speaker, Y. Shamir: MK Cohen, I have called you to order three times. You know what possibility is open to me after having done that.

G. Cohen (Likud): Let the whole world know that there is opposition. Why are you ashamed?

The Speaker, Y. Shamir: I ask you to stop.

G. Cohen (Likud): I appeal to Minister Hammer. You get up every morning wondering what Israel's next concession will be. That is what you have said. Perhaps it will make fewer concessions if you—

The Speaker, Y. Shamir: MK Cohen, unfortunately, I now have no choice but to propose that you be removed from the Chamber....

G. Cohen (Likud): I appeal to the Knesset Members. You have raised your hands so many times. You will regret this—

...

The Speaker, Y. Shamir: The majority has voted in favor of removing you from the sitting. I ask you to leave.

G. Cohen (Likud): I think it is a disgrace to Israel's Knesset today that it is removing a Knesset Member from the Chamber. I relinquish my immunity, I wish to sit with those youngsters whom you have put in jail today in order to shut their mouths, in order to accomplish this falsehood more quickly, so that they will not be seen. You are afraid of criticism—

The Speaker, Y. Shamir: MK Cohen, I ask you to leave the Chamber.

G. Cohen (Likud): Don't you have women ushers? I'm not going outside, I'm leaving to continue the struggle against you. (She leaves the Chamber.)

The Speaker, Y. Shamir: Knesset Members, I ask you to keep quiet. I call on the Prime Minister to continue.

The Prime Minister, M. Begin: There are two main subjects on the agenda of our discussions: the situation in the region and the peace process.... We are an integral part of the free world, and as such—

M. Wilner (Democratic Front for Peace and Equality): Do you know what is happening today in the West, in the free world of Chile, of South Africa, of Uruguay, of Nicaragua? That is your free world.

The Prime Minister, M. Begin: What about Moscow...?

M. Wilner (Democratic Front for Peace and Equality): You conduct pogroms in schools. You send the army against sixteen-year-old schoolgirls. That is the free world and those are human rights.

The Speaker, Y. Shamir: I call you to order for the first time....

The Prime Minister, M. Begin: Because we are an integral part of the free world we view with concern developments in the region and elsewhere. 151 countries are members of the U.N. today. Only 35 of them have a democratic regime, independent law courts, a free press which is entitled to criticize and even to attack the elected government, a parliamentary opposition which has every right to criticize and even attack those in whom the nation has placed its trust to form a government. In the last two years six countries have gone over to totalitarian regimes. The free world must ask itself: what is becoming of us?

M. Shamir (Likud): Did you try to draw any conclusions from what happened in Iran? Isn't it clear to you today that by withdrawing from the Sinai you are abandoning the State of Israel? Did you say that to the U.S. authorities? Will they abandon us as they have abandoned other places? We won't be the victims of political errors....

The Prime Minister, M. Begin: I repeat, it may be possible to interrupt the Prime Minister, but one cannot stop a Knesset Member from saying what he wants to say from this podium....I hope that the Speaker will give me the necessary protection in this....It is regrettable but true to say that in the Middle East Israel is the only democracy....

M. Shamir (Likud): Why are you signing? You are signing with a Nazi dictator who is plotting to destroy the State of Israel. You know that.

The Speaker, Y. Shamir: MK Shamir, I call you to order for the first time. I call you to order for the second time.

(MK Shamir shouts from the floor.)

I call you to order for the third time.

The Prime Minister, M. Begin: Consequently, we have the stability embodied in that kind of regime. Consequently we can, as we all desire, guarantee human and national liberty in the region, so that all the nations may live in it together. We have demonstrated our desire for peace, both the nation and its elected representatives. As you said quite rightly, Mr. President, we took great risks and made enormous sacrifices for the sake of peace. Not only do I not deny that fact, it is my duty to

note it, because we prefer sacrifices for peace than victims in war. We have no further need to demonstrate our desire for peace, our love of peace and our readiness to take risks and make sacrifices for it. We have already done it.

The Camp David agreements were signed, brought before the Knesset for approval and adopted by the majority in the House. We will be faithful to the Camp David accords and to every word they contain. We will implement the agreements in full. Our signature is our bond. Agreements must be kept. That is what we have always believed and what we will continue to believe. The Camp David accords consist of three parts: one, the signing of a peace treaty between Egypt and Israel; two, the appeal by Egypt and Israel to Israel's other neighbors to join the peace process; three, the problem of the Arabs of the Land of Israel, our neighbors—

T. Ziad (Democratic Front for Peace and Equality): The problem of the Palestinian Arabs, that's what it's called.

The Prime Minister, M. Begin: —with whom we wish to live in peace, in understanding, in mutual respect and in security, giving our neighbors every chance of attaining the autonomy which, to the best of our understanding, is one of the finest concepts of Judaism and Zionism.

T. Ziad (Democratic Front for Peace and Equality): Autonomy is a disguise for continued occupation.

M. Shamir (Likud): Autonomy establishes the Arafat-Palestinian state in the Land of Israel. You know that. Autonomy is withdrawal to the borders of 4 June 1967, abandoning the heart of the Land of Israel. No one in this country agrees to autonomy.

The Speaker, Y. Shamir: MK Shamir, I remind you that I have called you to order three times....

The Prime Minister, M. Begin: As you said quite rightly, it is possible to conduct negotiations on the two main subjects independently, as we indeed did. From this podium today I would like to call on Syria, Jordan and Lebanon, our neighbors who participated in the Baghdad Conference, to join the peace process and start negotiating with Israel at whichever site they choose and to which we agree, so that we may prepare peace treaties.

U. Avneri (Sheli): And the Palestinian Arabs.

The Prime Minister, M. Begin: But naturally I can only issue this appeal. Neither Egypt nor Israel—nor even the U.S.—can force any of those countries to come to the negotiating table. They have heard and read our invitation. I wish to express the hope that the day is not far off

when they will accept it...There are still serious problems connected with the peace treaty between us and Egypt.

T. Toubi (Democratic Front for Peace and Equality): Your political problems are that you want to maintain the occupation against the Palestinian Arabs. Until you recognize their right to a state alongside Israel neither nation will have peace....

The Speaker, Y. Shamir: MK Toubi, I call you to order for the second time....

The Prime Minister, M. Begin: We have never played with words or what is called "legal niceties." The fact is, however, that the problem is one of essence, not semantics. We want a peace treaty which is meaningful, and therefore we did not agree to any addition which could annul the significance of certain paragraphs in the peace treaty....

M. Shamir (Likud): You agreed to it in Washington....

The Prime Minister, M. Begin: I hope that the peace treaty will say, as we agreed in the past, that its existence does not depend on any action or lack of action by either side, and the same applies to any discrepancy which might arise between the peace treaty and other treaties signed, since the commitments contained in the peace treaty are binding and will be implemented. I also hope, Mr. President, that on this score we may find a solution which is fair to all the sides, and which leaves intact those paragraphs which are the heart of the treaty.

We have a security problem. Even after, as I hope, the peace treaty between us and Egypt is signed, there will still be hostility on our eastern and northern borders, as was expressed at the Baghdad Conference. As regards the concentration of equipment, that will be a very serious front for us and we will have to be on our guard. Consequently, the subjects we discussed and on which we agreed are very important for us. What is security for us? As I told you when I first came as your guest to your great country, Mr. President: security for us means human life, the lives of men, women and children in Israel.

T. Ziad (Democratic Front for Peace and Equality): Security for you means occupation....

The Prime Minister, M. Begin: Yes, we have learned from bitter experience, both in this generation and in this country. And therefore we will on no account agree to place our civilian population in jeopardy of attack. We will defend it and protect it, because that is our first duty, the duty of the representatives of this nation. And I am sure that you and your advisors, Mr. President, will understand that rule. It concerns everyone in Israel. We abhor bloodshed and wars. We must give true security to our people, and that will provide true security for our neighbors too.

M. Wilner (Democratic Front for Peace and Equality): The occupation precludes security....

The Speaker, Y. Shamir: In this sitting the Knesset Members do not have the right to express their views. I ask you to sit quietly. When you have the floor you may speak....

The Prime Minister, M. Begin: Peace means complete normalization. We want peace which is genuine. We will help one another, visit one another, the borders will be open. In political terms today, normalization means the exchange of ambassadors between countries which have signed a peace treaty. That is why we have insisted and will continue to insist on the despatch of our ambassador to Cairo and the despatch of the Egyptian ambassador to our country once the peace treaty has been signed, in accordance with the timetable determined therein.

M. Shamir (Likud): Why don't you say: to Jerusalem? What is this "to our country?"

The Minister of Justice, S. Tamir: Isn't Jerusalem "in our country?"

M. Shamir (Likud): That wording is deliberate. The whole affair is—

The Speaker, Y. Shamir: MK Shamir, this is the last time I'm warning you.

The Prime Minister, M. Begin: It is true that we still have to solve serious problems. What have we done till now, Mr. President? Not only have we evinced our love of peace and hatred of war; not only have we proved our desire for the complete normalization of our and our neighbors' lives; we have also displayed another characteristic, immense patience in the peace process. We have learned that from time to time difficulties crop up, and even though they were not expected we did not give up. Despite the difficulties, we will always endeavor to overcome them because of the principles I mentioned and which we will not abandon, for they are the breath of life for us. That is why our talks have continued in Jerusalem too, and may yet continue, until all the outstanding problems are solved. Then we will be able to come to the Knesset and recommend that it approve a peace treaty in the perfect belief that it will bring true peace.

We assured the Knesset that we would not sign the peace treaty until it had been discussed and approved by it. We will keep that promise. That is not merely part of the democratic process. It is true that governments usually sign international treaties and bring them for retroactive ratification by parliament. But the problem is not a usual one, the situation is unusual. And hence our undertaking. Under Israeli law it is the government itself which ratifies international treaties. We have not followed the letter of the law. There are times when that cannot re-

solve problems. We followed our understanding and consequently gave that undertaking to the Knesset. And only after the Knesset approves the peace treaty, if agreement is reached on all the outstanding issues, will we be ready to sign it on behalf of the nation in Israel and its accredited representatives, the Members of this House.

Mr. President, the time you have spent with us has been a festival for the entire nation. It is not true to say that you came to put pressure on us. I can add that if pressure had been exerted on us we would have rejected it, but I wish to make it perfectly clear that no pressure whatsoever was exerted on us. It is true that we discussed things and exchanged views as free men, and as I said, there were points on which we agreed and points on which we disagreed. That is why I can say that your visit here has been a festival for the entire nation. And even though I have been interrupted from both sides of the House, you must know, Mr. President, that with all its differences of opinion, this House represents our nation, and it is our nation alone which chooses its representatives, and they will treat this House with respect.

Consequently, we undertook to bring the peace treaty before the Knesset for its approval, and only after the Knesset has discussed it perfectly freely and voted on it can we put our signatures to it. I am proud of Israel's democracy, even though it extracts a price, as it has today, too. But we have been given proof of the fact that it works, can be made to work, can be believed in, and that democracy greets the great American democracy. We have weathered various crises together, and I fully believe that we will do so in the future too.

We heard a very important statement from you today, and we appreciate it. It is true, the friendship between the U.S. and Israel is in the heart of the American people, and it is also in the heart of this nation. When you return to your country, Mr. President, tell your people that they have an ally in the Middle East which maintains a life of liberty, which loves peace and desires it with all its heart, whose elected representatives have made great sacrifices and taken enormous risks for it and have been faithful to everything they have signed on whatever document. Also tell your great nation, Mr. President, that the American people does indeed have an ally in the Middle East, a nation which is free and loyal and stable as only a democracy can be. In that spirit—

T. Ziad (Democratic Front for Peace and Equality): How does democracy accord with the policy of the national repression of half a million civilian Arab inhabitants of this country?

The Speaker, Y. Shamir: MK Ziad, kindly stop.

Z. Atshi (Movement for Change and Initiative): Do you speak for them?

T. Ziad (Democratic Front for Peace and Equality): Yes, I speak for them.

Z. Atshi (Movement for Change and Initiative): I know for whom he speaks. One might think he spoke for half a million Arabs....You do not represent them, neither their life, nor their thinking, nor their opinions....

T. Ziad (Democratic Front for Peace and Equality): And you? You represent the policy of repression and occupation.

The Speaker, Y. Shamir: MKs Ziad and Atshi, I ask you not to interrupt....

The Prime Minister, M. Begin: Tell your people, Mr. President, that the nation in Israel and the American people, as you and I believe, will always stand side by side, in every test, for peace, justice and liberty. (Applause.)

The Speaker, Y. Shamir: I thank the Prime Minister. I now call on MK Shimon Peres to address the House.

M. Wilner (Democratic Front for Peace and Equality): I would like to propose a motion for order....

The Speaker, Y. Shamir: MK Wilner, you have one minute in which to propose your motion for order. MK Peres, kindly wait one minute.

M. Wilner (Democratic Front for Peace and Equality): I propose that the Knesset reject the political proposals of President Carter and Prime Minister Begin, because they both lead to war in the Middle East.

(Shouts: Talk to Brezhnev. Talk to the U.S.S.R.)

Together with Sadat, they have schemed against the Palestinians. We wish to save Israel. We wish to give Israel security. Without President Carter, without Prime Minister Begin, we would have attained peace. We would have gone to Geneva, together with the U.S.S.R., together with the PLO, together with Syria and Jordan.

The Speaker, Y. Shamir: MK Wilner, your time is up, kindly finish.

M. Wilner (Democratic Front for Peace and Equality): But you do not want peace. You are leading us to war.

The Speaker, Y. Shamir: MK Wilner, I call you to order.

Z. Atshi (Movement for Change and Initiative): MK Wilner, why don't you take those proposals to Russia? Make them in Moscow.

The Speaker, Y. Shamir: MK Wilner received permission to propose a motion for order. Since he did not submit a motion for order I do not have to reply....I call on MK Shimon Peres to address the House.

S. Peres (Alignment): Mr. Speaker, Mr. President of the U.S., Mr. President of Israel, distinguished Knesset Members, honored guests,

not long ago we read in a book written by an American statesman: "Why not do your best?" Today, Mr. President, your journey has given an impressive answer to that question. We for our part welcome you to the land of our fathers and united Jerusalem, the eternal capital of Israel, in the words of the Book of Proverbs: "When thou goest, thy steps shall not be straightened; and when thou runnest, thou shalt not stumble."

You are the leader of what is today the greatest democracy known to mankind, a democracy which has created prosperity and remained generous. America has fought to help other nations to free themselves from bondage and conquest without being tempted to conquer areas which do not belong to it or to rule others.

T. Ziad (Democratic Front for Peace and Equality): Did the Vietnamese nation conquer America?

S. Peres (Alignment): It is a Power which is able to impose its policy but prefers to conduct negotiations, even when they involve arguments, offering other nations its brilliant achievements in the field of science and technology in order to raise their standards of living.

We in independent Israel have deep admiration for the pioneering spirit which beat in your forefathers' breasts, as it did in those of our forefathers, respect for your religious and ethnic tolerance, for your ability to innovate, for your capacity to look towards the future. We rejoice in the friendship between us which has continued since Israel came into existence, enduring the trials of the wars we have undergone and lasting till the moment of peace which is now approaching. In Israel, as in the U.S., we believe that liberty can be fulfilled only by a democratic regime, and that a country's strength should be based on its freedom. Mr. President, the last decade has been distinguished by considerable self-criticism in the life of the U.S., but there is no point concealing our admiration for that lively display of freedom. We also, while disagreeing with one another in many areas, are united in our gratitude for and appreciation of the friendship of the U.S. for Israel.

Mr. President, as the State of Israel emerged into the light of day it heard the thunder of the cannon intended to annihilate it. We emerged the victor from all our wars, even though we were supposed to have been their victim. We have learned to be sensitive to our physical security, and we are also the heirs and trustees of the memory of the Jewish Holocaust and not only our national experience in the State of Israel. We have paid very dearly in order to attain independence, liberty and security. We have learned that a nation which is not prepared to make sacrifices in order to attain its basic values will lose its liberty and have no rest. The objective of the peace we seek is not to gain an advantage or bypass the independence, liberty and security of our neighbors or ourselves, but to maintain them without bloodshed, hostility, victims or

refugees, and so that neither Arabs nor Jews nor anyone else will have to live here in fear or submission.

Wars have left the Middle East a region racked by suspicions and fears. We hope to rehabilitate it as a region of freedom, stability and cooperation, despite the variety and differences of religions, beliefs and opinions. We do not wish to rule another nation, all we want is that no other nation shall threaten ours. We want to reach a situation in which no American mother will be worried about her son because of us, no Arab mother will be fearful because of us, and our mothers—

M. Shamir (Likud): That has never happened. Tell the truth. It was always the Arabs who attacked Israel. We have to defend ourselves. Why do you conceal that truth? We have the right to the territories which are in our hands today. They are the result of a defensive war. But you have abandoned them.

S. Peres (Alignment): Moshe, I'm talking about the future. —and our mothers will be able to wake up each morning in the certainty that there will be no more bereavement and tears. Consequently, Mr. President, I believe that the message you bring with you will arouse a positive response throughout this House. As a democratic society there are different opinions among us, but on the subject of peace our hearts beat as one. I speak on behalf of the Labor movement, which is currently in opposition. We did not agree with all the proposals our government made at Camp David—

M. Shamir (Likud): But you voted together with the government. What a funny kind of opposition.

S. Peres (Alignment): —yet nonetheless we voted for the Camp David agreements—

T. Toubi (Democratic Front for Peace and Equality): But MK Shamir, they're doing your work. Why are you complaining?

The Speaker, Y. Shamir: MK Toubi, I call you to order....

S. Peres (Alignment): —because peace with errors and vagueness in the clauses is preferable to the absence of peace.

M. Wilner (Democratic Front for Peace and Equality): Camp David is not peace....

S. Peres (Alignment): We wished the Prime Minister God speed on his last trip to Washington, knowing that if a compromise were reached—and it is not difficult to criticize a compromise—it might open a door in the negotiations with Egypt which seemed to have been locked. We expressed our admiration for the President of Egypt's historic visit to Jerusalem and observed the millions of Egyptians—a nation which bears its suffering with proud restraint—who turned out in their masses

in the wake of the dove of peace. The inhabitants of Israel and Egypt know—

M. Shamir (Likud): In the wake of the order of a dictator.

S. Peres (Alignment):—that there is no alternative to peace.

M. Shamir (Likud): Anyone who says that isn't saying the truth....

S. Peres (Alignment): Moshe, you have your truth, which is terribly narrow, one man's truth, and it isn't worth expanding.

The Speaker, Y. Shamir: MK Shamir, do you want to be removed?

M. Shamir (Likud): The Egyptian people turned out because they were ordered to do so, and when they are ordered to do something else....

S. Peres (Alignment): The inhabitants of Israel and Egypt know that there is no alternative to peace, that there can be no return to the hostility which inflicted suffering and death on both nations, and that for any retreat from peace neither the leaders nor the nations themselves will be forgiven. We know that the Egyptian leaders, with whom you have just spoken, are bothered by the Palestinian problem which has not yet been solved. We are also bothered by it. Our spiritual heritage and national interest require us not to ignore the rights of the Palestinians—

H. Druckman (National Religious Party): What rights do the Palestinians have?

S. Peres (Alignment):—or to disregard the fate—

M. Shamir (Likud): What about the right of the Jewish people to the Land of Israel? Remember your teachers, remember Berl Katznelson. The Jewish people has a right to the entire Land of Israel. Say it.

The Speaker, Y. Shamir: MK Shamir, I'm warning you.

M. Shamir (Likud): It's shameful to hear such things.

S. Peres (Alignment): MK Shamir, in all honesty, don't the Palestinians have any rights? What's so shameful about saying that? Aren't they human beings?

The Speaker, Y. Shamir: Will the guests please sit down.

S. Peres (Alignment):—or to disregard the fate of the refugees in the tent camps. After all, we took in 600,000 Jews—

H. Druckman (National Religious Party): Not in this country.

S. Peres (Alignment):—who came from Arab countries.

M. Shamir (Likud): Propose that to Iraq, to Syria. They caused that great tragedy. Do we have to pay for it...?

S. Peres (Alignment): We hope that there will be peace with all the Arabs, including the Palestinians, peace which will bring both them and us tranquillity, an opportunity for national expression and independent rule; not a half-peace, but a full and comprehensive peace. In Egypt we have found a major partner for settling the disputed issues. We for our part have made far-reaching concessions, including relinquishing all of the Sinai—which we thought was highly necessary for the defense of the country—in order to accede to Egypt's demands. On the other hand, we have discovered that the PLO is an organization which has written a manifesto of hatred, and even seeks to implement it in practical terms in order to destroy Israel.

U. Avneri (Sheli): Are you prepared to negotiate or not?

S. Peres (Alignment): It is an organization which has split up into armed groups—

U. Avneri (Sheli): Are you prepared to negotiate with it if it recognizes Israel?

S. Peres (Alignment): MK Avneri, you worked on that for many years in vain, why do you ask me that?

U. Avneri (Sheli): Not in vain.

S. Peres (Alignment): It is an organization which believes that terrorism, not compromise, is the deciding strategy.

T. Ziad (Democratic Front for Peace and Equality): That is a distortion.

S. Peres (Alignment): It is an organization which has split up into armed groups—

T. Toubi (Democratic Front for Peace and Equality): You don't want to recognize the Palestinian Arab people so you hide behind that kind of demagogic story.

T. Ziad (Democratic Front for Peace and Equality): You will sit with the PLO yet.

The Speaker, Y. Shamir: MK Ziad I'm warning you. Kindly let MK Peres continue....

M. Wilner (Democratic Front for Peace and Equality): If there is a Palestinian state, the PLO will recognize Israel.

S. Peres (Alignment): I hadn't heard that you were the PLO representative in this House.

M. Wilner (Democratic Front for Peace and Equality): The PLO has said that and Peres knows it.

The Speaker, Y. Shamir: MK Wilner.

S. Peres (Alignment): It is an organization which has split up into armed groups whose weapons are cocked and who compete with one another as to who can be more extreme and identify more with the gloomy reaction which besets our region. They are associated with a Great Power which could benefit the denizens of the region but chooses to contribute weapons of destruction and devastation.

We say to our Palestinian neighbors that the question before us is not to be or not to be. We all want to live. The question is, how to be and what not to be. We are trying to find an appropriate partner and a fair solution so that we can reach a good understanding with the Palestinians, an understanding which will satisfy their aspirations for self-rule for them as part of the Arab world as well as our needs for security in our land. The Labor movement supports a full and fair dialog with Palestinian leaders who recognize the State of Israel, evince readiness to conduct negotiations for a permanent peace and acknowledge that a mutual compromise is necessary in order to attain a just peace.

U. Avneri (Sheli): Does that include the PLO?

S. Peres (Alignment): For more than ten years we have been living here alongside more than one million Arabs. We know that they do not wish to be ruled by us, and they must know that we do not wish to rule them. We have learned to appreciate their national uniqueness, and I hope that they have learned to appreciate our democracy. We want to discuss a new future and good neighborly relations with them, as well as security for them and us. They are entitled to participate in determining their future, provided, of course—

T. Ziad (Democratic Front for Peace and Equality): What do you mean by "participate"?

S. Peres (Alignment): Not with guns and not with terrorism.

T. Toubi (Democratic Front for Peace and Equality): By the occupation you wish to prevent—

The Speaker, Y. Shamir: Kindly do not interrupt the speaker.

C. Biton (Democratic Front for Peace and Equality): By all means, call for negotiations from this podium....

S. Peres (Alignment): Just as we concede that there is some justice in their demand for an independent identity, they must concede that they do not have sole rights in the region. Our right exists. We of the Labor movement believe that this double problem can be solved within a Jordanian-Palestinian framework, one which will apply to Transjordan—half of the original Land of Israel—as well as to the inhabitants of

the West Bank, who are Jordanian citizens to this day. We have met in the past with Jordanian leaders. Although those meetings did not give rise to a signed treaty, they were not barren. Certain seeds of peace were sown then. The long border between us has remained quiet on the whole. There are bridges over the River Jordan across which people, books and goods pass. When Jordan's independence was threatened we did not remain indifferent, and when we were threatened from Jordan we reacted quickly but also hastened to start afresh. It would be tragic if the King of Jordan's present dissociation from the peace process were to become a permanent refusal and if, in the wake of that refusal, a third state were to be established between us, one which would inevitably be suffused with bitterness, revolt, dreaming of conquests in both Jordan and Israel—

U. Avneri (Sheli): Why inevitably? Give them freedom.

T. Toubi (Democratic Front for Peace and Equality): That's not true. It would be Israel's neighbor. That way there will be peace.

S. Peres (Alignment):—and associated with a Power which seeks a foothold for itself, not salvation for others. King Hussein has said that peace is necessary and that he wants it. Peace cannot be dictated, but it can be missed. If he disapproves of actions currently being taken in order to attain peace he should try to influence them by participating in them, not by disregarding the chance itself.

T. Ziad (Democratic Front for Peace and Equality): But Hussein is the Shah of Jordan. Don't make peace with another Shah.

S. Peres (Alignment): Mr. President, we do not aspire to expand. We aspire to security and independence. The long history of our people is full of unimaginable suffering and it needs a geographical base, one which is limited but firm, which does not threaten anyone. We cannot return to the borders of 1967 because of what happened then and in 1973.

M. Shamir (Likud): Your policy is taking us back to the borders of 1947. You are joining the government's worst plans.

S. Peres (Alignment): We need defensible borders not in order to rule the Palestinians but in order to counteract any unexpected attack....The territory is not large, but its ability to provide us with security is what matters, that is, our ability to mobilize our people's army to self-defense within it if the skies of the region suddenly darken. Hence, for example, our narrow strip of settlements along the previously uninhabited Jordan Valley.

M. Pa'il (Sheli): That was a mistake of the first order.

M. Shamir (Likud): You voted for the evacuation of the settlements. That is unforgivable. You voted to remove settlements you had established.

U. Avneri (Sheli): They will all be dismantled in the end.

S. Peres (Alignment): The settlements there fulfill a function, Mr. President, as do the ships in your country's fleet: frontline positions in a stormy sea. The movement which I have the honor of representing today adheres to the vision of a pioneering, egalitarian, independent and peace-loving society. It has chalked up some unprecedented productive achievements, expressing the freedom of the nation and equal rights in kibbutzim, collective agricultural settlements, large cooperative enterprises and development towns. In all those undertakings we have molded certain patterns of life which may be considered worthy of imitation by other interested countries, especially those which are still in the early stages of development and are seeking redemption from the ills of their initial processes. This movement, Mr. President, together with the rest of the House, welcomes your bold visit. It believes that peace is within our reach. Despite the fact that we are in opposition, just because we are the Labor movement, we will give our full support to the completion of the peace process which offers a fair solution to all those involved in it.

Today, Mr. President, you are standing in a region with an ancient civilization. Those mountains have known the heights of prophecy, just as depths of enmity have been embedded within them. Enmity must now make way for peace. We believe that the desolate deserts which currently divide Arabs from Jews may be overcome by plants and water, reawakening as cultivated fields which join neighbors and give rise to cross-fertilization. We pray that the dangers threatening the region will be replaced by peace and the revelation of new wells of youthful energy and creative impulses, so that we may all—Arabs, Druse and Jews—bequeath to our children who will follow us the best that the Middle East has to offer, security instead of suspicion, moderation instead of fanaticism, understanding instead of impulsiveness and, consequently, creation instead of destruction.

There is room in this part of the world for those who are different as well as those who are similar: for those who are different in their religion, belief, culture, language, traditions and hopes for the future. No one should have to relinquish their uniqueness in order to attain security and tranquillity. There is room here to improve and develop, without fear and intimidation, the best which every culture has to offer. This is an historic opportunity and we must not miss it. We must not let this moment slip through our fingers. Each and every one of us must do everything he can, and more, Mr. President, to make sure that the peace mission comes to a successful conclusion. (Applause.)

M. Shamir (Likud): It is not a peace mission. It is the abandonment of the State of Israel....

The Secretary-General of the Knesset, N. Lorch: Their honors, the Presidents!

(Accompanied by a fanfare, the President of the U.S., Mr. Jimmy Carter, and the President of Israel, Mr. Y. Navon, leave the Chamber. The Knesset Members stand and applaud.)

Peace Treaty between Israel and Egypt

Introduction

President Carter's visit to Israel, and his renewed personal intervention in what came to be known as "the peace process," provided the necessary impetus for overcoming the last obstacles. On 20 March 1979 the Knesset was asked to "approve the Peace Treaty with Egypt, with its annexes and accompanying letter." Once more, the list of participants in the debate was unlimited, and the entire proceedings were to be telecast live on Israel TV. As a result, the speeches were delivered in the course of the following two days, in two sittings: one lasting almost ten hours (until 3:32 a.m.) and the other over eighteen hours (until 4:10 a.m.), the longest Knesset sitting ever.

The Treaty was approved by a vast majority—95 in favor, 18 against, 2 abstentions, 3 absent.

A few days later President Sadat, Prime Minister Begin and President Carter (as witness) signed the Treaty, in Washington D.C.

Sitting 206 of the Ninth Knesset

20 March 1979 (21 Adar 5739)

The Prime Minister, M. Begin: Mr. Speaker, Knesset Members, I have come to give the House a report on the last stages which have brought us to this blessed moment, when I can stand before you and recommend that you approve a peace treaty between Egypt and Israel.

These stages began with the complete, justified and inevitable rejection by Israel of the invitation extended to me to meet with the Egyptian Prime Minister, Dr. Halil, at Camp David for a "summit meeting." Not that I have anything against Dr. Halil, whom I met when President Sadat visited Jerusalem and who is a very nice gentleman, but the constitutional arrangements in Egypt being somewhat different from those in Israel—and America, too, I might add—the Prime Minister of Egypt is appointed by the President of that country and owes his allegiance to him....The question was not one of prestige but rather Dr. Halil's ability to make decisions, particularly in view of the fact that Egypt's latest proposals, which were unacceptable to Israel, gave rise to the need for extensive negotiations between our two countries, and might even have led to deadlock and the paralysis of the entire peace process....

Consequently, with the agreement of the entire government, I informed the U.S. President that I could not accept his invitation to meet with Dr. Halil and him, though I was ready at any time to go to Wash-

ington to discuss the problems of the region and the peace process with him....Whereupon he phoned and invited me to come straight away.... Before that meeting two extremely grave documents had been submitted to us, one of them seeking to alter Article VI of the peace treaty between us and Egypt and which may be regarded as the soul of the treaty.... Paragraph 2 of that Article reads: "The Parties undertake to fulfill in good faith their obligations under this Treaty, without regard to action or inaction of any other party and independently of any instrument external to this Treaty." Paragraph 5 of that Article reads: "Subject to Article 103 of the United Nations Charter, in the event of a conflict between the obligations of the Parties under the present Treaty and any of their other obligations, the obligations under this Treaty will be binding and implemented."

To simplify matters, the first paragraph means that the treaty will stand even if Syria refuses to join the peace process....We all know what Syria says not only about Israel but also about Egypt....The same applies with regard to Jordan, which the U.S. cannot force to join the peace process even though it supplies every last bullet Hussein receives....Thus, the object of that paragraph is to preempt any future Egyptian attempt to pull out of the peace treaty because of the failure of any other country to join the peace process....

Paragraph 5 concerns war and peace. It says that we are signing a peace treaty with Egypt, but Egypt has signed dozens of agreements with Arab countries, while we have not signed any agreement with any country. We stand alone....We would willingly sign an agreement with America if this was offered to us at America's initiative....But the fact of the matter is that we have stood alone all the years, and Egypt has signed agreements with Israel's most implacable foes....The object of paragraph 5 is to ensure that the peace treaty between Israel and Egypt takes precedence over various agreements between Egypt and other Arab countries....

Let us suppose that Syria attacks Israel—and I explained this to the U.S. President without any hesitation—then Israel will defend itself. But as we all know, the problem is not solely one of sound strategy but of the need to survive. Israel will defend itself by launching a counter-attack....It has no other course. It cannot defend Tel Aviv, Jaffa or Netanya, because then it would be with its back to the sea....In order to survive we must always be ready, if we are attacked, to take the fighting onto the enemy's territory and launch a counter-attack, which we would do if Syria attacked us....Then Syria would call on Egypt to save it by attacking us in the south....And even though we had signed a peace treaty, war could break out at some point—because no nation lives on borrowed time—in both the north and the south....Hence the signal importance of paragraphs 2 and 5 of Article VI....

But at Camp David a document was submitted to the Foreign Minister, probably at the initiative of the Egyptians, saying that the contents of Article VI would not be interpreted in contradiction to the fact that this treaty was signed within the framework of a comprehensive peace settlement in the Middle East, and that no part of it supersedes Article 103 of the U.N. Charter....This would mean that Paragraphs 2 and 5 of Article VI were to become meaningless, and that other agreements signed by Egypt would take precedence over the peace treaty with us, because we had known of the existence and contents of those agreements when we signed the peace treaty....Consequently, the Foreign Minister made it clear that we would not sign the document interpreting the treaty in that way.

The second document submitted to the Foreign Minister at Camp David was what is known as the "joint letter" to be addressed to the U.S. President and signed by President Sadat and myself....This contained seven deviations from the document originally worked out by our teams at Camp David. These were: 1. the separation of the Gaza Strip from Judea and Samaria as regards holding autonomy negotiations between Israel, Jordan and Egypt; 2. the assumption by Egypt of Jordan's role in the autonomy negotiations should Jordan refuse to participate in them; 3. the establishment by Egypt of a liaison office and officer in the Gaza Strip, which is part of the Land of Israel; 4. the introduction of a one-year time-limit for the implementation of the autonomy, something to which we had never agreed knowing that the murderous PLO organization would intimidate and terrorize the inhabitants to ensure that there were neither candidates nor voters as the date approached, as it has already begun doing....

T. Toubi (Democratic Front for Peace and Equality): Meanwhile you are murdering the schoolchildren and inhabitants of the West Bank who have spoken out against autonomy and the peace agreement.

...

The Prime Minister, M. Begin: No Stalinist Communist is going to preach at us, you abject slave, you foreign agent....You sit in the Knesset and speak freely....

T. Toubi (Democratic Front for Peace and Equality): You murder children, you murder schoolchildren. The cry will go forth from here, you will not succeed in silencing it.

The Speaker, Y. Shamir: MK Toubi, I call you to order for the third time, and if you say another word you will be removed from the Chamber.

The Prime Minister, M. Begin: Do you think we've forgotten what you did, you supporter of the Mufti.

M. Wilner (Democratic Front for Peace and Equality): You are a fascist.

The Speaker, Y. Shamir: MK Wilner, I call you to order....

The Prime Minister, M. Begin: MK Wilner, you were the abject slave of Stalin, of Brezhnev, of Malenkov, of Khrushchev. Who is like unto you, you slave of slaves.

C. Biton (Democratic Front for Peace and Equality): And you are the slave of Carter.

M. Wilner (Democratic Front for Peace and Equality): The IZL negotiated with Mussolini, Hitler's ally....

The Prime Minister, M. Begin: The infernal cheek of abject slaves and foreign agents, whom we allow to sit in this House.

M. Wilner (Democratic Front for Peace and Equality): You are the slaves of the Americans. You are selling Israel to the Americans. You are the abject slave of the Americans.

...

(The vote is taken and MK Toubi is removed from the Chamber.)

...

The Prime Minister, M. Begin: As the House knows, interjections are permissible, and I am fully capable of replying to them, but what they tried to do was deprive me of the right to speak in this House. They would not have dared behave like that in the Supreme Soviet, where that sort of thing is impossible....Another deviation from the original agreement is the substitution of the phrase "full autonomy to the West Bank and Gaza District" for "full autonomy to the inhabitants," which are two very different things, for we agree to give full autonomy to the Arab inhabitants of Judea, Samaria and Gaza, but not to the territories....

Another deviation was the omission of the bracketed phrase (Administrative Council) after "self-governing authority," as it was in the original Camp David agreement....The Administrative Council was to be a defined body comprising 11 or 9 or 13 members with administrative functions which would conduct the daily affairs of the inhabitants without any interference from us, but would have no authority to alter the terms of the autonomy arrangement....If that phrase were to be removed it would be possible to interpret "self-governing authority" as a Legislative Council, which would be something very different. ...Another deviation was the omission of the phrase "and other related issues," referring, of course, to Israel's security, which had appeared in all previous drafts of the letter....These deviations were discussed and clarified at great length by the U.S. President and me.

The following afternoon there was a significant change in the situation....The President invited the Israeli delegation to the White House and submitted the following new proposals to us: to Article VI (5) should be added: "The Parties agree that it has not been determined that this Treaty supersedes other treaties or agreements. The foregoing does not derogate from Article VI (5) of the Treaty." I suggested that "and vice versa" be added after "supersedes other treaties or agreements," and this was accepted....

During consultations with President Sadat it transpired that the phrase "does not derogate" was unacceptable to him, and he preferred "is not inconsistent with," but we could not agree to that, because that would be tantamount to returning to the previous interpretation of the paragraph....Incidentally, that is very characteristic....For months, both at home and abroad, we were accused of engaging in semantic quibbling and legalistic definitions. I asked the U.S. President why Sadat could refuse to accept that phrase after it had been found acceptable by everyone else, whereupon the U.S. proposed an alternative which completely annulled the significance of Article VI (5)....Look how much attention is given to one phrase, and how....Of course, we will all rack our brains and eventually reach a mutually acceptable phrase, such as "is not to be construed as contravening the provisions of Article VI (5) which reads as follows," as has been proposed by us....We insisted on removing the additional phrase "comprehensive peace settlement," and we have been apprised by the Americans that President Sadat has agreed to this....

The document known as the "joint letter" now reads: "This letter confirms that Egypt and Israel have agreed as follows: The Governments of Egypt and Israel recall that they concluded at Camp David and signed at the White House on 17 September 1978 the annexed documents entitled "A Framework for Peace in the Middle East Agreed at Camp David" and "Framework for the Conclusion of a Peace Treaty between Egypt and Israel." For the purpose of achieving a comprehensive peace settlement in accordance with the above-mentioned Frameworks, Egypt and Israel will proceed with the implementation of those provisions relating to the West Bank and the Gaza Strip. They have agreed to start negotiations within a month after the exchange of the instruments of ratification of the peace treaty. In accordance with the "Framework for Peace in the Middle East," the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan is invited to join the negotiations. The delegations of Egypt and Jordan may include Palestinians from the West Bank and the Gaza Strip or other Palestinians as mutually agreed." No, I beg your pardon, I beg the House's pardon....I have put the wrong document in my briefcase, it is identical with the previous one, and I have therefore stopped reading it out. I do not have the other document with me just now.

M. Pa'il (Sheli): If I might give the Prime Minister some advice, he should give fewer details and explain the basic problems, the principles

of the agreement....We are able to read Hebrew and English. The treaty and the annexes are before the Knesset.

The Prime Minister, M. Begin: I thank you for your suggestion....Believe me, I have advisors who know more about law than you do, and I have learned something too. You were an instructor in our Army, after all, thank God, and must have learned something about Napoleon. He said that details were very important. Listen to the details.

M. Pa'il (Sheli): I can quote him better. I would like to inform the Prime Minister that it is the main point which matters, not the details....

The Prime Minister, M. Begin: And so, I beg your pardon for that slip. I can assure the House that the other document contains all the changes I proposed in Washington, such as the reinsertion of the word "inhabitants," etc. But items with grave implications remained in it, such as the one-year time-limit for the introduction of autonomy, liaison officers in Gaza and the introduction of autonomy in Gaza first. We naturally opposed those deviations from the Camp David accords too....

After all the deliberations we reached an agreed version of the letter, which is now before me. It is important. I will read it because it has been agreed upon by all three sides....

M. Pa'il (Sheli): We have read the document. We have it. Why do we have to hear it read out again?

The Prime Minister, M. Begin: You don't have it. Why are you preventing me from doing my job properly? What's the matter with you? I think it is necessary. Are you trying to tell me what to do?

The Speaker, Y. Shamir: MK Pa'il, you cannot tell the Prime Minister what to say. Kindly do not interrupt.

The Prime Minister, M. Begin: "...The purpose of the negotiations shall be to agree, prior to the elections, on the modalities for establishing the elected self-governing authority (Administrative Council), define its powers and responsibilities, and agree upon other related issues. In the event Jordan decides not to take part in the negotiations, the negotiations will be held by Israel and Egypt.

"The two Governments agree to negotiate continuously and in good faith to conclude these negotiations at the earliest possible date. They also agree that the objective of the negotiations is the establishment of the self-governing authority in the West Bank and Gaza in order to provide full autonomy to the inhabitants. Egypt and Israel set for themselves the goal of completing the negotiations within one year so that elections will be held as expeditiously as possible after agreement has been reached between the Parties."

Some words of explanation: there is no longer a time-limit for the introduction of the autonomy. The negotiations should last a year and begin a month after the instruments of ratification have been exchanged, while the elections to the Administrative Council should be held "as expeditiously as possible."...The self-governing authority referred to in the "Framework for Peace in the Middle East" will be established and inaugurated within one month after it has been elected, at which time the transitional period of five years will begin. The Israeli military government and its civilian administration will be withdrawn, to be replaced by the self-governing authority, as specified in the "Framework for Peace in the Middle East." A withdrawal of Israeli armed forces will then take place and there will be a redeployment of the remaining Israeli forces into specified security locations.

"This letter also confirms our understanding that the U.S. Government will participate fully in all stages of negotiations. Sincerely yours, Mohammed Anwar El-Sadat, Menahem Begin." There is a footnote saying: "In each paragraph in which the expression 'West Bank' appears, it is being and will be understood by the Government of Israel as Judea and Samaria."

U. Avneri (Sheli): I find that there are discrepancies between the English and Hebrew versions.

The Prime Minister, M. Begin: The Knesset will vote only on the Hebrew version.

S. Hillel (Alignment): But which is the binding version which you will sign?

...

The Prime Minister, M. Begin: There are three versions, Hebrew, Arabic and English. All the sides have agreed that if a problem of interpretation arises the English version will be binding....

S. Hillel (Alignment): We vote on the Hebrew version and he signs the English one.

The Prime Minister, M. Begin: Have I given you a clear answer, Mr. Hillel? I would now like to go on to a completely different subject, the exchange of ambassadors....At the time President Sadat agreed to the exchange of resident ambassadors between Egypt and Israel one month after our withdrawal to the El Arish-Ras Muhammed line....Mr. Shahal, you don't like people to disturb you, do you? I'm sure you don't respect someone who stands with his back to you when you're speaking from this podium. So remember the rule of Hillel the Elder.

M. Shahal (Alignment): Sir, if you were as careful in its observance as I am....Don't preach to others.

The Prime Minister, M. Begin: Very well, I was only asking, not complaining. I asked you to let me speak as is proper, with respect, to the Knesset Members, including my distinguished opponents, as is the custom in a democratic parliament. After it had been agreed between Egypt and Israel that resident ambassadors would be exchanged one month after the completion of the withdrawal, President Sadat rescinded his agreement, claiming that he had been assured that the withdrawal would proceed faster in some places than the nine months stated in the accord....Thus, for a reason of whose existence we were not aware, namely, the connection between the stages of the withdrawal during the nine months and the exchange of ambassadors, President Sadat declined to exchange ambassadors with us ten months after the exchange of the instruments of ratification....

I would like to point out that this is a very serious problem, because in this day and age, unlike the nineteenth century, for example, the only way international relations can be placed on a normal footing is by the exchange of ambassadors, as was the case with the U.S. and China recently....For us it is of the utmost importance that the normalization of our relations with Egypt should comprise the exchange of ambassadors....After discussions in Jerusalem, the government decided to enable the withdrawal to take place in stages within nine months....

Yesterday I received the following letter from the U.S. President: "Dear Mr. Prime Minister, I have received a letter from President Sadat that within one month after Israel completes its withdrawal to the interim line in Sinai, as provided for in the Treaty of Peace between Egypt and Israel, Egypt will send a Resident Ambassador to Israel and will receive in Egypt a Resident Israeli Ambassador. I would be grateful if you will confirm that this procedure will be agreeable to the Government of Israel." I sent our confirmation already yesterday, so the problem of the exchange of ambassadors has been solved.

I now come to a very serious matter, the subject of oil....Israel's annual oil consumption is between eight and nine million tons. This is a crucial problem for us, not only because of the vehicles owned by the general population but also because of industry and defense....The government has acted with caution on this important issue. Even before the Shah fell from power he said that he would comply with an oil embargo on Israel if this was imposed by the Security Council, the U.S. or the Great Powers....That impelled me to instruct our Minister of Energy to seek alternative sources of oil, which he did....And so, even after Khoumeini's revolution in Iran, we did not appeal to the U.S. to fulfill its promise to my predecessor, MK Rabin, given in 1975, when we left the oil fields at Abu Rodeis, to supply all Israel's oil requirements for five full years, but found our own alternative sources....

With the conclusion of the nine months' period, we are about to leave the oil wells which we dug and worked in the Sinai....That is why we

asked Egypt to undertake to sell us a certain amount of oil, i.e., 2.5 million tons, at world market prices—we did not ask for any favors. We are currently producing 1.6 million tons a year from the oil wells, and could easily have reached 2.5 million tons in another three or six months....As you know, Egypt does not need oil and already exports it, so this would in no way damage Egypt, its status or its economic requirements.

The Egyptians did not accept our proposal. We said that since this issue was vital for us, a solution would have to be found before we could bring the treaty before the Knesset for its approval or sign it. After lengthy negotiations we proposed that the Egyptians should undertake to sell us oil at the market price, without discrimination, and the U.S. should guarantee that our annual oil requirement would be supplied for twenty years....The Americans thought that twenty years was too long and suggested ten years and, as is customary in these cases, we eventually compromised on fifteen years, the amount involved being our current annual requirement, i.e., eight or nine million tons....

Thus, the oil problem has been solved, to the best of our knowledge. I would like to make it quite clear here and now that we will do everything we can to avoid having recourse to the U.S. on this score as regards its undertakings of both 1975 and now to supply our oil needs.... The problem is not that we doubt America's word, but that that country is suffering from its own energy crisis....The U.S. President was recently asked by a journalist how the U.S. could give oil to Israel in view of its own energy crisis....The President replied that the U.S. would honor its commitments and that Israel's entire annual oil consumption was only 1 percent of America's....I respect that noble answer and that is why I quote it here....But we must not forget that there are people in America who object to giving oil to Israel, and we must do our utmost to prevent that happening....It is of great psychological importance....

A few days ago the Prime Minister of Egypt, Dr. Halil, a very nice gentleman, as I have already noted, made a speech in which he said: "There will be a Palestinian state in Gaza and the West Bank. Israel will withdraw to the 1967 borders. The eastern, Arab part of Jerusalem will not be in Israel's hands." After saying these three things, Dr. Halil stated that during the period before the treaty is signed it would be advisable for all the sides to refrain from making political statements in public, so as not to exacerbate relations. Since he said those three things, as Prime Minister I have no alternative but to reply to them unequivocally, so that Israel, Egypt, Saudi Arabia, the U.S. and the whole world may know the views of the vast majority of the Members of this House....

U. Avneri (Sheli): It has already happened that the majority has become the minority, and vice versa.

The Prime Minister, M. Begin: For that you will have to wait a long time, MK Avneri....With regard to the statements made by Dr. Halil, the Prime Minister of Egypt, I am telling you, Dr. Halil, that Israel will never return to the borders of 4 June 1967....Secondly, united, unified Jerusalem is the eternal capital of Israel and will never, ever be divided....

M. Wilner (Democratic Front for Peace and Equality): If you want to continue with the occupation and destroy the Palestinian nation, that means that you want war and not peace.

The Prime Minister, M. Begin: Stuff and nonsense! What you are saying is completely unfounded. Thirdly, there will never be a Palestinian state in Judea, Samaria and Gaza.

M. Wilner (Democratic Front for Peace and Equality): You want war and not peace. Occupation, not peace.

The Speaker, Y. Shamir: MK Wilner, everyone will speak in his turn....

The Prime Minister, M. Begin: I will repeat the last sentence....There will never be a Palestinian state in Judea, Samaria and Gaza. How do I know? Because that is the position of the overwhelming majority of the House—

M. Shamir (Likud): The treaty you are signing leads directly to that.

The Prime Minister, M. Begin: Autonomy will not lead to a Palestinian state. Autonomy is one thing, a Palestinian state is another....

M. Pa'il (Sheli): In politics one should never say never....

The Prime Minister, M. Begin: I agree with that....What I said was not something political, it is something which is a matter of life and death for us....We wish to treat our Arab neighbors in the Land of Israel fairly, with mutual respect. A Palestinian state endangers the existence of our country, for which we shed blood and risked our lives. To our people I say, there is no power in the world which can impose the establishment of a Palestinian state in Judea, Samaria and Gaza. It will endanger our children in Tel Aviv, our women in Petah Tikva. That is not politics.

M. Wilner (Democratic Front for Peace and Equality): There is bloodshed because there is no Palestinian state. Once there is a Palestinian state there will be certain peace.

G. Badian (Likud): Why wasn't it established before 1967?

The Prime Minister, M. Begin: We are talking about our very existence. Do you think it is possible to bandy slogans about when what is at

stake are the lives of our children? Are we not experienced? I saw the ruins of the house in Romema where three small children were almost killed in their cradles....That is what would happen if an Arafat state were to be established in Judea, Samaria and Gaza. It would be a Soviet base. Within days Soviet generals and advisors would be installed in Bethlehem. Do we need that?

...

U. Avneri (Sheli): Mr. Prime Minister, the subject is crucial for us, and is far too serious to dismiss with a few slogans. It is time the Knesset held a rational debate on the subject.

The Prime Minister, M. Begin: Submit a motion for the agenda. I will support you. If the subject of a Palestinian state is discussed in the Knesset you will discover how few Members of this House support that foolish and incomparably dangerous idea....

U. Avneri (Sheli): I remember when I was the only person in this House who was prepared to return the Sinai in exchange for peace.

...

The Prime Minister, M. Begin: The Jewish people has every right to settle the Land of Israel. That right has been and will be kept. I only regret the fact that there are those among us who have been misleading the public for the past year and denying what has been done in that area during the last eighteen months....The Supreme Court has recently handed down a decision to the effect that civilian settlements are part of Israel's defense system....So there are no grounds for claiming that they are illegal....

...

M. Pa'il (Sheli): That was a political decision....

Y. Ben-Yehuda (National Religious Party): You are guilty of contempt of court. You are misusing your immunity....

The Prime Minister, M. Begin: Mr. Speaker, Knesset Members, when we have the Knesset's approval we will be able, next week, as we hope, to sign the peace treaty between Egypt and Israel. The security problems have not yet been resolved. Israel's security is still the focus of our concerns. Even after the peace treaty has been signed we will still have a northeastern border, meaning eight armored divisions, six mechanized divisions, fifteen independent brigades, 5,920 tanks, 3,320 cannon, 800 fighter planes and bombers, 113 batteries, 9 Skud missile launchers, 14 missile boats, 2 frigates, and that is not even the whole list.

The front will now be based on Syria and Jordan, on Lebanon, which is partly conquered by Syria, and on Iraq as well as Saudi Arabia, possibly. Iraq asked West Germany for 1,000 tank transports,

meaning that within forty-eight hours four armored divisions with their tanks can cross the desert and reach the Golan Heights or another Israeli front. That has not been the situation till now. In a few years Saudi Arabia will have F-16 planes. Jordan has a good army, it must be admitted. Syria has more tanks than Egypt has, 2,800 as opposed to approximately 2,300. That will be our northeastern border. We will not be dismayed. If we are attacked we will launch a counter-attack, and the God of Israel will help us and we will vanquish our enemies, maintaining our liberty and independence. But the danger is serious. The Knesset must know that. It is not up to us.

We want to sign peace treaties with Syria, Jordan and Lebanon. They are not prepared to sit down at the negotiating table with us today. I will not weary of calling on those three countries to join the peace process. We have had enough wars in the Middle East. What have they given the Arabs? Have they destroyed Israel, as was their declared aim? Can they dream of ever destroying Israel? But they shed the blood of their sons in their thousands, as well as the blood of our sons. The blood of their sons is human blood. I therefore esteem it. The blood of our sons is the most precious thing of all. All those wars were in vain, for they will never attain their goal. Why wage war in vain? Why not make peace? I know that this appeal will also, for the moment, be like that of one who cries in the wilderness and they will not come. But the time will come when you too will conduct negotiations and sign a peace treaty, though that is not in the foreseeable future. There is the Baghdad Front which has decided that Israel must be destroyed....

U. Avneri (Sheli): That is not true, sir. The Baghdad resolutions speak of a just and lasting peace in the Middle East, of peace with Israel....

The Prime Minister, M. Begin: I know what I have read....It does not befit you to defend the Baghdad Conference. You are, after all, a former Israeli soldier. That is a conference of hostility, of enmity, which threatens the life of President Sadat and the existence of Israel and is in league with the PLO, with murderers....

What I am saying is that the dangers to Israel have not yet disappeared. We have not yet attained complete peace and must still be on our guard. It is important for the free world to know and hear what the situation is and strengthen Israel, since that is in its interests, Israel being an integral part of it, a democratic, and therefore stable, country. No bullet will solve any problem here, and no violent demonstration will change the order of things. Stability is embodied in our democratic regime. That is why the free world has a true, stable and serious ally here, as well as one whose strength in the Middle East is not to be dismissed lightly. We will consequently be mindful of the danger as well as of the steps which should be taken to prevent war. We do not want to be

victorious in war. We want there to be no war at all, and will act accordingly.

In conclusion, I would like to explain what the government has decided and what it asks to be approved. Today, on behalf of the government, I ask the Knesset to approve the peace treaty between Israel and Egypt, with its annexes, including the accompanying letter. But that is not all. There is a very serious problem of the autonomy arrangements. We will have to hold fresh negotiations on that subject after the exchange of the instruments of ratification of the peace treaty. The government has decided to appoint a committee, the names of whose members you have read. After the peace treaty has been signed that committee, before which there are three proposals, will receive additional proposals, discuss them all and make decisions, which, after they have been approved by the government, will be conveyed to whoever is negotiating with us....

And so, we will negotiate, and I would like to assure the House that before we sign an agreement regarding the autonomy arrangements it will be brought before the Knesset for its approval. Even if the government approves that agreement it will not sign it until the Knesset has given it its approval, as we are doing today with the peace treaty.... That is why we are not discussing the autonomy problem today, but limiting the debate to the peace treaty with Egypt, which lies before you. We have not signed any secret agreement, neither with America nor with Egypt, nor will we do so in future.

What is the value of that peace treaty, for which we have sacrificed so much? I will be the first to admit that we have sacrificed a great deal, more than words can express.... But that is what we decided, what the majority decided, and why? The peace treaty is a breach in the wall of hostility which has encircled Israel on all sides ever since its establishment. For more than sixty years, in effect, we have been surrounded by countries which pronounced us their enemy, waged war on us and sought to destroy us.... All Israel's governments have aspired to break through that ring of enmity and attain a life of peace without killing, without orphanhood, without bereavement, to try and attain the normalization of relations, to visit one another, help one another, get to know one another as free, peace-loving peoples, to establish joint enterprises, to look to the future, not to live in the past. The past is terrible, with its losses, orphans and widows, acts of cruelty.

In this day and age one cannot live in the past. We must look to the future. That is why we wish to give peace a chance... with the largest and strongest Arab country. If it succeeds, as I hope it will, with God's help, then perhaps our other neighbors will follow suit, learning from life and experience that it is possible to live with Israel honorably and with understanding, in peace. And if they join, we will make peace with them too.

If we succeed in attaining that in our generation, namely, peace for all Israel and all its neighbors, then every Jew and every Israeli can say: fortunate am I that I have lived to this day. That is why this peace treaty is so important, being the first Israel has signed since our independent state was established, the first it has signed after five wars and 12,000 casualties, in order to prevent war, which will be worse than ever before, with forty million people on the eastern front and an army of hundreds of thousands, and maybe even more one day.

To break through the ring of hatred—that is our objective, our aspiration, our dream. I say with all my heart and all my being, knowing the sacrifices we have made, that it is worthwhile, necessary and desirable to do this for the sake of our people, for the sake of all our sons and daughters, for the sake of our future and for the sake of the welfare and security of our neighbors.

It is a humane act of the first order. It is a highly significant Jewish act. It is an estimable Zionist act—a peace treaty for the first time in the history of this country, for the sake of whose establishment, in effect, six million Jews gave their lives, for if things had turned out differently they could all have been living here; for the sake of which our sacred heroes gave their lives, without a murmur; for the sake of which we have mothers of sons who do not complain; which has been endangered by every war for its very survival, its entire population being threatened. We have overcome that in the past, and will do so in the future too. But we want not to be obliged to, and to be able to say to all Israel: there is a hope of peace in our hearts.

We are not exultant. There is no reason for jubilation. We are not boastful, for there is no justification for arrogance. All the previous governments wanted what this government is offering today, and I pay my respects to their efforts. But it turned out that now we are able to sign the peace treaty. That is why there is no exulting or boasting but modesty, love and faith in our hearts. On behalf of the government, I ask the Knesset to approve the peace treaty between Israel and Egypt, with its annexes and accompanying letter.

S. Peres (Alignment): Mr. Speaker, distinguished Knesset, in this important debate the Alignment will raise its hand to approve the peace agreement with Egypt. We did not reach this conclusion unanimously or easily, but we will vote as a movement, not as individuals. We gave careful consideration to the price of peace as well as to the chances of peace, particularly in view of the fact that we are not overenthusiastic about the government's program and that the gravity of the concessions in the Sinai and the problems connected with autonomy cannot be exaggerated. We decided to support the peace treaty even though we are the opposition.... It is the welfare of the nation, not party-political considerations, which guide us at this great and grave moment.

We decided to support the peace treaty because at present it is the only realistic chance of attaining peace....If it fails, peace fails. And the absence of peace—like peace—has a dynamic of its own. The absence of peace could impel the Middle East towards war, while a peace treaty with Egypt could pave the way for wider peace. If war breaks out the whole nation stands in the breach. If peace is made the whole nation must stand behind it.

There is no way now of cancelling the drawbacks of this treaty without annulling the treaty itself. And for the Labor movement, peace is a supreme value, reflecting the historic desire of the Jewish people and a genuine need of the State of Israel. What is new in our current situation is not our desire for peace but the willingness of the largest Arab country—Egypt—and the foremost Arab leader—Anwar Sadat—to depart from the paths of war to those of peace.

Even though we criticize the government for the way it conducted the negotiations, we respect its decision, which came after weighty deliberation and even at the price of abandoning its basic principles, to take this course, turn the chances of peace into actual policy and translate the policy of peace into the language of an international treaty.

Our reservations and respect derive from the contradictions with which we have been presented. We do not have the requisite number of votes to overcome these contradictions and we do not wish to absolve ourselves of the need to reach a responsible, firm and clear-cut decision. In the debate on the Camp David accords we made a proposal intended to obviate the need to dismantle the settlements, but it was rejected. It is no disgrace to be in the minority, but it would be a mistake not to admit it....

There is an opposition within the government itself which assumes that nothing will come of the autonomy plan. It is seeking to make life easy for itself, first undermining the credibility of the government's decisions and intentions and then predicting the future to suit itself. If the government's autonomy plan fails will the relations between Israel and Egypt grow and develop as we would wish them to? Will the problem of the Palestinian Arab population in Judea and Samaria disappear? Will their national aspirations be resolved? Will their natural increase stop? Will the U.S. expand its aid for us? Will the Arab world comply? But the main point is, what will happen to us? Will we want the IDF always to rule a population which does not want to be ruled by it? After the government of Israel has recognized the binding English version of the Camp David document, which says that there is a Palestinian nation which has legitimate rights and just demands—

The Prime Minister, M. Begin: As well.

S. Peres (Alignment): I am aware of the "as well," sir. And after that nation was offered, in the language of Camp David, interim self-rule as

a transition to permanent self-rule, can we now tell them: forget it? A just solution for the problem of the more than one million inhabitants of Judea, Samaria and Gaza is necessary not only to be fair to the Palestinian Arabs, it is also necessary for us, to express the Jewish people's concept of justice. We are a nation which does not want to rule other nations, which does not want to be injured by the forces of another nation but does not wish to use its forces to injure others. I say this even though in our opinion the autonomy plan is the greatest mistake this government has made. No one asked it for this plan, neither the inhabitants of the territories, nor Egypt, Jordan or the U.S. I think that the government did not really intend that this plan should come into existence. And even though at the moment the plan appears to be the vehicle of the peace plan, we know that it cannot go very far and will soon be revealed as a stumbling block which might bring the new and fragile vehicle of the peaceful relations between us and Egypt crashing down.

The autonomy plan was originally conceived in the innocent guise of cultural autonomy, but was gradually transformed into administrative autonomy and then, at Camp David, into self-government for the inhabitants of the territories....And that is not the end of the road, because at Camp David the government undertook "to recognize the legitimate rights and just demands of the Palestinian people as well." The government is trying to attach a great deal of significance to the words "as well," as if Israel's security needs offset the legitimate rights of the Palestinians....The government keeps insisting that what is involved here is autonomy for the inhabitants, not the territories. That does not accord with what was contained in the Camp David agreements, nor with what the Prime Minister said in the House in Hebrew, the phrase he used being self-government, not self-administration....This leaves the question of what is legislative open....

The question is not merely verbal. How can one separate an inhabitant from his home? A farmer from his field? Can one seriously say: you will decide your own fates in Nablus, but not that of Nablus itself? And who will govern Nablus? The civilian government, which is supposed to withdraw? And who will govern the territories? The State of Israel, which does not have sovereignty over them...? Having agreed to defer our claims to sovereignty over Judea, Samaria and Gaza till the Messiah comes, how can we govern someone else's land...?

The government is entitled to make concessions, but it must not depict concessions as being other than what they are....The vocabulary must be responsible, otherwise we delude ourselves, undermine our country's credibility, and cast doubts in everyone's minds about everything. Egypt left Camp David with the impression that self-government was merely a corridor to Palestinian sovereignty over all the territories within the 1967 borders. The government of Israel left with the impression that it might be the prelude to Israeli sovereignty. This discrepancy

will begin to be clarified when the discussion of the scope of the Palestinian self-government authority in the West Bank and Gaza begins, in another few weeks.

The Alignment continues to advocate territorial compromise, not because it likes compromises, nor because it relinquishes our historic right to the Land of Israel, but because it believes that the alternative to a territorial compromise is the relinquishment of all the territory. The Arabs do not agree to a territorial compromise because they hope to get everything....

The Minister of Health, E. Shostak: They're not getting autonomy either.

S. Peres (Alignment): But the autonomy contains more of a promise that the Arabs will get everything.... Believe me, both you and I should be more modest. We have said from this podium, you certainly have, that we will not dismantle the settlements in the Rafah area, that we will not return to the international border, that we will retain defensible borders. Don't make unnecessary interjections....

U. Avneri (Sheli): Did you bring peace during the ten years you were in power after the Six Day War?

S. Peres (Alignment): We built a country which could not be destroyed, one which is respected, with which others wish to make peace....

The Prime Minister, M. Begin: MK Peres, your party adopted the principle of autonomy and even prepared a plan for it. Why are you attacking it?

S. Peres (Alignment): We did not adopt it, sir, but we are aware of the fact that the Knesset adopted it and, as a responsible party, we accept the Knesset's decisions and propose things which seem to us to be necessary for the future, within that framework, assuming that the territorial compromise is the only permanent solution which does not involve relinquishing all of Judea and Samaria, will assure defensible borders and provided that the requisite Arab partner is found in the future....

The Minister of Health, E. Shostak: That guarantees a Palestinian state immediately....

S. Peres (Alignment): And I gather that what you are proposing guarantees that it will come about gradually....

U. Avneri (Sheli): Correct, that is what you are both guaranteeing.

S. Peres (Alignment): We are guaranteeing defensible borders immediately.... We believe that the true choice is between a compromise for the sake of peace and a decision by means of war, and here our preference is clear. The Alignment proposes that the Knesset instruct the gov-

ernment to adhere to minimum conditions in its negotiations on the future administration of the West Bank, Judea and Samaria, by means of autonomy. We are not content with what the government will decide, because the government abandoned its earlier decisions within twelve days. It might be said that this is not the right moment, but also that the right moment was neither yesterday nor will it be tomorrow....

When I heard what the Prime Minister said here today about launching a counter-attack, and what Minister David Levy said on the Prime Minister's behalf yesterday about Judea and Samaria, I can only conclude that if such maximalist statements are being made it is possible to give the government guidelines. I want to make it quite clear that none of the Alignment's guidelines contradict the Camp David agreement or present an ultimatum, but our proposal states that there are crucial points on which we should not budge....

We propose that the Knesset instruct the government to conduct the negotiations in such a way that the autonomy arrangement will be solely transitional, so that it does not block a permanent solution based on a territorial compromise within defensible borders; that the Jordanian-Palestinian option is preferred to the danger of the establishment of an Arafat-PLO-Palestinian state; that the defense of Israel against aggression from the outside and terrorism from within remains in our hands; that the security areas are the sites not only of IDF camps and bases but are also under Israeli control and include the settled areas of the Jordan Valley, the Etzion Bloc and southern Gaza; that cooperation in the development of the water sources is assured and, of course, that Jerusalem, the united capital of Israel, continues to benefit from the law, jurisdiction and administration of the State of Israel.

This is a great moment for the State of Israel. Israel of the 1970s is not the same as it was in the 1940s. Today we are strong and experienced, and it is Israel's strength which enables it to take the risks involved in peace, and we are talking about a genuine and comprehensive peace. As the Prime Minister said, there are also dangers, there is the northeastern border and there are the PLO's calls to murder both Jews and Arabs as it seeks to conduct arguments by means of rockets, killing its opponents and murdering peace. That organization, the breadth of whose ideas fits the diameter of its machineguns, whose vision is as extensive as the range of its Kalachnikovs, does not stand a chance. Our rejection of the PLO does not involve rejecting the rights of our Arab and Palestinian neighbors. We wish them well, and have respect for them, their identity and their heritage, seeking to benefit their children and their future.

We congratulate the Egyptian people and its leaders today. Like us, they have tasted war and have decided to give enlightened hope and human civilization the priority they deserve. We remember with gratitude President Sadat's important visit to Jerusalem. We congratulate the

government of Israel and its Prime Minister today. We have not hesitated to criticize them when this was warranted, and we will not hesitate to do so in the future either, but we congratulate them today for the decision, which was by no means simple, which was made after a great deal of soul-searching and which leads us in the right direction.

We will work all over the world, among our friends and our rivals, to obtain recognition for the fact that there is no truer step towards peace than the one decided upon by the State of Israel and the United Arab Republic of Egypt, with the aid of the U.S. Wars break out but peace is made. The Labor movement has done a great deal to prevent wars, together with the entire nation. It has also done a great deal to build the country and make it strong enough to invite peace. Now, too, in opposition, we will give responsible support to the making of peace, peace which involves security, independence, justice and mutual respect among all the residents of the Middle East.

Minister M. Nissim: Mr. Speaker, distinguished Knesset, the House has not known many days like this one. The Knesset has invested its time, heart and soul in striving for peace. Now the time for peace has come. This is a great day for Israel, our nation and our neighbor, Egypt. But we cannot deny the fact that, together with hope and faith, our hearts are full of anxiety....Let us pray that hope and faith overcome our anxieties.

As the Prime Minister said, we have made great sacrifices for peace....We are relinquishing our greatest strategic asset, the Sinai, with all its resources, in return for which all we want is genuine peace, as reflected in a few basic and necessary elements....One such element is full normalization, which should be established not after Israel's withdrawal is completed but after the conclusion of the first stage, namely, the withdrawal to the El Arish-Ras Muhammed line....There must also be full diplomatic recognition, the complete cessation of the economic boycott and all war between our two countries and Israeli ships of every kind must be able to pass unmolested through the Suez Canal. Above all, the exchange of ambassadors by Egypt and Israel and the establishment of cultural and commercial ties will symbolize the change in our relations....

That is what we strove for, and that is what we have achieved.... What still remains to be done is to create the conditions which prevent there being any temptation to wage war on us, even though our strategic advantage is gone. This will be achieved by means of the security arrangements which are part of the peace treaty....Another important condition is that the peace treaty will not be affected by the action or inaction of other parties, and that it in effect overrides any other treaties and agreements made by the parties involved....For if Egypt does not leave the circle of war, why should we leave the Sinai...?

After MK Peres' speech one has to talk about what brought peace, or the bridge to peace....There is only one cut and dried answer, and that is, that the bridge to peace was autonomy. One may doubt its effectiveness or advisability in and of itself, but there can be no gainsaying the fact that without the autonomy plan there would be no peace at our doorstep....I am surprised that MK Peres, who is able and experienced, can say that the Alignment still adheres to a territorial compromise.... We heard that view for so many years, but what is the point of repeating it today, when the peace treaty is before the Knesset? I would be very surprised were any Arab country prepared to discuss a peace agreement with us if our proposal for Judea and Samaria was territorial compromise....That idea has been bandied about for a very long time by MK Peres and other members of the Alignment but has never aroused a response from the Arab countries....

MK Peres has attacked the autonomy plan. That is his right. If he does that, however, he must attack the peace treaty too, otherwise he is contradicting himself....But the Alignment is voting in favor of autonomy today....This government also mooted the solution of a territorial compromise, but received a flat no from the other side....

O. Ron (Alignment): The Camp David agreements, the document we are about to vote on, speaks of autonomy as an interim arrangement, as a transition arrangement....

The Prime Minister, M. Begin: That's not true. Not as a transition....After five years a final decision will be made....

U. Avneri (Sheli): But the intention is that when the transition period is up those territories will be handed over to someone.

Minister M. Nissim: The government's proposal regarding autonomy was clear: the intention was to establish autonomy as well as building a bridge to peace. That is the general outlook and belief. I repeat, we may be entering a complex set of problems as regards autonomy, there may be differences of opinion among us, but can anyone say that without that bridge we would have reached this point...? MK Peres tried to explain the autonomy as applying to territory, not inhabitants. I can say quite clearly that there is no basis for his contention, neither in the documents before you nor in any interpretation of them....Full autonomy is to be granted to the inhabitants, not to the territory....

U. Avneri (Sheli): The two go hand in hand.

Minister M. Nissim: The joint letter refers to the "self-governing authority (Administrative Council)," in accordance with our original proposal, and MK Peres is making a grave constitutional mistake by interpreting this to mean sovereignty. An administrative council has

powers of government, not of legislation or government in the constitutional sense of the word.

U. Avneri (Sheli): Then who has sovereignty...?

Minister M. Nissim: MK Peres is gravely in error on this point...The Camp David agreements state quite explicitly that it will be necessary to determine the "modalities, powers and responsibilities," and when that is done everything will be clear. If a proper government were involved there would be no need to discuss the modalities, powers and responsibilities, would there?

The Prime Minister, M. Begin: And there will be agreement.

Minister M. Nissim: There must be agreement on this between all the parties, and only after this has been reached—as the joint letter states—will it be possible to establish autonomy....If agreement is not reached the current situation will continue and autonomy will not be established. I do not say this gladly, because we proposed autonomy in order to establish it, not in order to deceive anyone....

A. Rubinstein (Movement for Change and Initiative): Nonetheless, the entire autonomy arrangement, after the Camp David agreements, is a provisional one. What worries us is what will emerge from the autonomy arrangement....

Minister M. Nissim: In accordance with the proposal, after five years of autonomy it will be possible to discuss the subject....It is true that the permanent status of that area will be discussed too, but that does not contradict the government's original decision regarding this peace plan....Each side will have claims and demands, if any side claims sovereignty, Israel will do so too, and we have never relinquished our right to make that claim. If they wish to continue with the autonomy arrangement, that will be discussed. That may be the moment for a territorial compromise. I am not passing an opinion on the subject, but to say that if we were to propose a territorial compromise today we could attain peace is an insult to our intelligence....Thus, all MK Peres' criticisms were unfounded and mutually contradictory....

U. Avneri (Sheli): He learned from you. In 1970 you accepted the ceasefire but not the word withdrawal, which was included in the armistice agreement. It's exactly the same method....

The Prime Minister, M. Begin: I didn't vote for the ceasefire....

Minister M. Nissim: MK Avneri, I will answer you, even though the example you are giving is somewhat remote. The ceasefire could have been attained then without accepting the Rogers initiative....Later on we heard from Nasser himself that the Egyptian army was worn out and he wanted to move the missiles forward.

The Prime Minister, M. Begin: It was on the verge of collapse.

Minister M. Nissim: It was on the verge of collapse, and needed the ceasefire and would have agreed to it even if the Rogers initiative had not been accepted....But despite its total rejection of it, the Alignment is voting for the autonomy plan. But what is the Alignment proposing? Defensible borders. Another contradiction. The autonomy plan does not mention defensible borders because it does not embody any borders. It is completely different, because we reject the Labor Party concept of a "territorial compromise" and "defensible borders." Anyone who claims that it is possible to hand sovereignty over Samaria to someone else while at the same time to speak of defensible borders is continuing with the self-contradictory line, because that area, together with the coastal strip, is the crux of the matter where our defense is concerned....Can you hear what you are saying...?

The Alignment proposes to hand Samaria—adjacent to which there are areas which are densely populated by Jews—to Jordan. Then you go and speak of defensible borders. In what way is autonomy different? In that it has no borders. The autonomy proposal makes no changes in the borders. The Jordan River is the border. Only the IDF will be deployed throughout the Land of Israel. Daily life will be shared, but administered by their Administrative Council....

In addition, MK Peres told Minister Shostak to read the Likud's platform, as if to indicate that there was something there which would cause him to blush in shame....Just for the record I will do so: the heading reads: "True Peace—our Central Aim." Then comes: "The Likud government will place the aspiration for peace above all other concerns, sparing no effort to advance peace. The Likud will be a party to negotiations for peace treaties with our neighbors. The Likud government will participate in the Geneva Conference and will take every step necessary to prevent a fresh war. Its firm stand and reliability will deter aggression and avert acts of hostility. It has been made perfectly clear that the Alignment's pretensions and its assurances that it would bring peace, and its criticisms of the Likud as being 'the party of war,' are unfounded."...

To continue: "The Likud government's peace initiative will be positive. Directly or by means of a friendly country, Israel will invite its neighbors to direct negotiations"—we all know that that is what happened—"so that a peace treaty may be signed without prior conditions."

M. Wirshovsky (Movement for Change and Initiative): We are discussing peace, why should that be brought in at this great moment?"

Minister M. Nissim: I was speaking about peace, about its foundation, its value, and also what bridge led to it. Further on we read: "During the negotiations each side will be free to raise any subject. The negotiations

may be conducted in the capitals of the countries of the region, or in a neutral spot, such as Geneva. The signing of the treaties will mark the termination of the state of war, the delineation of borders and the establishment of normal political, diplomatic and commercial relations, on the basis of mutuality."...Who would have believed that these clauses in our manifesto which now appear as prophetic could have been fulfilled in such a short time—a year and a half?

U. Avneri (Sheli): Haven't you forgotten a clause about the Greater Land of Israel?

Minister M. Nissim: No, I haven't. I'm willing to read it out. It still holds good. We said, and we still adhere to this: "Judea and Samaria will not come under foreign rule." That is also the autonomy proposal. Foreign rule—no. Self-rule—yes....This is a great moment and we must muster our desires, add them to our hopes and believe that we have not made a mistake. That is also possible. We have done what we took upon ourselves to do. We have done our duty. Let us hope and pray that all goes well.

...

M. Arens (Likud): Mr. Speaker, Knesset Members, in the hearts of us all beats the hope that with the signing of the peace treaty next week an era of peace between Israel and its neighbors in the Middle East will begin. Nonetheless, each one of us must make a difficult and painful decision; painful because of the high price it exacts—the uprooting of settlers in the Sinai, the Rafah area and the Gulf of Eilat.

Not every painful decision is also difficult. A painful decision can be easy when we are convinced that it is correct, that the price must be paid and that the outcome is assured. This decision is difficult. We do not know what its outcome will be. Only in a few years will we be able to tell whether we made the right decision or not....

I would like to take this opportunity of trying to look into the future, since the endeavor to predict the consequences of our actions is what should guide our decision-making....Certain developments seem more or less certain, such as the firmer organization of the eastern front and the attempt to exert pressure on Egypt to join it. There will be differences of opinion between Egypt and us during the negotiations on the autonomy plan and the future of Judea, Samaria, the Gaza area and Jerusalem, with pressure being put on Israel by the U.S. to accept Egypt's position....There will be a gradual reduction of the area under Israel's control in the Sinai, weakening Israel's strategic position, while the Egyptian army establishes itself in the Sinai and receives modern arms from the U.S....If I could say that this weakening of Israel's strategic position would not be utilized by the Arab world, including Egypt, for aggressive purposes, I would support the agreement....

In trying to predict what will happen there are two possibilities: one, that the present Egyptian regime and policy continues, and the other, that it does not....Assuming that it does, and that Egypt and Israel agree on the autonomy plan and the future of Judea, Samaria, Gaza and East Jerusalem, Jordan and Syria may join the negotiations at a later stage and there may be peace in the Middle East. Another possibility is that Egypt will move away from the Rejectionist Front and the rest of the Arab world, while drawing nearer to Israel. There will be agreement between us on the autonomy plan, and this means peace on our southern front.

A third possibility is that we and Egypt do not agree on the details of the autonomy plan. In that case Egypt either will or will not adhere to the commitments it took upon itself within the framework of the peace agreement. If it does, this could be termed an unstable peace on our southern front. Alternatively, in the wake of disagreement regarding the future of Judea, Samaria and the Gaza area, there could be a return to a state of hostility and Egypt could rejoin the Rejectionist Front. That would mean hostility and a certain danger of war.

A fourth possibility is that there will be aggression on the eastern front. Here, too, there might be an attack on Israel with or without Egyptian involvement....If there were no Egyptian involvement I would define the situation as one of unstable peace on our southern front. If Egypt was involved that would mean war on all fronts....

If there were to be a change of regime and policy in Egypt, however, this could well lead to a period of instability, and one does not require a very vivid imagination to see that this could lead to a number of situations....I think that we cannot ignore the possibility that there may be an attempt to utilize Israel's vulnerability for aggression or the threat of aggression....Each one of us will have to assess the possibilities and dangers as best he can....I have done this. In my opinion we have made concessions which are too far-reaching, taken upon ourselves risks which are too great and gambled too heavily.

M. Talmi (Alignment): Distinguished Speaker and Knesset, common sense impels us to welcome the signing of the peace treaty with Egypt, despite the criticism of the way the negotiations were conducted and the reservations regarding the autonomy plan. For decades we have awaited this happy moment, which could mark a turning-point in Israel's relations with its neighbors. Peace with Egypt offers an important opportunity, but it does not wipe out by one stroke of the pen the burden of the past with its wars and mutual distrust. The signing is an historic act, although the historical process is long and slow and it is still a long way to true peace between Israel and its neighbors....

During the last set of negotiations the choice was not between a good peace and an unstable one, but between a peace whose basic elements had been agreed at Camp David and a return to a state of hostility. The

governments of both Israel and Egypt had reasons which made it difficult for them to sign, but, fortunately, and with the assistance of the U.S., the reasons in favor outweighed those against....There is an agreement. The debate which raged in Israel regarding the "linkage" between the agreement and the solution of the problems of the West Bank and the Palestinians has ceased, and today it is evident to all that the two are connected....

I do not know what secret the Prime Minister whispered in the NRP's collective ear, but the newspapers say that his representatives assured Herut that "we will always remain in Judea, Samaria and Gaza." They are continuing to build illusions. Might I remind the House that not long ago we were assured that the decision regarding the future of the West Bank would be made after five years of autonomy, but whereas the autonomy plan speaks of a "review," the Camp David agreement refers to a decision. Some people say that the Prime Minister has undertaken to resign if our rule in the West Bank is impaired, but I remember hearing him say at the beginning of the negotiations with Egypt that we would not move the settlements in the Rafah area till the year 2000 and that he would resign from any government that did so....

Illusions have a price, which is paid by the nation. At the early stages of the negotiations the government acted hastily and did not fight for border adjustments which would enhance our security, which are possible and legitimate on the basis of Resolution 242. It gave in on Resolution 242 in the south on the assumption that it would not have to implement it on its eastern border. What is most serious is the fact that it has not yet penetrated its consciousness that we cannot rule one million Arabs who do not want us, that we cannot maintain a democratic Jewish state which rules the West Bank by force and laws which are different from those obtaining within Israel. And as long as that is not understood and the illusion that we will rule the West Bank forever is cultivated, autonomy will lead to the establishment of another state between us and Jordan, and it will start at the 1967 borders, where autonomy begins.

In the Knesset I generally encounter irrelevant replies to this problem. People say that we came here to solve the Jewish problem, not the Arab one. That reflects a stubborn refusal to see that it is our concern for Israel and Zionism which obliges us to find a solution to the problem....The issue is to create a situation in which we will not be living on a volcano, in which it will be possible to build an Israel which is not dependent on others and to which people will not be deterred from immigrating....That cannot be achieved without peace, and we will not attain true peace without solving the national problem of the Palestinians. Autonomy as a transition stage is part of the agreement and we will have to implement it. The government should be obliged to debate it in the Knesset before discussing it in the negotiations.

I regret to say that there are ministers in this government who were inordinately involved in the initiatives in the Rafah area, and it would be better if they were to refrain from seeking to prove the justice of their cause anew by expropriation campaigns and a race to establish settlements, once again deluding themselves that by doing so they are tipping the scales. They have something to learn from what happened in the Rafah area.

M. Arens (Likud): I think that the initiative for the settlements in the Rafah area came from the Alignment, actually.

M. Talmi (Alignment): I was hinting at expropriation activities which, as I remember, the government condemned.

A. Rubinstein (Movement for Change and Initiative): The government established those settlements.

M. Talmi (Alignment): I was not attacking the settlements, I was speaking against the approach that things can be decided by establishing settlements and expropriating land. Hence the demand to discuss autonomy and the government's course in the next few years before conducting negotiations and establishing facts, as has been done this past year.

Meanwhile the peace rejectionists are at work. Since Carter's visit tension has increased in the towns and villages of the West Bank and the PLO leader threatens to increase terrorism once the agreement is signed....I do not doubt that the security forces are doing their job. We must increase public alertness now....But the government must also deter those among the Jewish public who have declared that they will take the law into their own hands, if they think that necessary....It must be made clear that Gush Emunim will not be allowed to incite the public. It is the government's duty to impose the law on all those who flout it—Arabs and Jews alike.

S. Assad (Democratic Movement): Mr. Speaker, distinguished Knesset, at this important moment I feel it is my moral duty to congratulate Mr. Begin and the members of the government for the efforts they made during the last few weeks and their wise decision to approve the peace agreement between Egypt and Israel which will be signed next week....

From this podium, from the Israeli parliament, the bastion of democracy and liberty, I would like to address the two Semitic peoples, the sons of Isaac and Ishmael, the Arabs and the Jews. The word of the Lord speaks of the blessing of peace, and men are commanded to perform the will of God....In thirty years there have been four wars in the Middle East between the Arab countries and Israel, with untold bloodshed and suffering....And nonetheless, the problem was not solved, nor was anything gained by the peoples of the region. On the contrary, this dark period in the history of the Middle East has merely exacerbated the

problem and given rise to increased hatred between Arabs and Jews, to the extent that some people despaired of peaceful coexistence....

Brothers, that was the feeling which prevailed in the region until October 1977, until that great man, the President of Egypt, Muhammed Anwar al-Sadat, arose and announced his historic initiative, as a result of which he came to Jerusalem and was given a royal welcome by the Israeli government and public which, ever since the establishment of the state, had called for peace and worked to attain it. As a result of Sadat's blessed initiative and the government's positive and constructive attitude the greater part of the psychological barrier between the two nations came crashing down, and once again we could hope that peace would reign over the Holy Land. This bore out the principle that war and force can no longer resolve international conflicts and problems.

At this historic moment, when the first layer of the edifice of peace is being built, we unfortunately hear voices on both sides which condemn the peace agreement and accuse the leaders of the two countries of treachery, simply because they sought to put an end to the tragedy and bloodshed....That is, indeed, a strange kind of logic. I hope that those dissonant voices will have no influence on the peace process....

T. Ziad (Democratic Front for Peace and Equality): And what about the rights of the Palestinian people? That's the basis of the conflict, after all.

S. Assad (Democratic Movement): I won't enter into an argument with you. You won't convince me and I won't convince you. If there is cooperation between the nations of the region, the Middle East will be restored to its former glory as a religious and cultural center....It will also be prosperous, because of the scientific potential of its inhabitants and its natural resources....It will no longer be an area of influence under the sway of other countries, whose only desire is to exploit it for their own benefit....

The peace process is still underway. We must all preserve and cherish it until it grows and flourishes and becomes stable, able to withstand the storms which may threaten it....The written agreements, however carefully formulated, cannot hold out against the negative forces if the authorities do not ensure that there is a good atmosphere and fruitful cooperation, and if the two sides are not ready to make concessions to one another....In conclusion, I would like to say that in the life of every nation there are great men. I therefore congratulate the great men of this nation, and first and foremost Mr. Menahem Begin and his government, as well as the hero of Egypt and the Arab nation, President Anwar Sadat.

Z. Wertheimer (Movement for Change and Initiative): Distinguished Speaker and Knesset, I congratulate the Prime Minister on having

brought us peace and thank the U.S. President for his efforts to achieve it.

A year ago only a few people believed that there was anyone to talk to....The atmosphere in Israel was one of self-pity, "the whole world is against us," lack of self-confidence, false assurance and political blindness regarding the Palestinians....Suddenly we discovered that things could change. President Sadat came to Jerusalem and proved that he was ready to make peace. From being a suspicious man who had been in opposition for thirty years, Mr. Begin became a national leader who conducted difficult negotiations honorably and was able to trust the other side. That trust must be conveyed to the entire nation....For fifty years this nation has been taught to fight and rely only on itself....

The dream of the founding fathers of Zionism was to establish a productive, working, prosperous society which lived by its own labor and constituted a light unto the nations. All those objectives were pushed aside because of the reality in which we lived, which required us to defend ourselves. Now that there is peace we must turn over a new leaf—

A. Hadar (Horowitz) (Alignment): Do you believe that there will be peace?

Z. Wertheimer (Movement for Change and Initiative): I am going on the assumption that there is at least a beginning. We must change conceptions. Neither the composition of the government nor the national priorities are appropriate for today's situation, and we must place equal emphasis on civilian and security needs, rather than almost solely on security needs. Our objective must be to attain a Western standard of living which will attract immigrants and enable us to reach a population of six million Jews in Israel by the year 2000.

We must sign additional peace treaties with the other Arab countries, but we must do so with a sense of self-confidence. We must therefore acknowledge the fact that some of the causes of the conflict between us and our neighbors have always been land and water, and that our neighbors' economies rest primarily on agriculture, and will continue to do so in the near future. Our conclusion must be, therefore, that the key to the growth of Israeli society and the absorption of another three million inhabitants is through creating industrial sources of employment, enterprises which may be established near the borders, with doors on both sides, to constitute a natural bridge between us and the neighboring peoples.

Peace opens a psychological gate to immigration. We must create the challenges of a growing country, with a healthy economy, which is attractive to immigrants from the West....Instead of being a country which brings people—largely from distressed countries—and tries to find work for them, we must become a country which creates jobs and is looking for people....That will make us strong in both security and eco-

conomic terms, enabling us to become "the Switzerland of the Middle East," rather than the supplier of ice cream to Egypt....Only by creating scientific and industrial challenges, while establishing new urban centers with a high quality of life, will Israel shift from being a fortified and disputatious area to one which is prosperous, civilized, attractive and industrious.

The key to this rests with the Prime Minister. One alternative which is open to him is to continue with the present team, which is appropriate for a state under siege, one which acquiesces in massive U.S. aid and is apprehensive about investing in industrial projects which will boost our economy, create jobs and attract immigrants rather than in the services. The other is to change psychological concepts, as he did with regard to the need to make concessions in return for peace, and head a team which is prepared to turn warriors into builders, change the atmosphere of suspicion to one of faith, from bitterness to tolerance, from complaint to creativity.

A. Hadar (Horowitz) (Alignment): Is the whole problem merely one of changing the atmosphere?

Z. Wertheimer (Movement for Change and Initiative): That is not the whole problem....Instead of taking visitors from abroad to the Holocaust memorial site at Yad Vashem, we should take them to prosperous factories, and they should be met at the airport by children with flowers, not by soldiers with bayonets. If the Prime Minister does not see to bringing about that change all the dreams and efforts of generations of pioneers who drained the swamps and fought in Israel's wars will have been wasted. I know that all his life the Prime Minister has focused on political issues and neglected internal concerns. This is the time for him to prove himself. Just as by his stubbornness he brought us peace, that same characteristic must now be utilized to reorganize and build up a State of Israel which can endure throughout the generations in conditions of peace.

M. Katzav (Likud): Mr. Speaker, distinguished Knesset, on this day, the day on which the peace agreement with Egypt is approved by the Knesset, the Jewish people should remember its sons and daughters who fell in Israel's wars, to ensure the survival of the state. Throughout the history of the state, ever since the rule of the Turks, the nation has known bereavement and pain, and it is this, which we must remember today, which has enabled us to reach a peace agreement with the largest and strongest Arab country....

The peace treaty is controversial....Today's decision affects everyone in Israel. Unfortunately, however, the public has not been asked its opinion on the peace treaty. Such a crucial, fateful and important decision is being made by the nation's elected representatives, who have not been empowered to do this....Important issues were brought before the

public in the 1977 election campaign. We all asked for the public's trust to act in social, economic, political and security spheres....No one has brought the peace treaty with Egypt before the nation, nor was it mentioned during the election campaign, since no one thought then that things would develop as they did....

The nation empowered us to decide for it for four years only on those topics which were discussed during the election campaign....Of course, the nation would rather decide for itself on social, economic, political and security affairs, if that were feasible. But on this crucial, fateful and important subject we have not received the nation's mandate to decide....The nation must be the master of its own fate and we must put the decision in its hands.

S. Aloni (Citizens' Rights Movement): You didn't ask for a referendum on the Litani Operation.

M. Katzav (Likud): MK Aloni, don't you see the difference between the Litani Operation and the peace treaty with Egypt?

S. Aloni (Citizens' Rights Movement): I do.

M. Katzav (Likud): There are subjects which can be submitted to a referendum and subjects which cannot. There should be a referendum on a peace treaty, and in technical terms it can be implemented within ten days....

S. Aloni (Citizens' Rights Movement): Do you want to ask the nation whether we want to rule another people...? Or do you want a referendum in the West Bank as to whether they want us to rule them?

Y. Zakai (Alignment): That's not what he said....He said that this subject should be put to the referendum.

S. Aloni (Citizens' Rights Movement): To ask the nation whether it wants peace?

M. Katzav (Likud): MK Aloni, there is one subject currently before us. Because it is both controversial and fateful, one may vote for or against it....

S. Aloni (Citizens' Rights Movement): One holds a referendum on a specific subject. Kindly tell us what specific question you intend to ask in the referendum.

M. Katzav (Likud): The specific question is whether to approve the peace treaty with Egypt or not....The public is apprehensive, anxious and hopeful concerning the peace treaty. I also understand the minority of MKs who oppose the peace treaty because of the far-reaching concessions we are making and their concern for Israel's fate. I do not accept the division of the House into those who want peace and those who oppose

it....We heard the Prime Minister's explanations regarding clauses VI (2) and VI (5) today, yet Egypt has still signed treaties with countries which are our enemies, stating explicitly that it will help them should there be war with Israel.

The Prime Minister, M. Begin: MK Katzav, the idea of a referendum has been floating around here for twenty-five years. With all its difficulties, it is a positive idea. But if we were to accept it today the impression in the world would be that we were withholding approval of the treaty for several months, contrary to our undertaking....

M. Katzav (Likud): I thank the Prime Minister for his comment. The question is whether the referendum would indeed take several months.

Y. Zakai (Alignment): MK Katzav, in your place I would ask the Prime Minister what he would say today if he were the leader of the opposition, whether he would demand a referendum or not....

M. Katzav (Likud): The fact that Egypt still has valid mutual defense pacts with countries which are hostile to us must arouse fears and anxieties with regard to the future....One may assume that Syria and Jordan and the inhabitants of Judea, Samaria and the Gaza district will want to put the peace treaty between Israel and Egypt to the test and will seek to provoke us....

The peace treaty also contains deliberately vague formulations, intended to enable both sides to sign it. Yet the essential disagreements remain, and may well reemerge in the next three or four years....Thus, at any time it should wish to do so, Egypt may find an excuse for violating the peace treaty. Certain expressions and clauses give us cause to be concerned, and we would do well to remember that the root cause of the Second World War was the peace treaty signed at the end of the First World War....

However, I see many positive elements in the autonomy plan....The government of Israel did not accede to every demand made by Egypt. I would like to ask those who oppose autonomy and demand the imposition of Israeli sovereignty and law on Judea, Samaria and the Gaza District whether, if we were to annex those areas to Israel, it would not be logical and natural to enable their inhabitants to conduct their lives by means of their own internal institutions of administration as regards social, educational, agricultural and police concerns? It is evident to us now that administrative autonomy is necessary, even if Israeli sovereignty is imposed on Judea, Samaria and the Gaza District....

Those who oppose the peace treaty should also remember that the Likud was not elected to govern in 1948 or in 1967, after the Six Day War, but only in 1977....No Israeli government since 1948 spoke of the Jewish people's historic right to the Land of Israel. The terms "Judea and Samaria" were unknown in international diplomacy until mid-

1977. The present government did not begin to rule when the state was established, it is continuing a policy which was conducted for twenty-nine years, a policy which did not refer to the historic right of the Jewish people to the Land of Israel, and it is obviously no easy matter to change the course of international diplomacy....

Y. Zakai (Alignment): MK Katzav, how did they refer to the Rafah area in the last two years?

M. Katzav (Likud): Israel is interested in becoming part of the region. The dream of millions of Jews throughout the world and in Israel is being fulfilled. There is a peace treaty with the largest and strongest Arab country. Nonetheless, the Israeli public is not overly enthusiastic, despite all the predictions....For thirty years we yearned for peace, and now the nation's heart is heavy, and justifiably so....

The Egyptians should be aware of the fact that there are apprehensions and anxieties here, but that hope outweighs them all. We must not forget the Israeli settlers in the Sinai, whose dream has been crushed. They are the emissaries of the state. But we must also beware of losing the etatist approach, of misinterpreting the meaning of national sovereignty. We must be responsible for our fate and not let irresponsible elements decide matters for the nation. I am convinced that even in times of difficulty this nation will emerge triumphant.

Peace is a magic word, there is no one who does not want it. The reality of the daily lives of the Israeli and Egyptian nations is what will determine the fate of peace. There is an opportunity for direct contact between the two nations. There are elements in the peace treaty which occasion optimism, one of them being the fact that finally the government of Israel may be freed of the terrible burden of foreign affairs and security concerns and will be able to devote itself to Israel's internal problems....

A. Eban (Alignment): Mr. Speaker, distinguished Knesset, I would like to start by pointing out to MK Katzav that since its establishment Israel has been a representative democracy which has proved itself in the trials of war and the challenges of development. If the Knesset which represents the electorate does not trust itself, it had better go home....

The tribulations of peace are great and its price is high, but are not the agonies of repeated wars and the cost of continued hostility harder to bear? After all the arguments and discussions, after examining all the clauses and articles, the decision must be reached on the basis of asking what is the outcome of approving the treaty or rejecting it. My unequivocal answer is: this is the day for which we have been waiting....If we were debating the failure of the negotiations today would we not all feel the heavy and depressing burden of the dark clouds of fear above our heads...?

The large and growing section of the Knesset which is represented by the Alignment must welcome this achievement, and congratulate itself on it, for historic events do not spring from nothing. The peace treaty with Egypt is partly the outcome of negotiations conducted by the government since the end of 1977....In its deepest sense, however, this event reflects a basic change in Egyptian policy which crystallized after the Yom Kippur War. What does that change mean and wherein lie its roots? Those in Egypt who support peace speak to us clearly from the newspapers and in conversations. When they are asked how they reached their acceptance of Israel they reply that it is because of our might, not necessarily our right, and their realization that Israel cannot be defeated in war or wiped off the face of the earth....To these clear and honest explanations they add the fact that the disengagement and interim agreements of 1974 and 1975 constituted a bridge between war and peace, with three years of tranquillity, the separation of forces and reduction of troops....

If the majority in the Knesset had accepted in the past the policy advocated by the previous opposition, namely, opposition to any agreement with an Arab country, from the armistice agreements to the disengagement and interim agreements, with a continual conflict with the U.S., the prime source of our increased strength, we would be entrenched in a vicious circle of war today rather than embarking on peace....

I mention the history of the change in Egypt's position not in order to claim royalties for forgotten rights but because of their implications for the future. Several changes in thinking and approach in both Egypt and Israel are required today, and these are in no way dependent on the wording of the treaty. Egypt must realize that although it may have equality with Israel in formal, contractual terms, this does not apply in the area of implementation. The burden of implementation rests solely on Israel, it alone has to undergo a traumatic, virtually surgical, process. It must dismantle a naval base, uproot airfields, abandon settlements and banish settlers from their homes. It must relinquish the sense of strategic depth upon which it has relied for eleven years. It must prepare to replace the form of government in the territories with Arab self-government....

U. Avneri (Sheli): Let's not forget that Egypt, for its part, has entered into a conflict with the entire Arab world.

A. Eban (Alignment): I'm coming to that, sir. Even those of us who recommend accepting those concessions should not belittle their painful nature, but in the face of a deeper understanding by Egypt of Israel's sensitivity to security, Israelis must reach a fuller awareness of Egypt's character; not only its history, language, faith and culture, but also the special tension which pervades its entire national movement. No Arab and Moslem leader has ever agreed to detach himself in this way from

the avowed consensus within Islam and the Arab family. The tension between Egyptian particularism and Arab solidarity is the motif which runs through the entire history of Egyptian nationalism. In one mood Egypt thinks of itself, the Delta, the Nile, Alexandria, the memories of Hellenistic culture and the culture of the pharaohs. But in another mood it remembers that it occupies a senior position within the Arab and Moslem family of nations. It is an illusion to think that it has agreed or will agree to abandon its Arab position completely, take back the expanses of the Sinai and be satisfied with the fact that the Palestinians are granted the kind of autonomy described to us here by MK Nissim which in practical terms means continued Israeli rule while throwing a few crumbs of local rights to inhabitants whose existence as a nation with legitimate rights was recognized by Mr. Begin when he signed the Camp David accords....The fact that Halil interprets autonomy as the corridor to self-determination is of very grave significance for the future development of contractual relations between Israel and Egypt.

The Prime Minister was very pleased with the praise he received for the autonomy plan in its first incarnation from Carter, Callaghan and others. But he should have asked himself why they praised it....Was it because they had adopted the Likud's political position or because they thought that Mr. Begin had adopted theirs? It is true that all those who saw the autonomy plan praised it, but not all those who praised it understood it in the same way as the Prime Minister did. In that case the truth must be told to the nation in Israel. If autonomy is implemented honestly it means the transition to Arab self-government. That does not worry me provided Israel's basic interests—defensible borders and security arrangements—are assured.

The fact that the word in the text is "autonomy" rather than "independence" is completely irrelevant. Every institution and concept has a dynamic which is not always dependent on the intentions of the authors. The members of the government should read Professor Akzin's book, which says that when autonomy is granted to a population which has a national character, and that population lives within a defined territorial concentration and seeks to separate itself from the united framework, the detachment is inevitable. That being so, there are various possibilities, one being that the autonomy plan will not be implemented because the Arabs are not prepared to accept the limited and limiting interpretation put on it by the government in the spirit of the agreement with the NRP, in which case there will be conflict with the U.S., meaning a crisis which will not only prevent additional developments towards peace with the Arab world but will also endanger the great achievement of peace with Egypt. Another possibility is that under the influence of the U.S. and Egypt, as well as of sagacity, the autonomy plan will be implemented, the self-governing authority will be established and they will declare their independence, despite and in defi-

ance of the government and in the certainty of gaining the recognition of 120 countries. In the face of that possibility the prospect the Prime Minister is offering us is that the IDF will enter that "museum" in order to disperse the leaders as they are declaring their independence.

The document which the Alignment has prepared seeks a compromise solution which grants the inhabitants full independence under an Arab flag, after a transition period, while maintaining Israel's security. It is possible to disagree with it, but I have not seen any other document which seeks to attain the dual aim of not obliging us to rule a million Arabs while maintaining minimal conditions of security for Israel. The government should tell the nation frankly that on the subject of Judea, Samaria and Gaza there is no agreed policy and that there is a crisis in the offing because of the diametrically opposed interpretations of Israel and the other international elements regarding the fate of those territories. The nation does not require tranquilizers, it needs energizers so that it may be alert and responsible.

In conclusion, I would like to pay my respects to one of the leading political thinkers of our age, Jean Monnet, who passed away recently....He gave us some ideas which are brilliant in their simplicity: that there are no conflicts which continue forever, and that even a continent which has been drenched in blood and ravaged by warfare can reach peaceful coexistence. In the twentieth century borders can be bridges, not barriers. A person can be loyal to both his special national identity and the interests and prosperity of the region in which he lives. We would do well to remember that concept of community.

The test of the peace treaty with Egypt is less in the particulars of its wording than in the new reality which will grow up around it, that is, by creating joint regional interests, cooperation, commercial, tourism and social ties, with human, spiritual and cultural links of such a kind that all reasonable chance of war will be obviated. In congratulating the government and the nation on this achievement, let us hope that the peace treaty between Israel and Egypt will move towards that vision.

...
M. Wilner (Democratic Front for Peace and Equality): Mr. Speaker, distinguished Knesset, the subject we are discussing is the most important for the nation....No one else is as earnest as we are in their desire to put an end to war and bring peace. The problem is, will the decision brought before the Knesset today really bring peace? I would settle for less than that, even. Does the Egyptian-Israeli-American agreement bring peace nearer or not? I am convinced that not only does this agreement not bring peace nearer, it even places it further away and brings an unprecedentedly fierce war closer.

The first thing in the agreement is that Begin's government has obtained the agreement of the President of Egypt to continue with the occupation of the territories for another five years at least....Not only does

the agreement not resolve the main point of the Israel-Arab conflict, the question of the Palestinians, it sets out to deny them their right to self-determination and to establish their independent state alongside Israel. The Prime Minister said again today that Begin and Sadat will decide who will be the Palestinian representatives in the negotiations, stating at the same time that there will never be a Palestinian state....This means that what is known as autonomy is in fact cynicism, disregard for Israel's true interests and security and total lack of concern for the Palestinians....

The object of the agreement is not to enhance the security of Israel or Egypt, but to advance the strategic interests of the U.S. at the expense of Israel and Egypt. Its object is to provide Egypt and Israel with huge amounts of sophisticated weaponry, to serve the interests of the U.S. as policemen in a war which does not concern us and which is directed against national liberation movements and will bring poverty, inflation and misery to the entire region....

The Prime Minister has made it perfectly clear that the government continues to adhere to the policy of the Greater Land of Israel....The agreement between the Prime Minister and the NRP regarding what is known as autonomy makes it clearer still that no one is thinking seriously about peace....That agreement contains six points: 1. opposition to the establishment of a Palestinian state; 2. self-rule to apply to people, not territory, i.e., autonomy regarding sewage; 3. Israeli control of public land and sources of water within autonomy. More than 30 percent of the West Bank has already been appropriated; 4. the settlers in the West Bank and the Gaza Strip to be under Israeli jurisdiction; 5. settlement activities to continue in those areas; 6. internal and external security under the autonomy to be under the control of the IDF. All this means occupation, and occupation means war, with the resultant casualties and suffering to Israel....

Anyone who is in favor of peace is against occupation; anyone who is in favor of war simply has to propose a plan which involves continued occupation....Sadat has betrayed the Palestinian people, the peace and the Egyptian nation....With all his patriotic verbiage, the Prime Minister is selling Israel to a foreign Power, and by offering a naval base to the Americans has become the slave of American imperialism and has abandoned Israel's security and future to a cycle of wars, would that I were wrong....

What is behind the agreement is that Egypt and Israel will serve as policemen against socialist-oriented countries in Africa and that Israel is preparing for a war against Syria, with the agreement of Sadat and the U.S....This will deepen the rift between Israel and the Arab countries. Learn from what happened in Iran. The Prime Minister praised the "democracy" of the Shah, that blood-thirsty dictator. It is not a problem of arms. There were large quantities of arms in Iran, yet the

regime collapsed. U.S. arms cannot maintain rotten regimes upon which Israel's security and these agreements are based. Nor will U.S. backing prevent the inevitable—the realization of the rights of all nations.

Peace is possible. Information is being concealed from the Knesset and the nation....As a PLO representative said just last week, the PLO has already made too many concessions in agreeing to a Palestinian state in the West Bank and the Gaza Strip, which are only 22 percent of the area of Palestine....I say that the establishment of a Palestinian state does not constitute "the greatest danger to Israel," as the Prime Minister said, but on the contrary, if a Palestinian state is established and makes peace with Israel that will be the best guarantee of a just and comprehensive peace....Guarantees can be obtained from the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. if that is what you want, but anyone who builds security on the destruction of the Palestinian people will bring disaster on Israel.

I would like to conclude by saying that this agreement will act as a boomerang, just as the Camp David accords did not prevent misfortunes overtaking American imperialism, even accelerating its failures. Sadat is isolated in the Arab world. There is opposition within Egypt too. The new agreement is a plot which will isolate those involved in it. There is a solution, there is a way to peace, on the basis of the establishment of a Palestinian state alongside Israel together with withdrawal to the borders of 4 June 1967, with the participation of the U.N., the U.S. and the U.S.S.R., within the framework of the Geneva Conference.

M. Porush (Aguda): Distinguished Speaker and Knesset, is there no way of cleansing the podium after what MK Wilner has said? It is written: "The Lord shall give strength to his people; the Lord shall give his people peace," meaning that the Lord shall give his people peace once he has given them strength, for without strength there is no peace....Our nation's strength is the holy Law, and it is on that basis that we assess the peace agreement....

Neither human concepts nor mortal wisdom could have predicted the dramatic developments which we are currently witnessing. Who can fail to be stirred or to believe in Divine providence...? I would like to make it clear from the outset that I am glad that the peace agreement has been reached, despite the dangers involved. Our sages have said that all beginnings are difficult. I do not think that even the most enthusiastic supporters of the peace agreement with Egypt regard this as the ideal peace, but I am equally sure that deep in their hearts even those who reject the agreement most vehemently feel that it does, despite all its drawbacks, constitute a very serious turn-about on the part of the Egyptians, indicating acceptance of our existence....

The speeches made from this podium by previous prime ministers concerning their yearning for peace still echo in my ears....But none of them sat down to hold direct negotiations with any Arab country. Those

attempts that were made in that direction focused on the smallest and weakest Arab country—Jordan....Yet today we are being asked to decide about signing a peace treaty with the largest and strongest Arab country—Egypt....This is indeed an historic moment and a significant turning-point....

I have great respect for the Alignment's decision to oblige its members to vote for the peace treaty proposed by the government if its own proposal to separate the subject of autonomy from the agreement is rejected. I commend the members of the opposition for their 'etatist responsibility in supporting an agreement which was reached without them. We commend the decisions of most of the parties which decided to support the agreement. The agreement embodies great hopes as well as grave hazards, though the latter do not overshadow the former....

This must be a moment of rejoicing and trembling for us....After sixty years of ceaseless wars we are now about to sign the first agreement, and with the largest Arab country. That is certainly a cause for rejoicing. But there is no one who can guarantee what the future has in store for us and how the agreement will be fulfilled. And hence we cannot but tremble....Until the President of Egypt took his dramatic step no Arab leader had shifted in his attitude towards us in any way, and neither has any other Arab leader done so yet....

We must give full credit to the Prime Minister, Menahem Begin, who directed events with wisdom, courage and vision, withstanding pressure heroically, refusing to bend unless absolutely convinced, utilizing the warmth of his Jewish heart, relying on his sense of mission for his people and defending our rights to our land....Menahem Begin is the first prime minister of Israel to be proud of his faith and base his case on the unique holiness of the Jewish people....As believing Jews we are convinced that Mr. Begin's adherence to the faith of our forefathers is the reason for his present tremendous achievement....

As believing Jews we realize that this agreement is far from being perfect....We place our trust in God, not in human beings, and it is on that basis that we will watch the developments ensuing from the agreement....We are not unaware of the pitfalls which lie ahead, particularly as regards the topic of autonomy for the Arabs in Judea, Samaria and the Gaza Strip. On that topic we know that we will find ourselves in disagreement with the President of Egypt, who supports the idea of a Palestinian state, even though it is only by virtue of the autonomy plan that the peace agreement could be reached....

MK Abba Eban was correct in saying that the President of the U.S., the Prime Minister of England and the President of Egypt understand the idea of autonomy differently, and I would go so far as to say that President Sadat has deliberately left the topic undefined....But no other plan ever proposed in the past by any previous government could have brought about the turning-point which has led to the peace agreement....

The hopes embodied in the peace agreement are that President Sadat, after realizing that in no war with Israel—not even the Yom Kippur War which took us by surprise—has Egypt ever gained anything, has reached the conclusion that Egypt stands to get what it wants only by peace. If that is the case, there is good reason to hope that the peace agreement between us will endure.

At present none of the other Arab leaders appears to be ready to cooperate on the autonomy proposal. We all recall what happened in 1947, when the U.N. decided on the establishment of a Palestinian and a Jewish state. The Arabs did not accept it and sought to destroy us. We all know that when the Lord hardened Pharaoh's heart it has always worked to our benefit. Thus, today, too, we see that all the discussions about the nature of autonomy are only among ourselves, for no Arab country other than Egypt is prepared to negotiate with us about it. Thus, Egypt will have to decide to hold separate negotiations about autonomy only in Gaza. In our view, we should not oppose this, because that, too, will be a step taken separately by Egypt....

We approve signing the peace treaty if that means that Egypt is removed from the cycle of wars. That is in itself a guarantee of the cessation of warfare. The Prime Minister has ensured that this peace treaty supersedes all previous agreements made by Egypt with the Arab countries....That in itself will ensure the end to bloodshed, something which is of the highest value for our people, which prizes human life above all else....We will vote in favor of the peace treaty, regarding it as the expression of the original Jewish approach....

We extend our congratulations and best wishes to the Prime Minister and the team which will go with him to attend the signing ceremony....This treaty is one which we have accepted willingly, not under pressure, and it is one which the Prime Minister may sign with pride and courage. God will give strength to his people, God will bless his people with peace.

...

M. Pa'il (Sheli): Mr. Speaker, distinguished Knesset, the peace agreement and its annexes which are being brought before us today could be an historic turning-point in the history of Israel and the Middle East....The question is, will it be a full peace treaty with Egypt, constituting the first step towards comprehensive peace settlements between us and other Arab countries, or will it be just another interim agreement by which the IDF will withdraw from the Sinai without there being any change in the political situation, constituting an intermission which postpones the next war for a few years....

Eighty percent of the solution to the problem is in Israel's hands. The difference between a peace treaty and an intermission lies in the extent to which the treaty with Egypt is linked to a political solution, on

the basis of mutual recognition, of the Palestinian problem in the West Bank....

The model of the peace agreement with Egypt, expressed in Israel's withdrawal from the Sinai in return for a peace treaty and demilitarization there, should be applied on other fronts, where we would agree in principle to withdraw from the territories occupied in the Six Day War in return for peace treaties and demilitarization....The true test of the peace treaty with Egypt is not in obscuring what has been signed but in studying what we must still do. The program outlined in the joint letter signed by the President of Egypt and the Prime Minister of Israel is the bridge, but it also contains a gap. I would not want our leaders to utilize that gap to delay the process....

One month after the treaty is signed, that is, at the end of April 1979, the joint Israel-Egypt committee is to meet in order to determine the method whereby the self-governing authority of the West Bank and the Gaza Strip is to be elected....That committee, with representatives of the kingdom of Jordan, with or without Palestinian representatives, should aspire, according to the letter, to conclude its work within a year.... Naturally, there will be arguments during the course of the committee's work. There will be disagreement regarding the method of elections to the self-governing authority and about who and what is to come under that self-government....There will also be disagreement as to the right to self-determination of the Palestinian Arabs and whether this should extend in some form to East Jerusalem....In my view, one should be open and enlightened on this subject. I do not know what your view is.

H. Corfu (Likud): MK Pa'il, from where will you take the authority to implement all this? After all, your party received only two seats.

M. Pa'il (Sheli): On behalf of the two seats which I represent in the Knesset and on behalf of the historic Jewish wisdom which I accept, I propose my interpretation. General and Israeli history has not yet proved that the majority is always right....Until recently only a minority advocated withdrawing from the Sinai, and now you are implementing it....When the year is up, in April 1980, assuming that the discussions are brought to a conclusion, with the agreement of two, or preferably three or four, parties, and an electoral system for the self-governing authority is determined, this document does not give a precise date for the elections....

The Prime Minister, M. Begin: Correct.

M. Pa'il (Sheli): What it says is that the elections will be held as expeditiously as possible. That is the gap, sir, and I very much fear that the present government, the Alignment and the NRP will try to utilize that gap to the utmost in order to gain time and delay those elections....

The Prime Minister, M. Begin: No, no. If there is an agreement, there is an agreement.

M. Pa'il (Sheli): I hope I'm wrong...What I am trying to say is that if the modalities of electing the self-governing authority are as I have proposed, which is what the other side will demand, there will be a partner with which to negotiate....But if you try to undermine the establishment of the self-governing authority by using delaying tactics and establishing settlements, you will be embarking on a process of dissolving the linkage....If the Arab world realizes this while the negotiations are being conducted the President of Egypt will not send his ambassador here in another year nor will we send ours to Egypt, and then instead of a peace treaty we will merely have an interim agreement after we have withdrawn from the western half of the Sinai. I fear that there are too many leaders in Israel, in the Likud, the Alignment and the NRP, who want that, who want another interim agreement in order to gain time without making any political changes....

If we want the agreement which the Prime Minister is to sign next week in Washington to be a peace treaty and not an interim agreement, the Knesset must dictate the policy line to the government of assuring linkage between the agreement with Egypt and the solution of the Palestinian problem, with Israeli readiness to withdraw from the West Bank and the Gaza Strip, the immediate cessation of settlement activities and the determination of next Independence Day as the date for the elections to the Palestinian self-governing authority....

Let us roll up our sleeves in order to implement the next step towards obtaining comprehensive peace and not let any leader undermine the agreement or cause it to become another interim agreement rather than a peace treaty. We will vote for this treaty, in the hope that it is indeed a step towards comprehensive peace.

...

Y. Zakai (Alignment): Mr. Speaker, distinguished Knesset, the Alignment central committee has obliged the party's representatives in the Knesset to vote in favor of the government's proposal whether they agree with it or not. But if we do not have the freedom to vote as we wish, we still have the freedom to express our views. My view is that we are about to vote for an agreement which is not a peace agreement but merely an agreement for withdrawal with honor....

Many ceremonies will accompany the signing of this agreement in Washington, Jerusalem and Cairo, but they will not express what is really happening....The truth will be reflected in other ceremonies which will not be publicized by the media and will consist of companies of dusty soldiers lowering the Israeli flag all over the Sinai....Is there any chance that this withdrawal will bring peace...?

The most important fact mentioned by the supporters of the agreement is that Egypt is the largest and most important Arab country in the Middle East. That is true. Egypt will not relinquish its position as leader of the Arab world, and will consequently conduct a policy which accords with the aims of the Arab world, and if those aims are not attained through negotiation the agreement we are about to sign will not prevent war. Those who think that now that Egypt will get the Sinai back it will have no cause to wage war on Israel are simply forgetting what happened only yesterday. Egypt waged war on Israel in 1967 when no Egyptian territory was occupied by Israel and east Jerusalem was still in Arab hands....Why, then, should we delude ourselves that in another three or four years, when it transpires that Israel will not withdraw from Judea, Samaria and Gaza or agree to the repartition of Jerusalem, Egypt will agree to abandon the aims of the Arab world? President Sadat has made it absolutely clear, both here and elsewhere, that his objectives are the establishment of a Palestinian state in Judea, Samaria and Gaza and the division of Jerusalem....

Israel cannot agree to those objectives and Egypt cannot permit itself to abandon them, nor will it....There is no room for compromise.... There can be no half measures when it comes to a Palestinian state or the division of Jerusalem. There will undoubtedly be a confrontation at some stage or other....But first we will hand over the Sinai, dismantle the settlements and give up the airfields. I imagine we will be given time to do all that. Two or three years will suffice to heal the rift between Egypt and the Arab rejectionist states, and then it will transpire that our withdrawal to the international border between us and Egypt was a return to the war border of 1967....

We are told that there is a dynamic to peace and that it has to be built, but both dynamics and peace require time and the time we have been given is insufficient....The timetable for our withdrawal from the Sinai has been forced upon us and represents the minimal amount of time required for us to load our stuff onto trucks and get out....Nine months for the first stage of withdrawal and another two years to dismantle the settlements, the bases and the airfields. That is immediate withdrawal. And within that time no dynamic will manage to build peace or begin to do so. Anyone who thinks that during those three years, during which there will be bitter arguments over Judea, Samaria and Gaza and the future of Jerusalem, there will be relations of friendship between us and Egypt is deluding himself. What we can expect as a result of this agreement is that in another five years at the most we will be confronting the rejectionist front of the Arab world, and Egypt within it....Any other interpretation of this agreement is self-delusion....

...

Y. Ben-Meir (National Religious Party): Mr. Speaker, distinguished Knesset, today the Knesset is not voting on the Camp David accords, on

which the Knesset has already decided and for which most of the members of the NRP, including myself, did not vote....I would vote the same way today, and I would like to make it clear that the way I and my colleagues vote today should not be interpreted as constituting an expression of regret for our previous decision....On the contrary, all the doubts and anxieties we expressed then have merely been intensified in the last few months. I think that most of the House is less than happy with these agreements....

M. Algrabli (Democratic Movement): I suggest that you speak for yourself alone.

Y. Ben-Meir (National Religious Party): It's evident I'm not speaking for your party, which does not have a majority in the Knesset....Most of the Members are still unwilling to accept the dismantling of Jewish settlements, even those who will vote in favor of the agreements....I think that the decision made at Camp David to dismantle settlements was a mistake.

The Prime Minister, M. Begin: There was no decision at Camp David to dismantle settlements. President Carter asked me if I could refrain from participating in the discussion because he knew my opinion from Camp David.

Y. Ben-Meir (National Religious Party): The decision to remove the settlements, wherever it was made, was a mistake.

The Prime Minister, M. Begin: The decision was made here after the House decided to unite the vote....

Y. Ben-Meir (National Religious Party): It was made at the government's recommendation. I am entitled to express my opinion. I think that decision was a mistake and will have an adverse effect on the nation's spirit for years to come....But the fact is that the Knesset, which represents the nation, approved those agreements by a large majority....And that decision must be accepted by us all and its implementation is binding on Israel, not according to the Egyptian or American interpretation of it but according to the Israeli one. And although it is our right to interpret the agreement as we see fit, we cannot deny the fact that it has been approved by the Knesset....

Tonight the government is asking us to approve the peace treaty with Egypt which arises from the Camp David agreements....And despite all my opposition to many parts of that treaty, I must ask myself what voting against it means.

U. Avneri (Sheli): Leaving the government.

Y. Ben-Meir (National Religious Party): Anyone who votes against the treaty tonight is saying either that he wants Israel to retract its accep-

tance of the Camp David agreements or that this treaty does not accurately represent those agreements....The first position is incorrect and the second is untenable. Both the English and the Hebrew versions of the treaty more or less represent the Camp David agreements....My responsibility as a Knesset Member does not permit me to tell the government that we should cancel those agreements or withdraw our acceptance of them....That would be politically disastrous for Israel....Those agreements are an established fact by now, to my regret, they have been approved by the nation and we must learn to live with them....

There is something which, although not deviating from the Camp David agreements, is new in the context of the Israel-Egypt treaty, namely, the subject of autonomy. This, the question of the future, is the most important point and the greatest challenge for Israel in the coming year. That will constitute the focal point of the struggle and the criterion by which our resilience will be judged, because the subject of autonomy concerns our grip on and retention of Judea, Samaria and Gaza, which are the essence of the state.

The vast majority of the Knesset Members have expressed their opposition to the establishment of a Palestinian state....But I would like to tell ourselves, our children, our youngsters and the world here tonight that my party's opposition to a Palestinian state and the abandonment of Judea, Samaria and Gaza is not simply because that would threaten our security, which it would, or because it endangers our future, but because there is absolutely no justification for establishing another Palestinian state and because the Jewish people has every right to Judea, Samaria and Gaza. The Arabs have twenty-one countries covering an area of nine million square miles. In them each group can find the fullest expression of its political aspirations. The Jewish people has one small country, that's all. The Arabs of the Land of Israel, the Palestinians, are Arabs first and foremost, they share a common language, religion, past and culture with the Arab nation. What an Arab in Shechem and an Arab in Damascus have in common is no less and possibly more than an Englishman and a Scotsman who live in the same country or those in the north and the south of the U.S....Over and above all that, there is a Palestinian state today, Jordan, extending over more than two-thirds of Mandatory Palestine.

U. Avneri (Sheli): Jordan isn't Palestine. In Arabic Jordan isn't part of Palestine.

Y. Ben-Meir (National Religious Party): It is a Palestinian state on an area known as Palestine. Most of the Palestinian nation lives there. If it's self-determination you want, I'm prepared to grant self-determination to all the inhabitants of the Land of Israel, the four million Jews and Arabs who live here. You can't grant self-determination to each group. Where in the world does such a thing exist? What nation or

country has agreed to that...? There is no justice or logic in establishing another state so that those two countries can fight one another and compete as to which can be more hostile to Israel.

U. Avneri (Sheli): You are fulfilling the PLO's previous plan of a binational, secular, democratic state.

Y. Ben-Meir (National Religious Party): Our presence in Judea, Samaria and Gaza is not by right of force but by force of right, justice and truth. Autonomy contains many dangers, but I do not share in the sense of despair it has aroused. It is still up to us, provided we act wisely and well and with the fortitude we have displayed in the past, to ensure that autonomy does not turn against us and endanger the continued Jewish settlement of Judea, Samaria and Gaza.

The NRP regards this issue as the supreme test for it, and I believe we will come through it. My party has resolved that any autonomy plan must ensure that as a result of it no Palestinian state can be established in any shape or form in Judea, Samaria and Gaza, and that the existence, development and prosperity of the authorized Jewish settlement of Judea, Samaria and Gaza at present and in the future must be guaranteed. In order to do so the following principles must be assured: 1. The legal authority of Israel and the IDF in Judea, Samaria and Gaza must be guaranteed; 2. Internal and external security must be in the hands of the IDF and the appropriate Israeli security forces; 3. National land and the sources of water in Judea, Samaria and Gaza must be under Israel's control; 4. The Jewish settlements and/or the Jewish population of Judea, Samaria and Gaza must not be subject to and/or attached to autonomy, being subject only to Israel. Special status must be granted to continuous blocs of Jewish settlement; 5. Jewish settlements which have been and will be established in Judea, Samaria and Gaza with the government's authorization may not be removed; 6. The government will ensure that the appropriate conditions are created for the advancement and expansion of Jewish settlement in Judea, Samaria and Gaza.

M. Wilner (Democratic Front for Peace and Equality): That is a plan for war, a plan for cemeteries, a plan for orphans and widows...

Y. Ben-Meir (National Religious Party): My party has resolved unanimously that it cannot be a party to any program or bear responsibility for any autonomy plan which contradicts those points, and we will remain steadfast on that. That is our autonomy plan, and we will have no share in any plan or government which takes a different course.

U. Avneri (Sheli): It's just a front for failing to resign from the government.

Y. Ben-Meir (National Religious Party): MK Avneri, I'm glad that this plan is not acceptable to you or to MK Wilner, but it will be acceptable to the government of Israel and the overwhelming majority of the nation.

M. Wilner (Democratic Front for Peace and Equality): A Palestinian state will arise despite you....You are occupiers, colonizers....

Y. Ben-Meir (National Religious Party): MK Wilner, despite you we have existed for thirty years, and despite you we will remain here for another thousand years.

M. Wilner (Democratic Front for Peace and Equality): That's a lie, because I am in favor of the existence of the State of Israel and security for Israel. You are endangering Israel's existence....

Y. Ben-Meir (National Religious Party): I would like to use this opportunity of addressing the wonderful, pioneering population in the settlements of Judea, Samaria and Gaza and telling them not to lose heart....I am well aware of their justifiable anxiety, but *nil desperandum*....Let us dedicate ourselves anew tonight to the dream and vision we have borne for two thousand years of returning to the land of our fathers, the land of Zion and Jerusalem. Let us strengthen our hold on every inch and each clod of earth in Judea, Samaria and Gaza. I believe that despite the difficulties most of this nation wants to see, and does in fact see, a ray of hope in the fact that there is a chance of turning over a new leaf in our relations with Egypt and of reaching peace. Like most of the Knesset Members, the nation is going towards it with an uneasy heart but in the hope that it might prevent bloodshed....That majority of the nation will not be tempted to make peace if it involves abandoning our homeland, the heart of the Land of Israel. We will go towards this new situation even if it means taking risks.

Therefore, do not be downcast, for it is with a steadfast spirit that the vast majority of the nation still believes in our right to the Land of Israel and is prepared to fight for it. It is with those feelings that we will go towards a new era and, with God's help, will succeed in assuring our right and position in Judea, Samaria and Gaza for the benefit and reinforcement of the State of Israel.

U. Avneri (Sheli): And do you expect the settlers to believe you?

The Minister of Justice, S. Tamir: Mr. Speaker, Knesset Members, let us be frank, we have got to this stage by virtue of faith. For decades there have been people in every camp who denied that there was any chance of attaining peace in our time....Those who had faith in the chance of reaching peace, against all odds and appearances, were in the right.... One of the most important moments in the course of the events of the last eighteen months was when the President of Egypt returned from Jerusa-

lem after having saluted the Jewish flag, after having reviewed ranks of Israeli soldiers, after having stood on this podium, and forty million Egyptians cheered him for the sake of peace. That is when the numbers of those who believed swelled. Naturally, it did not happen overnight, there was a long and difficult struggle, with wars and bloodshed, before someone who was an enemy could be convinced of the strength of an unbreakable iron wall. Jabotinsky's theory of the iron wall which would bring us peace with and acceptance by our neighbors has been proved right and has brought us to this stage....

During the past eighteen months the political process has also been distinguished by the unwavering aspiration for peace and the resolute refusal to accept the unacceptable....I suggest that the Knesset and the entire nation remember the lesson of the Prime Minister's ability to say 'no' at the right moment and to withstand all the pressure exerted on him to retract that refusal to bend....

Y. Allon (Alignment): No. No refusal endured....We remained steadfast on the subject of the timetable....The Prime Minister refused to meet with the Egyptian Prime Minister since that was inappropriate and politically dangerous, thereby proving to the other side that the Israeli leadership would stand firm on certain points....That paved the way for the peace agreement....

M. Harish (Alignment): There was no steadfastness on the crucial subjects of the airfields, strategic depth, the Sinai, the Rafah area, Sharm el-Sheikh....

(Shouting in the Chamber.)

A. Nof (Democratic Movement): Eshkol's government agreed to go back to the international border....

The Minister of Justice, S. Tamir: And we stood firm on the crucial point of refusing to withdraw without a signed peace treaty....We were not prepared to accept any interim agreements or temporary arrangements....It has been proved to the world that Israel is an international factor to be reckoned with in this part of the world....

People ask me whether the treaty is a good one....All I will say is that it is a treaty which can be signed....There is no point agonizing over whether a better treaty could have been obtained now or at any other time....We must be realistic and operate within the confines of what is feasible....We are operating at a time of international changes, of storms in the immediate vicinity and in remote regions, and are limited by the area in which Israel can maneuver....Consequently the disapprobation of certain Members—whose pain I understand and whose genuineness I appreciate—refers to something which is beyond the bounds of the feasible....It is incumbent upon a responsible leadership to

strive to attain a reasonable objective with which it is possible and necessary to live.

U. Avneri (Sheli): According to the slogan: "liberated territory will not be returned."

The Minister of Justice, S. Tamir: Even tonight we are operating on the basis of the assumption that on certain subjects we have not yet reached full agreement with the U.S., and these will be settled when the Prime Minister is in Washington and before the treaty with Egypt is signed.... We are entitled to this aid from the third partner, which was very active and made an important and positive contribution during the negotiations.

Are we really witnessing a struggle here tonight between those who are completely against and those who are totally in favor? That might be correct at the edges, but does not apply to very many people in the House and the nation....Everyone has doubts as to Sadat's real intentions, the extent to which we can rely on the U.S. and the nature of the peace upon which we are about to embark....Those doubts are legitimate, understandable and necessary....

We are fully aware of the high price we are paying....In geographical terms Israel will shrink and that is painful, without a doubt....It is difficult to leave the Sinai, which has given us strategic depth, airbases, oil wells and natural resources, and it is extremely distressing to have to dismantle the settlements....We are cognizant of all the risks involved, knowing where this step is leading us....Tonight we are breaking the siege on and isolation of Israel for the first time since the establishment of the state....That is the achievement.

The heart of the problem of the Middle East was never the Palestinian problem. The heart of the problem is the refusal of the nations of the region to recognize the new Jewish state and live with it. Today that refusal has been broken....Our country will no longer be like the Crusader state, isolated and waiting for the inevitable day of its destruction; there will be an end to the vicious circle of wars and cease-fires....Today we can see the light at the end of the tunnel, and that is the great change. We rejected peace which did not involve direct commercial relations with Egypt on the subject of oil and the exchange of ambassadors, demanding full and active peace.

We sometimes tend to forget the object of our return here, to our home, which was not solely to grant refuge to our people. We returned to Zion, to the land of the Bible, to the cradle of culture, to the birthplace of the basic, humanitarian message, in the hope of bringing spiritual regeneration to ourselves and others. For that we need peace. By virtue of peace we will bring a new flowering to these ancient lands. Zionism not only benefits our people, it also brings new spiritual succor to a world which is confused and frightened in the face of a worldwide cataclysm.

It is for that that peace is necessary. That is why I appeal to those citizens of Israel who are still swinging between doubt and hope not to lose faith. Our struggle has been rewarded. We have been through difficult times together here, and peace seemed very far off if not unattainable, but because of our steadfastness and our faith we have reached this day when peace is within our grasp....And because of that steadfastness and faith we will continue together and attain our objectives....

...

J. Rom (Likud): Mr. Speaker, distinguished Knesset, this debate on the peace agreement with Egypt is being held although its outcome is known. It can be assumed that the majority will vote for it. It is, therefore, my sacred duty to bring my view, which foresees its difficulties and possible hazards, before the nation. I would like to point out to the Prime Minister that two of the four Herut ministers voted against the peace treaty in the government....

The Prime Minister, M. Begin: May I point out to you that 95 percent of the Herut party's central committee voted in favor of the peace treaty.

J. Rom (Likud): In essence, this agreement represents the sentence after the verdict which was handed down at Camp David, namely, peace which was born by surrendering to the Egyptian-American ultimatum to dismantle the settlements in the Sinai and leave it *Judenrein*.

The Prime Minister, M. Begin: There was no such ultimatum....

M. Wirshovski (Movement for Change and Initiative): Not even Herut's most vehement opponents say that.

Y. Allon (Alignment): That's true. The government relinquished the settlements of its own free will, not as the result of an ultimatum.

J. Rom (Likud): A peace of that kind does not indicate any Egyptian intention of preserving the peace on terms which would be acceptable to even the most enthusiastic adherent of the agreement.

G. Ya'acobi (Alignment): Didn't the government decide to relinquish the settlements...?

M. Pa'il (Sheli): The Knesset decided to dismantle the settlements in the Rafah area and the eastern Sinai for the sake of peace....

J. Rom (Likud): We must examine the Egyptian commitment and its signing of the treaty not only according to the criteria of Jewish tradition but also in accordance with what is customary in the Moslem world and the seriousness with which treaties are signed and broken in the Arab world, particularly in view of the Islamic tradition regarding a peace treaty signed with non-Moslems.

U. Avneri (Sheli): That's precisely what anti-Semites say about Jews....Those are racist remarks....

J. Rom (Likud): It's not a racist remark, it's an historical one....The justification we give for signing the agreement is that it removes Egypt from the circle of war against Israel, and that in return for our extensive concessions in the Sinai we will receive permission to rule Judea, Samaria and Gaza. That is a false conception, and its advocates fail to see that it does not hold water, especially after the changes in the region arising from the revolution in Iran and Egyptian and American policy. The Prime Minister says that he has five generals in the government who ensure that security is not harmed by the decisions which are made.

The Prime Minister, M. Begin: No, only four.

J. Rom (Likud): Anyone who has studied the political and strategic abilities of generals cannot be sanguine about that statement. General Klauswitz noted that there is no guarantee that an outstanding general is a good strategist, and warns against relying on commanders in drawing up national strategies and objectives....

(From the floor: What did generals say about politicians?)

We would do well to recall that President Truman quoted Clemenceau, saying that war was far too important a subject to be left to generals, and that is especially true as regards politics....I am not recommending that we accept either motto for ourselves, but there is no doubt that every statesman must be assessed for his abilities as a statesman. In assessing dangers and policies we should at least also rely on experts in Middle Eastern affairs and on military and political intelligence.

S. Aloni (Citizens' Rights Movement): And on common sense.

J. Rom (Likud): It is dangerous to rely on the assessments of people who have a fixed conception about things. All policy should be examined objectively, as the Agranat Committee recommended. The experience of the past should teach us to beware of the mistakes made by a closed team given to a social dynamic, as happened to President Kennedy with the Bay of Pigs....

It resembles the situation of pressure created at Camp David. There are many other indications of the Egyptians' intentions, such as their unwillingness to compromise, to come to Jerusalem or invite us to Cairo to sign the treaty, the statement by the Egyptian Prime Minister which contains the ultimatum that without returning to the 1967 borders, in Jerusalem too, and self-determination for the Palestinians, there can be no peace....

What should concern us more than anything else is the U.S. intention of supplying Egypt with large quantities of modern weaponry.

Egypt's demand for huge amounts of arms must serve as a danger signal. If Egypt wants peace, why should it arm itself to the teeth? The Egyptian and American policy statements regarding autonomy are in opposition to Israel's view that the IDF should remain in Judea, Samaria, Gaza and the Golan Heights, as well as continued settlement activity there....The U.S. President has said that he believes that President Sadat is a man of his word....That is precisely what Mr. Chamberlain said to explain his agreement with Hitler at Munich after having sacrificed Czechoslovakia....

But what about the nation in Israel? Will this treaty really bring us peace and tranquility? Given present conditions in the Middle East, can we divert our resources and attention to healing the economy and society, providing education and medical attention, ameliorating the conditions of the underprivileged neighborhoods and strata? The redeployment of our forces will impose a heavy financial burden on us which may well endanger Israel's economic stability....

We know that the threat to Israel's security in the east and the north will continue, while we will be forced to invest massively on redeploying the IDF in the Negev. The military expansion of Syria and Iraq, Jordan and Saudi Arabia, and the possibility of cooperation with Khomeini's regime in Iran, constitute a greater threat, thereby depriving Egypt of supremacy as regards its strength in the Arab world....

As regards autonomy or the Palestinian problem, we would do well to remember that the Jews in Moslem countries suffered pogroms and persecution and lived as second-class citizens for many generations....60 percent of Israel's citizens today originate from those countries....Israel solved the problem of the Jews from Moslem countries as well as that of European Jewry after the Holocaust....

In my view, what we should do is reopen the negotiations on the peace treaty with Egypt in order to ensure minimum security conditions to meet those laid down in the Israel government's peace plan of 1977. We should also make binding decisions regarding Israel's vital interests in the Land of Israel and see to it that they are implemented immediately. I may be among the minority which dares to speak out today and say things which are not pleasing to the ears of those who seek to paint a rosy picture of the future....I pray that history proves me wrong, but it is my bound duty to speak up on behalf of my children, for the sake of their future and that of all Israel's children, and say that I must reject this agreement as one which embodies more hazards than hopes and call on the government, which I would like to support, to alter its policy accordingly....

The Minister of Education, Z. Hammer: Mr. Speaker, distinguished Knesset, peace is a great and wonderful thing. All of us aspire to it and want it, perhaps more than any other nation in the Middle East. The division into those who love peace and those who hate it is false, but we

must look the facts squarely in the face and analyze the complex situation without being swayed by either undue optimism or exaggerated pessimism....

This peace is not the moral and social idyll envisaged by the prophets, it is a political peace based on economic, security and social interests....It is not a European peace in terms of its ideological forces and processes. It is a Middle Eastern peace....It is true that we are obtaining recognition, legitimization and political peace from Egypt, and that we are paying a very high security and ideological and moral price for it. We will still have to engage in a difficult struggle for the heart of our country, our nation and our security. So no one can sermonize at us about either our failure to display enthusiasm or the fact that we are not in mourning...We are signing this peace treaty with reservations, knowing that its terms are extremely hard but that peace is worth taking a chance for.

President Sadat took an immense political and psychological step, from his point of view, when he offered Israel legitimization. Our response to peace is overwhelming, but we have been asked to pay a very heavy price in land, bases, oil and settlements, all of which represent security. The government does not deserve to be condemned for standing firm for months in order not to abandon its basic security and moral principles while aspiring to attain peace. Time will tell if this peace treaty will bring about a dangerous reduction in Israel's borders, which will be vulnerable to attack, or a breakthrough to a new era in which wars and hostility are left behind and the social and spiritual endeavors for which Israel came into existence are fulfilled.

Peace is a supreme educational value which must be cultivated and every effort must be made to attain it, however uncertain the outcome. But we must be alert after what happened to us in the Holocaust and everything we went through before and after the establishment of the state, so that we can defend ourselves. We must always be ready to fulfill our responsibility to the nation, to our children, to our brethren and to our parents.

The forthcoming negotiations on Judea, Samaria and Gaza will be harder than any other we have known....Egypt's demands on the Palestinian issue may be less intense than they were on the subject of the Sinai but they are by no means negligible. Our claims to Judea, Samaria and Gaza are quite different from our claims to the Sinai. What we are talking about here is not a purely military agreement. What we are talking about here is Jerusalem, which is our eternal capital. What we are talking about is Judea, Samaria and Gaza, which are part of our Land of Israel. What we are talking about is thousands of pioneering families which have settled there at the behest of the nation. What we are talking about is security borders which are not far from population centers. What we are talking about is that the IDF cannot de-

fend us from the Jordan River and the mountain ridge if it is not combined with the permanent settlements along the border. If at the end of the process Israel withdraws on all fronts to the 1967 borders, heaven forbid, the IDF will not be able to defend it even if there are early warning stations and demilitarized zones. The Etzion Bloc and Kiryat Arba and other settlements must not be endangered, leaving them subject to the fate of the Jews of Hebron in 1929, God forbid.

M. Shamir (Likud): You have opened the door to that danger by the treaty you are bringing before the Knesset. That is the only course to which you are leading.

Y. Ben-Meir (National Religious Party): There is an opening, but we will not let it be utilized. Trust in the Lord and the nation, we will not let it happen.

M. Shamir (Likud): You think that sophistry solves everything....

Y. Ben-Meir (National Religious Party): Don't be so cynical....

U. Avneri (Sheli): The IDF will defend the country in every situation and from every border. It has done so in the past and will do so in the future.

The Minister of Education, Z. Hammer: But its forces are limited. One cannot remain on a border militarily if there are no settlements there. There will be no settlements on that border if there is no motivation to live in our country and the ability to live in peace and tranquillity, if there is no official encouragement of settlement.

U. Avneri (Sheli): Did the settlements defend the Golan Heights?

The Minister of Education, Z. Hammer: The existence of this peace, this uncertain peace, is precarious in the extreme. This is not the peace most of us hoped for. After the treaty is signed we will be facing a great struggle....In order to avert similar dangers in the future we must prepare appropriately for autonomy, ensuring that it does not serve as the nucleus of a Palestinian state and that Jewish life and settlement is safe throughout our country....That is the struggle we face and the test of this government's adherence to its principles....

M. Shamir (Likud): Like it adhered to the other things it promised.

The Minister of Education, Z. Hammer: I believe in your pain, but do not be so hasty to burn a bridge we will all have to cross....

M. Shamir (Likud): Those who dismantled Yamit will also dismantle Kiryat Arba.

Y. Ben-Meir (National Religious Party): Anyone who says that damages the cause you believe in....

M. Pail (Sheli): Do you realize that if you implement what you have just said you are undermining the peace treaty?

The Minister of Education, Z. Hammer: I don't think so. Definitely not.

M. Shamir (Likud): He'll talk about pain and hearts again.

The Minister of Education, Z. Hammer: At any rate, that is our test, mine too, and we'll see what each person says when the time comes. I believe that we will all stand firm. The peace which we are about to attain will present us with serious tests for the first time in Israel's history, the tests of being Jews willingly, in an open society, not a closed ghetto, of cultivating our unique cultural and social Jewishness while maintaining good neighborly relations, of utilizing peace not in order to seek material benefits but in order to focus on the spiritual and social objectives for which the State of Israel was established. It is therefore crucial that our basic principles are maintained even as this peace is built and developed.

...

Y. Rabin (Alignment): Mr. Speaker, distinguished Knesset, I will vote unhesitatingly in favor of the peace treaty between Israel and Egypt, with great hopes and deep concern in my heart....My support for the proposed peace treaty is the logical extension of my vote in favor of the Camp David agreements....I knew then that what was involved was taking three steps to bring peace with Egypt and any other Arab country nearer. I regarded the first step—the signing of a peace treaty between Israel and Egypt—as the principal positive component and the most important of them all. I have always believed that the key to everything that happens between Israel and the Arab countries lies in our relations with Egypt....

I am sensible of the dangers in the two steps which will follow it: the first, immediately after the signing of the peace treaty, the negotiations regarding establishing autonomy in Judea, Samaria and the Gaza Strip; and the second, between three and five years after the establishment of autonomy, if it is established, when an effort will be made to attain permanent peace on our eastern border, a step which will have to resolve all the most complex problems of the Arab-Israeli conflict....On that issue the gaps between the position of Egypt and the other Arab countries and that of Israel are at their widest and deepest.

When I supported the Camp David agreements I knew that a peace treaty could not be signed with Egypt without attaining peace on the other fronts unless Israel accepted the principle of restoring full sovereignty to Egypt over the whole of the Sinai up to the former international border. I must admit that I had hoped that Egypt would agree to some border adjustments which would enable our retention of some or most of the Rafah

area, the Etzion airfield....I hope that the government has indeed made an effort in that direction and that it is merely Egyptian intransigence which has prevented it. I did not delude myself that at this time Jordan would agree to full peace with Israel without our agreeing to withdraw to the borders which existed prior to the Six Day War, perhaps with minor adjustments. I knew that Jordan insisted on the repartition of Jerusalem....I therefore regarded it as a great achievement for Israel when Egypt agreed, within the framework of the Camp David agreements, to defer for another five years or possibly more the date for reaching an agreed solution of the various problems so that there could be peace on our eastern border without that delaying the signing and implementation of the peace treaty between us.

Together with my agreement with and support of the approach reflected in the Camp David accords, I am against the idea of establishing autonomy in Judea, Samaria and the Gaza Strip....Was there an alternative to autonomy? I know that therein lies the essential difference between the approaches of the Likud and the Alignment to the problems in the east. Within the framework of that overall approach a better possibility was not examined which would, in my view, have assured the process of normalization with Egypt in a more efficient and safer way, a possibility which would have involved Jordan, the only other Arab country in addition to Egypt which is ready for full peace with Israel.

My plan would be to have, instead of autonomy, a transition period of five years based on joint Jordanian-Israeli responsibility for Judea, Samaria and the Gaza Strip. Israel would disperse the IDF throughout those areas in order to avert any possible military attack. Israel, in conjunction with Jordan, would be responsible for preventing the organization of terrorist cells and the implementation of acts of terrorism....Israel would have the right to establish settlements in security areas in accordance with the approach of the Alignment governments. Jordan would be responsible for the administration of Jordanian-Palestinian civilian life, while encouraging the local authorities.

It is true that this possibility would oblige Israel to agree to the implementation of Security Council Resolution 242, including withdrawal from territories to recognized and secure borders on all three fronts, though on no account withdrawal to the borders of 4 June 1967. A solution of that kind would also have enabled the postponement of the decision on a permanent solution on that front, which would have made it easier for us to live in peace with Egypt. It would have removed the daily responsibility for the problems of the Palestinians, for the problem of peace with Jordan, from Egypt's shoulders. Hence, for me the question is not what kind of autonomy should be established, the Likud's or the Alignment's, but the very idea of autonomy contradicts my basic approach to the question of how to advance peace with Egypt and in the east.

The voters elected Mr. Begin at the last elections knowing that his basic approach was that there should be no foreign rule over the area between the sea and the Jordan River....I am worried because I am convinced that the Prime Minister is indeed faithful to that principle and will therefore eventually bring the peace process to a standstill, with all that that implies....

Although I am not in agreement with the government's basic approach to solving the problem of our eastern border, I commend the Prime Minister, the government, President Sadat and his government and the U.S. President and his government for having brought us to the point of signing a peace treaty with Egypt....I also commend the Prime Minister for his achievement at the last stage of the negotiations for having overcome the U.S.-supported Egyptian attempt to establish an explicit link between the peace treaty with Egypt and what does or does not happen on the other fronts of the Israel-Arab conflict, as well as for having refused to set a date for the elections for the self-governing authority....I hope that the government will follow through the achievements of the past and obtain an aid agreement with the U.S. which offers even better conditions than in the past....

The main problem confronting us now is what will happen after the peace treaty is signed? No one among us deludes himself that the prophetic vision of peace has been attained. Israel's actions and omissions will have a significant effect on the implementation of the peace treaty, though they will not be the only variable affecting the eventual outcome. The real test will lie in the development of the relations between the peoples of Egypt and Israel and in the establishment of autonomy....Our principal efforts should be directed towards establishing a network of human, cultural and economic relations which will, in time, change negative concepts regarding Israel which are still deeply embedded in the minds and hearts of millions of Egyptians.

We must make the Israeli public more aware of the problems of Egypt and the Egyptians....There must be meetings and exchanges between Israelis and Egyptians at all levels, without seeking to obtain immediate economic benefits. The Israelis who have all the solutions to Egypt's problems should be left at home. Those who seek to persuade the Egyptians forthwith to establish joint projects, primarily in the Sinai, should be pacified. Breaking down the barriers of hostility and suspicion between the two nations is a delicate process which must be tackled with circumspection, since it will determine the course of later stages in the developing relationship between us....

I think we should take the advice of the Egyptian Prime Minister, Mr. Mustafa Halil, who recommended not hastening to begin negotiations on autonomy....The negotiations should be conducted in a calm way during the year allotted for them....There is no need to rush things....The difficulties in finding an agreed solution for autonomy

are manifold, exceeding by far those which confronted us in the negotiations on the peace treaty with Egypt. I am very apprehensive about the chances of completing them successfully, though I hope that I am wrong.

We must not reject out of hand the Egyptian proposal which will presumably be made at some stage of the discussions regarding making a start to imposing autonomy in the Gaza Strip alone. Other ideas will probably be mooted in view of the great difficulties which will arise during the negotiations. We must not approach them with rigid and preconceived ideas. Every suggestion which is made must be examined in the light of whether it facilitates increased normalization of our relations with Egypt, whether it endangers Israel's security and whether it restricts the scope of Israel's political action in attaining a permanent solution....I am referring to the four principles mentioned by the Prime Minister: no return to the borders of 4 June 1967, no partition of Jerusalem, no independent Palestinian state, the preservation of Jewish rights to engage in settlement activity in the Land of Israel. All those positions are anchored in one form or another in decisions of the Knesset. I think that we should act with restraint with regard to establishing new settlements during the first few months after the signing of the agreement.

The Prime Minister concluded his opening address by suggesting that we give peace a chance. I say to the Prime Minister: you have been privileged to be the first prime minister to bring about the signing of a peace treaty between Israel and an Arab country. I earnestly hope that everything will indeed be done to give peace a chance.

...

The Minister of Agriculture, A. Sharon: Mr. Speaker, distinguished Knesset, for over a year everyone in Israel has been torn between the desire to bolster our security and the yearning to give things a chance, to avert from our sons the bloodshed which was the lot of our generation. Under the circumstances, I am not among those who are wildly enthusiastic over the chances of peace, nor am I among those who are determined to turn their back on it....Both sides of the scales are heavy with hopes and hazards, but those hopes and hazards are not inevitable.

M. Pa'il (Sheli): I hope that you are not one of the hazards....

The Minister of Agriculture, A. Sharon: Neither blind fate nor the decision made here tonight will determine what is to become of us....We must take our fate in our hands and be masters of our future. What we do after tomorrow to ensure our future is far more important than what we decide tonight....

As a soldier, I have been privileged to fight in all the wars of re-nascent Israel. As a member of the government, I have been charged with the duty of adding layers to the building-up and settling of the country whose foundations our parents, the founding generation, established....We must prove that we are the worthy successors of those brave

and splendid pioneers....That is the test of Israel. That is the test of the government. That is the test of our national leadership.

M. Pa'il (Sheli): How about adding peace...?

The Minister of Agriculture, A. Sharon: That is the test which will determine our fate, deciding whether we have opened the gate to hope or to hazards. Our children are living in Judea and Samaria, the Jordan Valley, the Gaza Strip and the Golan Heights, and are continuing to fulfill the nation's mission by fortifying the state. Today they are looking to us and asking what kind of state and what way of life we will give them in the wake of the peace agreement....Will it be a framework which will ensure flourishing Jewish life? Will we continue to develop agricultural and urban Jewish settlement, which is inextricably intertwined with the development of the state? Or will we condemn our undertaking to shrink, heaven forbid? If our reply to them is a serious and substantive yes, if we engage in widespread settlement activity throughout the Land of Israel, we will forge a path to peace. If our reply to them is a weak, hesitant and fearful yes, we will have taken the first step towards a terrible war.

I will vote for the treaty because I still believe that Israel, its government and leadership realize the gravity of the great test and are firmly resolved to stand firm....

M. Amar (Alignment): When did you reach that decision?

U. Avneri (Sheli): Could the Minister tell the House what happened between Monday and Thursday?

M. Wirshuvski (Movement for Change and Initiative): Minister Sharon has decided to hang on to his seat at all costs....

The Minister of Agriculture, A. Sharon: Anyone who, like me, yearns for peace is not absolved of the duty of seeing the other possibility too. What will we tell our children if the hazards outweigh the hopes? Have we prepared ourselves for that eventuality? I am fully aware of the importance and power of the IDF, but even the IDF needs reasonable opening conditions if our expectations are not fulfilled and we have to send our boys to the fronts once more. In order to guarantee the chances of peace as well as to contend with war, if our hopes of averting it are dashed, we must ensure the expansion and prosperity of the settlements in Judea and Samaria, we must expand and extend what we have established in the Gaza Strip, tighten our grip on the Golan Heights and create the conditions for full Jewish life throughout the country....Without those conditions there will be no settlement, and without settlement there will be neither security nor peace....

M. Pa'il (Sheli): Have you noticed, sir, that you are voting for an agreement today which contains self-government for the Palestinians

in the West Bank and the Gaza Strip? How does that fit with what you have just said?

The Minister of Agriculture, A. Sharon: Peace with Egypt can bring manifold blessings to the Egyptian masses who need it and to the Jewish people which yearns for it in Israel and the diaspora. The peace treaty with Egypt may well end the first chapter of our war of independence and open for both nations a window to prosperity, development and partnership. Only if we leave here tonight determined to sign the peace treaty and once again raise the flag of settlement throughout the Land of Israel—

M. Pa'il (Sheli): Which will undermine peace.

The Minister of Agriculture, A. Sharon:—will we be convinced that today we have plowed the first furrow of true peace in the Middle East.

...

The Deputy Prime Minister, Y. Yadin: Mr. Speaker, distinguished Knesset, I stand here today in fear and trembling, feeling deeply that we have been given the opportunity of voting for a peace treaty, the first between the independent State of Israel and our largest neighbor since the days of King Solomon three thousand years ago, when, to signify normalization, the resident Egyptian ambassador, Pharaoh's daughter, became one of Solomon's wives....That marked the beginning of a period of peace the like of which was not attained until many years later, in the reign of Simon the Maccabee....The treaty we are about to sign with Egypt marks the completion of an historical cycle of more than two millennia....

It is true that this peace treaty has been attained by virtue of great and painful sacrifices on our part, but today, after having discussed everything very thoroughly since Camp David, we can no longer sit on the fence....We must not let the nation feel that we are accepting peace unwillingly and half-heartedly....In our heart of hearts we all feel that this is a festive day, let us not mar it with doubts and hesitations....

We, who fought for our very lives before the establishment of the state, signed armistice agreements in the hope that peace would be attained and fought wars which were imposed on us by our enemies during the last thirty years, must offer up thanks at having reached this day....Perhaps as a result of this treaty true peace will be attained.... This treaty is essentially good, even though it has its faults, and is the only way peace could be attained under the circumstances....

I find this the right moment to praise three people....First of all, the Prime Minister who, for the last fifteen months, has had to contend daily with the other side and his own colleagues in order to attain peace with hope, security and the possibility of Zionist fulfillment, sparing no mental or physical effort. We can only express our admiration for his

courage, tenacity and ability to make painful decisions....We should also send congratulations to President Anwar Sadat for having taken an unprecedented step and broken the barrier of hostility and for having made an extremely important contribution to the attainment of the peace treaty. Today we must tell him and the great Egyptian people that we want peace with all our hearts and will do all we can to attain and maintain it....We should also send our warm congratulations to President Carter....Without the desire for peace of the Egyptian and Israeli peoples the peace treaty would not have been reached. But without President Carter's perseverance and energy that peace would have tarried.

If I feel anxiety today it is about our security....Israel is strong, its army steadfast; if, heaven forbid, the peace is broken we will repel and defeat our enemies. What arouses concern in me today is whether we will be able to cope with the challenges which will confront us on the social and internal levels which, once the treaty is signed, will paradoxically become more difficult to solve....I call on the government to work more effectively to amend the social situation and turn the tribes of Israel into one nation with adequate education and basic living conditions, giving everyone an equal start in life....At the same time, let us use this festive day to call on diaspora Jewry to immigrate to Israel and help to build the land and strengthen peace....

As we raise our hands for peace today let us decide not to return to the daily routine the day after the treaty is signed and resolve to work to enhance peace every day....We must not turn our backs on our social problems....Despite the doubts and hesitations, despite the pain at having to dismantle our settlements in the Sinai, we will vote today with a sense of joy and elation, for this is a great day for us....In conclusion, may I suggest that after the unique vote the House rise and sing the national anthem....

...

The Minister of Defense, E. Weizman: Distinguished Speaker and House, I am trying to look back at my thirty years in independent Israel, since the IDF was established and the War of Independence began, and ask myself which were the moments of elation and excitement....I have no doubt that this night is one of them. I can only thank the person who commanded most of Israel's armies and who spoke here before me tonight, bringing the debate to a higher emotional level than before, namely, the Deputy Prime Minister.

In December 1977 I was privileged to fly to Egypt for the first time without having to guard the tail of my plane, in daylight, at 25,000 feet, for a meeting with the man who was then my colleague, General Gamsi....He was then the Minister for War, and to my joy General Ali changed his title today to Minister of Defense....It was a moving moment as I came in to land at Cairo airport while below me lay Cairo and the sands where some of my best friends and soldiers had died....

It has been my good fortune to have been born in Israel. Like all my generation, I grew up between two basic problems, the aspiration to build the country and the problem of our relations with our Arab neighbors.... From my contact and personal experience with the Egyptians, I can say quite confidently that the Egyptian nation and its leaders want peace. I felt that wherever I went in Cairo, and I can only hope that the eagerness for peace which the Egyptians displayed a year ago has not died down, as it seems to have done in Israel, unfortunately....

We have been through many wars.... We have not yet experienced peace.... It is hardly surprising that in certain spheres we live in fear of the unknown.... We know that in war all the nation's resources are concentrated on one objective—victory—for a very short period of time. We have known victories, as well as one or two defeats. As I see it, the problem in peacetime is focusing our efforts over a longer period of time, something which we have not experienced in the past....

Like others, I fear what will befall us on the internal level as regards our social and economic problems.... Let us hope that as a result of peace and the relatively normal situation some immigrants will come.... I hope that one of the things we are able to do is expand industry and heighten our technological efforts in Israel....

One of the things which has been said here on more than one occasion, and with which I disagree, is that we are losing our independence to the U.S. There is no doubt that in certain spheres we are more closely connected to that Power, but I do not think that that is as a result of our lack of independence. I am convinced that if we have reached this great day, when the Egyptian President and leaders are prepared to meet the Prime Minister and sign a peace treaty after thirty years, it is amongst other things by virtue of Israel's ability to endure all the wars which have been imposed on us.... This might not be the right time and place to mention it, but since 1956 we have destroyed more than 1,200 enemy planes and 4,000 enemy tanks, most of them of Soviet manufacture.... We have not reached this point easily but I do not feel that we have given up our independence in our relations with the U.S.... The world is full of interdependence: America depends on Saudi Arabian oil; Saudi Arabia is dependent on American dollars; the Russians depend on American power, and the Americans depend on Russian power. We may be small, but spiritually and militarily we are big....

As a result of the new situation and the sacrifices we have made we will receive large sums of money from the U.S.... In an interview in the U.S. I was asked why we needed such large quantities of arms. My reply was that for good things one pays a lot, and for bad things one pays more. War is an expensive business and to our regret we have to maintain a large and strong army.... I have no doubt that there are security dangers....

I am the last person to argue with those who think that no more dangers threaten Israel. We thought in the past that there were no more dangers threatening Israel and we were surprised. I hope that will not happen again. The northern and northeastern border—Syria, Iraq and Jordan—is one with great military strength.... The IDF and the Ministry of Defense are not indifferent to that strength. The IDF is constantly on its guard, though I hope that that threat will not be implemented....

Ever since we began fighting in the Middle East we knew that without Egypt the Arab world would not go to war. Egypt went to war on its own several times, perhaps because we impelled it to do so. I am convinced that we ventured on and were not led to the Sinai Campaign and the Six Day War—

Z. Atshi (Movement for Change and Initiative): We encountered one another.

The Minister of Defense, E. Weizman: We encountered one another, thank you, MK Atshi. I would like to propose that all the Members of the Knesset try to imagine the immense military change which will take place. We will find ourselves in a situation in which Egypt will no longer threaten us.... I am often asked and we often ask ourselves—what will happen if Sadat disappears? What will happen if there is a different leadership? It is my assessment that at least the leadership we know today supports Sadat's course. But if that changes, if the leadership changes or Sadat changes, I am prepared to say with the fullest confidence that the military agreement we have reached, which places 120 miles between us and the Egyptian army, is a reasonable one, and if there are any changes in the military situation in the Sinai we will take note of them....

Anyone who has commanded armies knows that however well-equipped one is militarily—and we are extremely well-equipped—this agreement enables us to tell our children, our soldiers, our reservists that we have done our best, and if, heaven forbid, there is a change and we return to the way of life we knew before this agreement and have to call up our reserves, we will know that we have done everything we could.... For no army is stronger than its fighting spirit.... There are people in this House who have fought wars with minimal arms but a great deal of spirit. We must ensure that even when we have a great deal of weapons we have a great deal of spirit.

The document is good, the articles are important, we worked on them for sixteen months, changing, adding, removing.... Peace will be determined primarily by the relations between the two nations, if we understand the Egyptians and they understand us.... I believe that at present there is an immense gap in understanding. On the Egyptian side there is tremendous apprehension, as some MKs have already

pointed out, that Israelis will want to teach them how to grow cotton, build houses and do other things. Please, take it easy, because they don't like it when people come and tell them how to do things. They are a proud people with a strong sense of nationhood, a nation with problems. Anyone who thinks that things are simple is mistaken. There is a nation with poverty, hunger, problems. On the other hand, there is great apprehension among us, though this surprises me....I propose that all those who are apprehensive remember that the IDF is always at the ready, but that through understanding between the two nations we will attain those things we have wanted so much for so long.

For me personally, as someone who has participated in most of Israel's wars, this is a great day. I remember flying and looking through the sights of my guns, and I do not know whether I saw that I was shooting for peace or bombing for this step. Many Knesset Members have fought in Israel's wars. I think that those sacrifices, victories, bombardments and bombings, as well as all the building and creating and the aspiration to reach understanding between the two nations, are all reaping their reward today and will bring us to the signing of the treaty in Washington next Monday.

The Foreign Minister, M. Dayan: Mr. Speaker, distinguished Knesset, the Israeli-Egyptian peace treaty before us is not a pastoral peace treaty. It is not the fulfillment of the apocryphal vision "nation shall not lift up sword against nation." It is a peace treaty which has military annexes, which is accompanied by the building of airfields, which guarantees the increase of the IDF's strength. It is a political peace treaty, but it is also realistic and detailed and its purpose is to establish normal relations, like those between any two countries, between Egypt and Israel.

It is a realistic peace agreement which does not ignore or gloss over the facts and realities with which we live. It also contains a trial period of two years during which we will remain in the eastern part of the Sinai Peninsula after the relations between Egypt and Israel have been normalized. Those two years will serve as a testing time for the relations between Egypt and us, following the autonomy negotiations. During those two years we will not be in the whole of the Sinai but we will be in Sharm el-Sheikh, the airfields, the settlements and along the Egyptian-Israeli border. And we have America's guarantee to supply us with oil for fifteen years if we leave the oil fields.

During the course of hammering out this realistic agreement the Egyptians never once tried to evade committing themselves to an article which would guarantee the establishment of full and normal relations between Egypt and Israel. We had differences of opinion with them, but not on that subject. They did not attempt to make this an interim agreement and were prepared for a full-scale agreement, a complete revolution in relations....

From the Arab viewpoint this agreement serves a dual function, signifying both peace and acceptance. It is a peace agreement which must put an end to the state of war and establish peaceful relations. And consequently it is an agreement of acceptance of Israel's existence, and therein lies Israel's victory....I am not ignoring the military contribution to the attainment of this agreement, but we did not impose peace on Egypt by means of the IDF's victories....What the four wars we fought gave us was Egypt's defeat, the fact that at the end of each war the IDF was nearer to Cairo than before. Although we did not impose peace on them, we imposed mental stock-taking on them. It is to Sadat's credit that after the Yom Kippur War he abandoned the Nasserist conception of "what was taken by force will be restored by force," and of constantly preparing for war, making a complete about face towards peace....

On Egypt's part that is a very bold step, as is evinced by the response to it throughout the Arab world....But it also represents a far-sighted approach as regards both the future of the Egyptian people and the pattern of peaceful relations between Israel and Egypt, and should be admired and welcomed.

Although we are not dealing with the subject of autonomy tonight, I would like to refer to two points. Firstly, that the subject of the self-governing authority of the autonomy is incorporated within a wider, more comprehensive and more decisive framework, i.e., the five-year transition period....During that time practice and principles will be determined....It must be clear that all the elements of relations between countries will obtain between Israel and the Kingdom of Jordan, not between us and the autonomy, once the five-year period is up....The peace negotiations, the determination of the borders and the associated security arrangements will be worked out within the framework of the peace agreement between us and Jordan. There is no basis for those elements within the autonomy arrangement....

M. Pa'il (Sheli): Is the Minister aware of the fact that the Camp David agreements state that four elements will participate?

The Foreign Minister, M. Dayan: Gentlemen, I don't wish to answer. I ask you not to disturb me. Before you is an agreement, which you may read. I don't wish to engage in a dialogue....During the transition period the IDF will remain on the present borders, along the Jordan River, will continue to control the border crossing points between Jordan and Israel and will remain in Judea, Samaria and Gaza. The same applies to the international border with Egypt and to specified locations....That definition isn't ours, it is a joint one endorsed by the U.S. and Egypt. Those two elements, the relations between countries, which are solely between us and Jordan, and the IDF's control of and deployment along the borders and the surrounding areas, are the principal guarantee of the situation on the ground during that period....

I would like to conclude by saying that I am very pleased that tonight, in this House, there are more Members who will vote for the peace agreement than those who voted for the Camp David agreement. Even those who do not agree and will vote against it cannot say when and how we will have the chance of attaining a better peace agreement with Egypt than the one now before us. Consequently, tonight there will be more people supporting this agreement because it is very difficult, even to those who oppose it, to reject the Egyptian hand extended in peace.

M. Shamir (Likud): Extended to take the Sinai for nothing.

The Prime Minister, M. Begin: Mr. Speaker, distinguished Knesset Members, in winding up this debate, which is unprecedented in the Knesset's thirty years, I would like to note its importance. This is one of the finest hours of our parliament, taking us above the gray routine of everyday legislative reality....This is a moment which can without exaggeration be called historic, because we are confronting a turning-point in the relations between two Middle Eastern countries, in the hope that it will lead to others....Happy are we that we have seen this moment.

I would like to reply from this podium to my colleague, the Prime Minister of Egypt, Dr. Halil. He reacted yesterday to my opening speech in this debate, which contained a response to things he had said. Had Dr. Halil not said that the Old City of Jerusalem would be detached from Israel, that Israel would withdraw to the borders of 4 June 1967 and that there would be a Palestinian state in Judea and Samaria, I would not have expressed our view on those points in the Knesset, because they are things which we simply take for granted....As everyone in Israel knows, the vast majority of the population supports my stand on those three points. But the Egyptian Prime Minister cannot imagine that, unilaterally and just before the peace treaty is signed, he can injure the deepest feelings of the Jewish people everywhere, making statements which are in essence a call for war and bloodshed, and that we will not respond in any way....

After my reaction he claimed that what I said had clouded the atmosphere. That is not so. Your statement, Dr. Halil, clouded the atmosphere, and I merely reacted to what you said. One cannot claim that it is permissible to injure our people while the response to that injury clouds the atmosphere. Either everyone keeps quiet or everyone says what they have to say. I hope this teaches us a lesson for the future. I am prepared once again to propose a verbal ceasefire to my colleague, the Prime Minister of Egypt. Let us keep quiet. We are about to sign a peace treaty with good will, with trust, we wish to adhere to every word we have signed. Do not injure the feelings of our nation. You should know what Jerusalem is for this nation. Do not hurt our nation's feelings. Do not say that a fresh danger is to threaten it. Then we will not have to respond

from the podium of this free parliament and can all reach Washington and as free men sign the most important document ever written and signed by the accredited representatives of the Jewish state and an Arab country.

T. Toubi (Democratic Front for Peace and Equality): I would like to ask the Prime Minister why it is an injury to the feelings of the nation to say that the Palestinians have the right to establish an independent state? In 1947 they danced in the streets of Tel Aviv, after all....

The Prime Minister, M. Begin: MK Toubi, you asked a question respectfully and I will reply in the same vein....When the Jews danced in 1947 it was not because Jerusalem and Bethlehem had been taken from them but because they were to have a state of their own, after almost two thousand years of wandering throughout the world, of being burned at the stake, of being murdered, of being persecuted, of being enclosed in ghettos and, in the last generation, of witnessing the destruction of a third of our number. That is why we who did not dance, who were still in the underground, who declined to dance because our country was being partitioned, said that we understood the mood of the nation which suddenly, albeit after the historic War of Independence with its manifold sacrifices, had reached the day when it knew it would have its own government, its own parliament, its own army which would defend it so that never again would Jews be dragged to the gas chambers, never again would a little Jewish child be hanged. That was why we rejoiced, because we had gained our independence. You know that I have always respected the Arab nation....

But look what happened....The State of Israel, and round about—did they accept that decision or did they decide to drown it in blood? We remember the decisions that were made, the lives that were taken, and we were consequently advised not to declare our independence, and there were differences of opinion between the parties, yet we established our state. What happened so that we could maintain our independence...? One percent of the Jewish inhabitants then in the country were killed. According to today's population, that percentage would have meant thirty thousand killed. Can you imagine what would happen if our nation lost thirty thousand people? That's what happened in 1948.

M. Shamir (Likud): Today, by that treaty, you are causing murderers to act as they did in 1948, when they fought to destroy Israel. The Knesset will sign that thing today and afterwards set up memorials.

U. Avneri (Sheli): Show respect to the fighters. I was there. You were not. Show respect for the fighters on both sides. Show respect for soldiers. Every fighting soldier feels that....

The Prime Minister, M. Begin: I would like to say, on that point, as a Jew and a Jewish fighter, that I see nothing wrong in putting up memorials to the soldiers of another nation....

On the subject of autonomy of course it is possible to frighten us, to criticize us, to reject it, even to mock it. One can do anything but the fact is that that idea is the key to obtaining the peace treaty with Egypt.... Without it we would not have reached this point. It is just an idea and is no reason for special rejoicing, but the fact is that my friends of the Alignment, my distinguished opponents, are submitting a proposal today which contains their own autonomy plan....

(From the floor: Only for a transition period.)

There is something in that, because beforehand that problem was rejected utterly and completely. Today the entire House understands. It was an important, positive idea, and it was the only way we could attain a peace treaty with Egypt. I say again that we face a difficult year, a year of struggle, both internally and externally....I concede that we wish to fulfill that idea and enable our Arab neighbors to run their own affairs by means of an institution which they elect themselves in free and secret elections....

M. Wilner (Democratic Front for Peace and Equality): What you are doing now on the West Bank shows how free things will be. The whole idea of autonomy is merely a front to enable Sadat to agree to the continuation of the occupation....

The Prime Minister, M. Begin: In that case, Mr. Wilner, wait until Sadat comes here and say that to him....I do not agree that it is merely a front for Sadat. You learned that from *Pravda*, whose veracity is questionable, to put it mildly....

The simple truth is that President Sadat sought no front and we may find ourselves disagreeing with him. We did not deceive anyone.... From the very first moment we said that autonomy would be contingent on there being security for Israel in Judea, Samaria and Gaza. That is a precondition. That is what we told the President of the U.S., that is what we told President Sadat, that is what we said at every opportunity in public, at every conference and meeting....That has to be given a chance too....That is what we must do. How can we live together in this small country, which is only forty miles wide from the Jordan River to the sea? Where are there other countries which are so tiny? And would you divide that small country and mark a border through it? That is a brilliant solution, and that border would become one of bloodshed. That I know from a very good teacher—experience. Should one not learn from the experience of nineteen years...?

So, in what way have we erred by seeking a way of trying to live together? Does MK Wilner want us to allow our soldiers to have stones

thrown at them in the West Bank? And those stones can kill, not merely wound. We want to live in peace.

T. Ziad (Democratic Front for Peace and Equality): You conduct daily pogroms on the West Bank.

M. Wilner (Democratic Front for Peace and Equality): You have banned political freedom, you have banned meetings, forbidden performances. You forbid a political word to be spoken on the West Bank. You immediately send in the army and the police, killing and wounding people, arresting schoolchildren....

(Interjections from the floor.)

The Prime Minister, M. Begin: I thank all those who shouted out interjections. They have helped me overcome my tiredness....The idea of autonomy made it possible to sign a peace treaty with Egypt. We wish to implement it provided there is no longer a border and we can live in peace side by side, in understanding, mutual respect and freedom.... How beautiful the Land of Israel will be then. Let us try to achieve that. If they had only listened to us in 1948, when all the organizations—the Haganah, the IZL and Lehi—called on our Arab neighbors to stop the bloodshed and live together in peace....

T. Toubi (Democratic Front for Peace and Equality): That was when you perpetrated Deir Yassin. Demagoguery....

The Prime Minister, M. Begin: If the Knesset approves the peace treaty, its annexes and the accompanying letter in another few minutes, I hope that it will be possible for myself, President Sadat and President Carter to sign the peace treaty in Washington next Monday....I hope that a week later President Sadat will sign the treaty here in the Knesset and soon after that I will go to Cairo, or possibly the other way round.... Those three ceremonies are of great psychological and political importance, so that every Arab in the Middle East may see that the official representatives of Egypt and Israel can sit down together and sign a treaty in Cairo and Jerusalem. That will also be a cornerstone in the edifice of normal relations. That is why we proposed it....

At this late hour, at the conclusion of this momentous debate in the history of our nation, I would like to send the good wishes of the entire House to the President of Egypt for the tremendous courage he displayed in coming here and discussing peace with Israel. We invited him and were prepared to discuss peace with him. I extend the greetings of the representatives of the nation in Israel to the great Egyptian nation. Five times our sons met on the battlefield. Each one of them did his duty. Every soldier of every army who is sent to the battlefield is only doing his duty. That is why we have no complaints. We do not live in the past. We wish to build a new future. We extend greetings to the Egyptian nation as we embark on the new relations between our two peoples.

And now, permit me to say a few personal words. I would like to tell my veteran colleagues in this House, which is my home away from home for I have spent half my life here, what I feel. It is true that there is joy at the fact that we have reached this moment, there is concern for the future, as there must be and as is only natural....Yet despite everything I am also conscious of the fact that we have reached a turning-point. I hope it is a turning-point for the good, for us and the Egyptians as well as for other countries around us, because all of us want to reach the objective which is so simple and so human: peace. With God's help, may we return from the signing ceremony and tell our people: we have brought you peace.

...

H. Corfu (Likud): Mr. Speaker, distinguished Knesset, the concluding proposal on the government's statement regarding the peace treaty between Israel and Egypt, as proposed by the Likud, National Religious Party, Democratic Movement, Movement for Change and Initiative, Aguda, Development and Peace, Citizens' Rights Movement, the Independent Liberals and Ya'ad party groups is as follows: The Knesset approves the peace treaty between Israel and Egypt with its annexes and accompanying letter.

...

The Vote

Those in favor	95
Those against	18
Abstentions	2
Absent	3

(MK Corfu's concluding resolution is adopted.)

Proposed Change in the Parliamentary Immunity Law

Introduction

Parliamentary immunity is a well-established norm in most democracies. Israel is no exception. However, parliamentary immunity is more far-reaching in Israel than in any other country, relieving Knesset Members of "criminal or civil responsibility resulting from a vote, or the expression of an opinion orally or in writing, or any action they may have undertaken inside or outside the Knesset, as long as the vote, the expression of opinion or the action were in the pursuance of, or for the purpose of, their function as Members of the Knesset" (Knesset Members' Immunity Law, 1951, clause 1). Under this clause immunity is absolute and cannot be waived by the MK concerned, nor abridged or cancelled by his peers.

For other actions, such as an alleged misdemeanor or crime committed prior to his election, a special procedure has been laid down to ensure that no harassment on political grounds is possible. This law had been adopted in the first years of the state when many MKs, particularly from the opposition, viewed the Executive with a great deal of suspicion. Subsequently parliamentary immunity came under growing criticism, and several attempts were made to restrict it and bring it more into line with normal practice in other democracies. The following is but one example.

Sitting 231 of the Ninth Knesset

6 June 1979 (11 Sivan 5739)

A. Rubinstein (Movement for Change and Initiative): Mr. Speaker, distinguished Knesset, I see from the newspapers that there is a definite majority, comprising both the Likud and the Alignment, against my proposal. That may be so, but from this podium I would like to say that this is the only place in Israel where the majority opposes my proposal. I am prepared to take any forum of jurists, past and present Attorneys General, Knesset Speakers, academics, experts in political science and constitutional law or members of the press, and assure the Members of the Knesset—

G. Hausner (Independent Liberals): And ordinary people with common sense.

S. Toledano (Movement for Change and Initiative): Men in the street.

A. Rubinstein (Movement for Change and Initiative):—and assure the Members of the Knesset that there is no one in Israel who is not disgusted by the continued licentiousness on the roads and the negative example set by the unjustified parliamentary immunity granted to MKs in every sphere. Moreover, I can quote the opinions of experts who have come out quite clearly against the existing situation, which they regard as scandalous in legal terms. Former Attorney General and current Knesset Member Gideon Hausner has expressed his opinion on the subject from this podium. Former Attorney General and current Supreme Court Justice Meir Shamgar has said: "The behavior of a Knesset Member on the road as a driver has nothing to do with his parliamentary freedom of action. There is no reason why on this topic a Knesset Member should not have the same status as any other citizen." There is no newspaper, whether morning or evening, right-wing or left-wing, which does not support restricting MKs' parliamentary immunity. No other parliament in the world, whether in the West or the East, whether based on the continental or the Anglo-American system, has immunity even approaching that of the Members of this House. Finally, I repeat, no thinking man supports the prevailing situation. In other words, the majority which exists here in this House against restricting parliamentary immunity, according to the newspapers, exists solely inside this House and not outside it.

What is the reason for this gap between the attitude of the majority in this House and that of everyone else? What is the reason for the gap between the Knesset and the universities, including the Institute for Comparative Research of the Hebrew University, which was asked to give the Knesset its opinion? What is the reason for the gap between this majority and the position of the present and past Knesset Speakers, who have all come out against the existing situation? The only difference is that as Knesset Members we are discussing something which concerns ourselves. That is in itself an exceptional situation which derives from the anomaly of Israel's constitution. Because in well-ordered countries the issue of parliamentary immunity is determined by the constitution-makers, by a superior body, such as a constitutional assembly, which has considerations of its own, not by the members of parliament themselves, not by the people concerned.

The fact that we are dealing with something which concerns us obliges us to exercise maximal self-restraint. Only two weeks ago the Knesset passed a law drastically increasing the penalties for traffic violations....Can we say that these strict laws apply to the entire Israeli public but not to Knesset Members? Why? What is the connection between traffic violations and our function as Knesset Members? None whatsoever. It has been claimed that if our immunity is restricted

Knesset Members will be delayed. The police, that secret arm of the cruel and draconic regime, will detain Knesset Members on their way to the Knesset. But the police can do that today. Our parliamentary immunity does not prevent the police from giving us speeding tickets, it merely makes it possible to have them cancelled. It simply endorses the fact that as Knesset Members we will not bear the same responsibility we impose on every Israeli citizen. Is there any justification for this scandalous state of affairs?

If it were only a question of traffic violations, that would be something different. I must confess, however, that I do not know how to conduct the campaign against the mortality on the roads which wipes out entire families, while this scandalous state of affairs continues. But let's assume that this is the way things are—

...

Y. Yitzhaki (Likud): Perhaps you would address the issue of why such a wide-ranging law of parliamentary immunity was introduced. There is a reason for it.

A. Rubinstein (Movement for Change and Initiative): I certainly can explain it. Incidentally, it was passed despite vociferous opposition from Knesset Members, led by the Prime Minister, David Ben-Gurion.

U. Avneri (Sheli): And that proves why it was needed.

A. Rubinstein (Movement for Change and Initiative): It was passed at a time when there was no confidence in the independence of the law-courts. That is all. What is parliamentary immunity? It is, first of all, an expression of no confidence in the ability of the courts to hand down independent decisions.

(From the floor: That's not true.)

U. Avneri (Sheli): Definitely not. That is a basic misinterpretation. Today, too, you can bring a Knesset Member to trial.

A. Rubinstein (Movement for Change and Initiative): Since 1951 standards have been established, an independent legal system has been set up, as has the system of defense and prosecution. During the thirty years since the establishment of the state one cannot point to a single instance of harassment, though there have been very many cases of the misuse of parliamentary immunity and the abuse of individuals, who are unable to defend themselves, from this podium. There has been the abuse of grave traffic violations, of unforgivable deeds, which I do not wish to list from this podium though we all know what I am referring to.

If only traffic violations on the roads were involved, that would be something different. What we are talking about, however, is not an incidental aspect of Israeli life, it is something which is seminal to the lives of all of us. If I had to sum up the genuine and essential problem of

Israeli society, I would say that it is the problem of how to avoid the anarchic situation in which each group uses its power, disregarding the feelings and rights of others; it is the problem of how to prevent a situation in which everyone says to himself: I have power; I am an action committee; I am a trades union; I decide; I am a citizen; I stand in line; I use that power without considering others; I have something—therefore I can get more. That is the foremost psychological problem of Israeli society. The question is how one overcomes it. One might be able to do it by ascending the podium and preaching. One can, for example, preach to the workers who stay away from work and get a salary. But how can we, Knesset Members, preach to others when, in accordance with the custom of the House, an MK may be absent from the Knesset, Jerusalem and even Israel for a long period of time, because of his private concerns, and continue to receive a salary from the Knesset? My proposal refers to that, too. In other words, I think that in order to start changing practices in Israeli society we must first set an example to the nation. Neither preaching nor a change of regime will help...

A. Hadar (Hurwitz) (Alignment): What have the members of your party done?

A. Rubinstein (Movement for Change and Initiative): This week they decided to waive their parliamentary immunity....

Y. Sarid (Alignment): The question is, what did you do when you went abroad? Did you waive your salaries?

A. Rubinstein (Movement for Change and Initiative): One of the reasons for my making this proposal is that, in accordance with the existing situation, according to the law governing the salaries of Knesset Members, an MK cannot waive his salary.

Y. Sarid (Alignment): He can, he can.

A. Rubinstein (Movement for Change and Initiative): I am certainly prepared for any legislation—

T. Toubi (Democratic Front for Peace and Equality): Pay the fine.

A. Rubinstein (Movement for Change and Initiative): That is what I usually do.

C. Biton (Democratic Front for Peace and Equality): Ask the MKs to pay the fines themselves.

A. Rubinstein (Movement for Change and Initiative): That is what I and the members of my party do. I would be glad if the members of other parties were to do likewise. But it is a question of law rather than practice, and anyone who has examined the matter thinks that the law

should be changed. This applies to everyone concerned and cuts across party lines.

I have read all kinds of personal attacks on me by members of the Alignment. I will not react to them. I think that someone who uses terms of abuse and makes slanderous attacks on others is open to counter-attack. But I will not use that right. Though I was surprised to note that two of the people who attacked me used terms which are usually the preserve of the extreme right. I, too, have something to say on that score. When the time comes I will do so.

What I would like to say once more is that not even the coalition has an answer to these arguments. What was its answer? That they would not act on the basis of the headlines in the newspapers. I had not noticed the reluctance of the members of the coalition to act on the basis of newspaper headlines on other subjects. But the contention that this proposal arises from newspaper headlines is completely unfounded. I registered this proposal on 17 October 1977. It was removed on 5 April 1978. It was altered drastically after I held a joint meeting with the Alignment and Likud parliamentary factions. For example, at the Alignment's request I limited my proposal to offenses punishable by a fine, so that no trial would be involved. All that came after I had engaged in fundamental discussions with Knesset Members and jurists.

The proposal was reregistered on 5 January 1979 and should have come up for preliminary debate on May 24. Then I was asked by the Minister of Justice to defer the discussion by a week so that accord could be reached. I had an agreement with the Minister of Justice that I would drop the paragraph concerning MKs' salaries and he would support transferring the proposal to committee, where his own proposal would be submitted and together we could push through a joint proposal. After that, when the coalition committee rejected my proposal, I deferred it for another week. MK Corfu reached an agreement with me, promising to support my proposal if other MKs did so and it was not initiated by my party. I said that I was prepared to do that and asked the coalition MKs who had promised to support it whether they would be prepared to propose it. It then suddenly became evident to me from the newspapers and the media that the coalition committee had decided to remove the proposal from the agenda. MK Sharir said on television that the subject had been prepared in haste. The discussion of this topic has been going on for over eighteen months.

There is another reason, and that is that the issue of parliamentary immunity has been bothering the general public and the Knesset for over two years. What was stopping MKs from submitting a proposal?

G. Hausner (Independent Liberals): I submitted that proposal to the Seventh Knesset, six years ago.

A. Rubinstein (Movement for Change and Initiative): I am talking about the Members of this House. What was stopping the coalition from submitting this proposal throughout this period? On the contrary, when, from time to time, I reminded them of it, in order to speed things up, I encountered a negative response. Last week they remembered that they had to appoint an internal committee. All this is just a delaying tactic with the object of defeating the proposal. Moreover, why shouldn't the proposal be transferred to committee for a preliminary reading? I am prepared to undertake to postpone the continuation of the debate until we gain the agreement of all the party groups. Why should it be rejected as an excuse for maintaining the existing situation and misleading the public? I want to make it perfectly clear that I am prepared to accept any possible compromise in committee. I am prepared to drop the paragraph on whose omission I agreed with MK Corfu and the Minister of Justice. I am prepared to vote on the various sections separately. I am prepared to reach any arrangement. In my view, what has been done here is doubly iniquitous, first by leaving the existing situation as it is, and secondly by deceiving the Israeli public and saying that a party group committee is to be set up overnight in order to deal with it....

Y. Sarid (Alignment): I'll support your proposal. But all the same, I want to ask you why one of the members of your party, Steff Wertheimer, has never attended the Knesset, to the best of my recollection.

A. Rubinstein (Movement for Change and Initiative): Never attended the Knesset? I would say that was an exaggeration.

Y. Sarid (Alignment): Has hardly attended the Knesset. His attendance record can be checked. I think it is about 10 percent of the requisite time. What has your party group done to fulfill all the fine principles it preaches?

A. Rubinstein (Movement for Change and Initiative): MK Sarid, it is not preaching. As I told you and the Speaker, I am ready and willing for the Knesset to publish the daily attendance record of the MKs.

Y. Sarid (Alignment): That's no answer. I am saying that he hasn't been present even 10 percent of the requisite time. Why don't you set your own house in order before you preach to others?

A. Rubinstein (Movement for Change and Initiative): Believe me, I am not making party or personal calculations. I am definitely in favor of attending the House, though I am not prepared to attest to the attendance of any specific party group. If our proposal is adopted—and I reject what you said—the daily attendance register will be published....

M. Wirshuvski (Movement for Change and Initiative): Including committees.

A. Rubinstein (Movement for Change and Initiative): I am prepared to include that. I am prepared to include anything which will enhance norms. I am not speaking as the representative of a party group. The last thing I want is to clash with the members of other party groups. I am prepared for another party group to take this initiative and to remove my name.

The subject concerns the standing of this House, not the parties. It is not our personal affair or interest. The public sees what is happening in the Knesset, regarding it in an increasingly negative light, seeing its trades union aspect. We must prove by this vote that we are a house of representatives.

A. Sharir (Likud): Mr. Speaker, distinguished Knesset, I will begin with the last words of the previous speaker, that the subject concerns the honor of the entire House and is not the personal interest of his party group. I agree with him on that point, I do not think that it is the personal concern of MK Rubinstein or his party group. In that respect our clear and declared position is that it is something which concerns the entire House. Anyone who cares about the honor of the Knesset had better refrain from injuring it, from pursuing cheap publicity and from conducting smear campaigns against MKs.

M. Wirshuvski (Movement for Change and Initiative): Do you include the Minister of Justice in that?

A. Sharir (Likud): I certainly accept that it is necessary to examine the law of parliamentary immunity. It is our view that every aspect of that subject should be fundamentally examined too, as should the various phenomena occurring in connection with the activity and immunity of MKs and which have come under public criticism. But I do not think that the discussion should be restricted to the narrow sphere of MKs' parking tickets. That is the least important and worrying aspect of this subject, although I say this while stressing that as a first step I am certainly prepared to cancel it.

My colleagues and I think that there is no place for discrimination, special privileges and immunity when what is involved is not connected with the implementation of the public role of MKs. On this point things have been said out of viciousness and demagoguery, making use of blatant lies, in an attempt to harm the Knesset and its Members, blacken their names and make political capital. I reject all that utterly. The law of immunity was designed to enable MKs to act and fulfill their tasks, and any right which is not connected with the implementation of their function should be annulled. That is my firm opinion.

U. Avneri (Sheli): The Minister of Justice circulated among the party groups what I regard as a disgusting proposal to destroy MKs' immunity. Do you support it or not?

A. Sharir (Likud): I will refer to that in a little while....The fact that of the wide range of subjects which should be examined in connection with the law of parliamentary immunity only the subject of parking violations has been selected is evidence of the pursuit of irrelevant details, verbal villainy, a desire to make political capital, representing the subject as a public scandal and attempting to gain public approbation because there are more drivers who resent excessive privileges. That is what I reject.

The party groups have decided to establish a committee which will deal with all the problems of the law of parliamentary immunity. The issue of parking is something between an MK and the authorities. But there are more serious problems between MKs and society which should be examined, such as violations of the slander law, etc. Parliamentary immunity in the case of traffic violations, which has been so widely discussed of late, was granted in the past by Israel's Legislature in order to obviate the possibility that the authorities would harass a representative of the public and impede him in the implementation of his duty. What is easier than to delay an MK on one pretext or another and prevent him from taking part in debates or votes? Those people who are concerned about the health and welfare of MKs on Israel's roads had better check the speedometer in their cars. It is difficult to imagine today, in the well-ordered democratic regime which has existed in the country since its establishment, for thirty years. The laws were intended to prevent possible future situations and not solely to contend with existing ones. If in future the need arises to discuss the law of immunity as a result of the fact that the regime harasses the Knesset and impedes its functioning, it will be too late. Then it will be impossible.

As I said before, the party groups have decided to appoint representatives in the next few days to form a committee and examine all the problems connected with the law of immunity, and submit recommendations and conclusions as soon as possible. Amendments to the law of immunity should be made with the agreement of all the party groups, especially the opposition and in particular the principal opposition, whose representative should, in our view, chair that committee. Any other course is unacceptable, anti-democratic and anti-parliamentarian. Amendments to the law of immunity should be made only by the Knesset and not by the government.

M. Wirshuvsky (Movement for Change and Initiative): What do you think of the Minister of Justice's proposal to tell MKs how to act?

A. Sharir (Likud): The law of immunity seeks to protect the Legislature from the capriciousness of the Executive. How can amendments be proposed by it? Immunity was given to the Knesset, to the highest institution of the nation and the state, not to the Knesset Members. I suggest that we all treat the Knesset's honor with circumspection.

I think that the subject requires a serious and deep examination by all the party groups, as I said before, and especially by the opposition, whose rights we must defend. I am convinced that the party groups will find the appropriate legislative public response as soon as possible. I consequently propose that the proposal be removed from the agenda.

A. Rubinstein (Movement for Change and Initiative): Mr. Speaker, distinguished Knesset, I had hoped that in what MK Sharir said I would find an answer to the grave problems I raised. I agree with him that we must preserve the honor of the Knesset. In fact, that was the object of my entire initiative.

I would like to ask how a proposal like mine enables the authorities, however bad the regime, to engage in harassment? I deliberately formulated the sections in such a way as to preclude any possibility of arresting an MK, putting him on trial or even delaying him. On the subject of slander my proposal is minimalist and extremely simple. I am prepared to break it up into its separate sections and make every possible compromise. My proposal is that if a citizen has been injured as the result of a slanderous statement made by an MK outside the Knesset building, the MK should be able to waive his immunity.

The Vote

Those in favor	17
Those against	23
Abstentions	4

(The proposal to transfer the proposal to amend the Knesset Rules 5739-1979 to committee for preliminary discussion is not adopted.)

Proposal to Allow the Prime Minister to Dismiss Ministers

Introduction

Under the Basic Law: the Government, once he has formed his government and obtained a vote of confidence, the Prime Minister is at best first among equals. He has no casting vote nor any other privilege over and above those of his colleagues, except for the rather double-edged one concerning resignation: his resignation automatically brings about the demise of the government, whereas the resignation of any other minister affects that minister alone. As a result, individual ministerial responsibility, although frequently referred to, has been difficult if not impossible to enforce, and the principle of collective ministerial responsibility has reigned supreme.

From time to time attempts have been made to remedy the situation, i.e., to bring the prime minister's authority more into line with his responsibility as head of the governmental team, by enabling him to dismiss ministers who have not properly fulfilled their functions. One such attempt at amending the law is quoted below. In 1981 a similar amendment was indeed adopted.

Sitting 231 of the Ninth Knesset

6 June 1979 (11 Sivan 5739)

M. Shahal (Alignment): Mr. Speaker, distinguished Knesset, the power to appoint and dismiss a minister arises from the constitutional structure of the instruments of government in Israel. The accepted approach here is based on the English tradition by which the government is collectively responsible to parliament, in accordance with Paragraph 4 of the Basic Law: the Government. Consequently, a minister can be dismissed for something he has or has not done only by the dismissal of the entire government through a vote of no confidence, in accordance with Paragraph 24 of that law. In the prevailing constitutional situation the prime minister does not have the authority to dismiss a minister because he is regarded as being merely first among equals, and although he forms the government he does not appoint it....

The need for ministerial responsibility and the ability to dismiss ministers has existed since the establishment of the state. But the subject has become more serious, urgent and of public concern since the Yom Kippur War, when it was determined that the issue of ministerial re-

sponsibility had to be dealt with on the public level. The Knesset has the moral, practical and constitutional duty of determining clearly and explicitly that a minister is responsible for his actions and errors and that it is possible for the prime minister to dismiss him, while informing the Knesset of this. The Knesset must approve the dismissal just as it must approve the appointment of ministers.

Five interconnected questions are relevant to the subject of responsibility: 1. Who is responsible? 2. Why is he responsible? 3. To what extent is he responsible? 4. To whom is he responsible? 5. and perhaps most important of all—What is the price of responsibility? The precise nature of the responsibility consists of the answers to these five questions. I think that only a few people will disagree that political responsibility in a democratic country requires the existence and functioning of the principle of individual ministerial responsibility alongside and supplementary to collective responsibility.

The opinion of the former Minister of Justice, Chaim Zadok, in the wake of the interim report of the Agranat Committee, reads: "The principle of the individual ministerial responsibility of a minister for the activities of his ministry is part of the constitutional concept and applies to the interaction between the Executive and the house of representatives." Mr Zadok pointed to the distinction between collective and personal responsibility, determining that with respect to the first instance there is a legal sanction, namely, a vote of no confidence in the government, while as regards the second there is no such sanction.

The proposal submitted by MK Rubinstein and myself seeks to determine that a sanction does exist and that a minister should pay the price if he is unfit for office or is responsible for a blunder in the sphere of his ministry.

It is customary for us to refer to English practice in legal and constitutional matters....In this particular sphere, according to England's unwritten constitution, the practice is that a minister is responsible in theory to the crown but in practice to the prime minister, and that the latter may dismiss him. He does not usually need to do so because as soon as he has hinted to a member of his government that he is prepared to dispense with his services, that minister hastens to resign.

The Deputy Prime Minister, Y. Yadin: They have a bi-party system. You should copy everything.

M. Shahal (Alignment): What concerns us is the situation in Israel, particularly when participants in the government—whether junior or not—have made legislation in that sphere their cause yet seek to ignore their commitments on various pretexts. I say this with regret, particularly regarding two people whom I respect, the Deputy Prime Minister and the Minister of Justice. Because the attempt to latch on to excuses of one sort or another, shrugging off responsibility for what appears in

their preelection platform, and claiming that we live in a regime where there is a coalition and a variety of parties, is unacceptable. The Minister of Justice went too far when he said that the Democratic Movement for Change would threaten to leave the government if this law were passed.

The Minister of Justice, S. Tamir: I did not say that.

M. Shahal (Alignment): I heard you quoted on the radio.

The Minister of Justice, S. Tamir: Listen to what I say, not to the radio. On behalf of the Minister of the Interior and his party, and on behalf of Yigael Yadin, the head of the Democratic Movement for Change, and his party, I said that it was inconceivable that in a coalitionary regime a prime minister who was the head of one party could dismiss ministers elected by their parties....

M. Shahal (Alignment): You are merely reinforcing my view, sir. I am just coming to your party and your statement. In your election program you promised changes in the quality of life, saying that unlike other parties you would keep your promises....You also said that the prime minister would be free to choose his ministers, allocate them tasks and free them of their positions, provided he informed the Knesset....

The Minister of Justice, S. Tamir: Read to the end. Read the entire context.

M. Shahal (Alignment): I have....As a jurist, I hold them in high regard.

The Deputy Prime Minister, Y. Yadin: Your party was in office for thirty years, why didn't you introduce changes?

M. Shahal (Alignment): For the moment I am referring to you and your party, not to myself. I am referring to what you promised. I am saying that that excuse is a fig-leaf which does not manage to conceal the promise.

The Minister of Justice, S. Tamir: We're not making excuses, we're proud of ourselves.

M. Shahal (Alignment): The Minister of Justice knows that when your party made that election promise, you did not make it conditional on there being a two-party system....

The Deputy Prime Minister, Y. Yadin: I'll show you the minutes of the meeting of our Secretariat, when we decided how to elect our ministers. It was decided then, by the people who are here today, that that would apply only if the government comprised one party....

M. Shahal (Alignment): Was that before the election platform or afterwards? You published that platform before you knew you would join the government. You did not tell the public that. Are you trying to tell me that you changed your minds after becoming ministers? I know that. I see that every day. It grieves me. This isn't demagoguery, it's the truth....I want to tell the Deputy Prime Minister, whether you deposed us or not is a question which will be answered elsewhere, but it matters to me that the public should be able to assess you at the next elections in accordance with your actions and your promises. I have no doubt about that.

The Minister of Justice, S. Tamir: Definitely.

M. Shahal (Alignment): You are not the only ones who didn't keep your promises. The present prime minister, Menahem Begin, often made more far-reaching proposals between 1962 and 1974 than that of MK Rubinstein and myself...MK Begin, as he then was, proposed that the Knesset, not the government, should dismiss a minister....I am giving him the honor of deciding whom to dismiss....On 21 December 1974 the current prime minister said: "The problem is moral, not only legal." That is absolutely correct. What you are doing today by denying the promises you made is cynical vis-à-vis the Israeli public and everything that I regard as fair in the relations between voters and their elected representatives....

The Minister of Justice, S. Tamir: Mr. Speaker, distinguished Knesset, it could have been expected that after two years in opposition the second largest party group in the House would have come up with some original ideas....

M. Shahal (Alignment): So that there should be no misunderstanding, may I point out that my proposal dates from 1975. It is not identical with what you think. It is an original proposal and is different from MK Begin's....

...

The Minister of Justice, S. Tamir: In principle, we share a great deal of common ground as far as the first part of your proposal is concerned.... You may have been abroad when I expressed my opinions here very clearly on the subject of individual ministerial responsibility. I think that what I said was acceptable to the majority of the House....I draw your attention to the debate on the Supreme Court decision regarding the Beduin of the Negev. I support individual ministerial responsibility....

During the thirty years of the Alignment's rule I cannot recall—perhaps you will refresh my memory—a single instance of the implementation of the principle of individual ministerial responsibility, including during the period after the Yom Kippur War, MK Shahal, when

the time came when, you claim, its eyes were opened on the subject. Nobody drew personal conclusions. The then-Minister of Justice, a member of your party, drew conclusions regarding the lack of individual ministerial responsibility of others. Thus, on this subject there is no disagreement.

I think there is a lot of truth in your statement that in most governments—and I think that is true today, too—it can be assumed that many ministers—I won't speak on behalf of all of them—would resign if the prime minister hinted that he was prepared to dispense with their services. Your proposal is more far-reaching, however, suggesting that the prime minister should be empowered to dismiss them.

It could well be, my friend and rival MK Shahal, that there is an increasing tendency in Israel to favor a presidential regime, following the American model rather than the British parliamentary one....That would enable the president to appoint and dismiss his ministers as he chose....In America, however, there are increasing complaints on the grounds that the presidential system runs into difficulties in its relations with Congress, and this has given rise to demands for the adoption of the conventional British parliamentary system. That is an issue which should be examined thoroughly and without disputatiousness.

But in the British system too, as you quite rightly pointed out, the prime minister, who forms a government comprising one party, in most cases, and is automatically head of the party, may replace his ministers, appointing and releasing them, and that is an appropriate and desirable situation and was acceptable to us when we drew up the platform of the Democratic Movement for Change—then still united—and is so still today....

The fact is, however, that Israel's governments, under the various prime ministers, did not act thus and did not implement what you are proposing for the simple reason that the coalitionary exigencies deriving primarily from the proportional electoral system precluded this.... My friend and colleague, the Minister of the Interior Dr. Burg, has told me that Ben-Gurion tried to raise the subject and that he rejected it flatly.

G. Hausner (Independent Liberals): But Ben-Gurion did it with regard to Moshe Sharett.

The Minister of Justice, S. Tamir: For completely different reasons, and within his party. As I said, a prime minister may hint something to a minister, who may draw the appropriate conclusions.

G. Hausner (Independent Liberals): A very broad hint.

The Minister of Justice, S. Tamir: And Sharett behaved nobly then. I remember that moment. He restrained himself, and I do not think he deserved it, but that is not our concern just now....A party will not allow

outsiders to dictate who its representatives should be, and the members of my party struggled to ensure that secret and personal elections within the party should determine who its ministers should be, and that all the trends represented in the government should be able to express themselves democratically.

Imagine a coalitionary government with three parties, not necessarily the present one, with different trends within those parties. Will the parties agree that the prime minister should choose the trends within the parties which suit him best? They will not. I am sometimes surprised by the fact that parties which are not in agreement with the prime minister or his party seek to create a situation in which their coalition partners are weakened by being made subject to the personal decisions of the prime minister. They sometimes seem to be more concerned by the possibility of a general consensus on a given topic....

When there is a coalition—which is not an ideal situation—one cannot free oneself of such considerations. That is the political reality. If the electoral system were to be changed the data would change, and we have indeed recommended that the electoral system be changed. For thirty years the Alignment spoke about changing the electoral system but did nothing, even foiling the initiatives of others.

M. Shahal (Alignment): That isn't true either, as you well know. They may have done more than you.

The Minister of Justice, S. Tamir: If you wish it, I'll address that too. Then it really would be preferable for the prime minister to choose the team and be able to make changes in it. That would give rise to a better, more efficient and more harmonious administration. That is the situation which we must strive to attain. But it is desirable, not actual. Do not tell me, MK Shahal, that for thirty years you wanted to attain it but could not.

A. Nof (Democratic Movement): The facts speak for themselves.

The Minister of Justice, S. Tamir: For thirty years there were repeated periods in which the Alignment was in effect all-powerful; far more than the Likud is today in numerical terms in the Knesset. We remember the numbers....I remember how, as a member of the opposition, I had to cooperate with the MKs of Rafi to fight for changing the electoral system. They told us how the party sabotaged their efforts, on the one hand declaring its support for electoral reform while on the other foiling it time and again. I remember Ben-Gurion's efforts on this issue, though I am not sure how much importance he attached to it. But the party, the historic nucleus, repeatedly thwarted attempts to change the electoral system.

M. Shahal (Alignment): Why don't you tell me what is happening now to the proposal for electoral reform? You have been making promises for nine months. Why don't you leave history alone?

The Minister of Justice, S. Tamir: It's all a function of the balance of power....I am saying that in reference to members of the Movement for Change and Initiative....If they had not led to the split in the Democratic Movement for Change they would be able to speak now with some moral authority, because when they weakened the numerical representation of the DMC in the Government they also weakened the chances of changing the electoral system. But when they come in the name of some general, abstract idea at least they have some right to do so whereas you have none. For you it's just a parliamentary game. That sort of thing won't wash anymore....

As far as the MCI is concerned, they know perfectly well that we spoke about a unified package....In given circumstances, within a certain form of government, there are things which cannot be changed, partly because of the unfortunate legacy of history and partly because of the balance of power.

M. Shahal (Alignment): You did not say that to the voters before the elections, sir.

The Minister of Justice, S. Tamir: You did not go with me into people's homes. At every meeting we attended I and my colleagues said that everything depended on the voters. If they gave us the power to form a government there would be one result, if they made us the balancing force there would be another and if they gave us less strength there would be yet another. If we were to find ourselves in opposition we would be able to contribute even less, though that is important too, and we would function as an opposition....

A. Rubinstein (Movement for Change and Initiative): But the DMC never sought to introduce a one-party regime.

The Minister of Justice, S. Tamir: The DMC preached and aspired to a one-party regime, but in the existing circumstances it is doubtful whether we will attain it because of the need to make coalitionary arrangements with the National Religious Party too.

A. Nof (Democratic Movement): You mean a one-party government.

M. Shahal (Alignment): I'm afraid that excuse is unconvincing, sir.

The Minister of Justice, S. Tamir: MK Shahal, we came to the Israeli political scene with a series of fresh ideological and programmatic ideas.

M. Pa'il (Sheli): Your only innovation was that you used a computer to elect the DMC's institutions. That failed too....

The Minister of Justice, S. Tamir: We came with a plan for a parties law, a plan I first raised in the Knesset several years ago, and in another few weeks we will finalize that proposal and bring it before the House.

M. Shahal (Alignment): That's not original either. We also proposed a parties law.

The Minister of Justice, S. Tamir: I proposed it first on behalf of the Free Center....The united DMC put it in its election platform. As a result of those initiatives you, MK Shahal, but not your party, entered the Knesset. Your party has not supported your proposal.

M. Shahal (Alignment): I submitted it with my party's consent.

The Minister of Justice, S. Tamir: It did not implement it when it had the chance....Naturally, one's ability to implement things depends on one's strength. As a member of the Constitution, Law and Justice Committee you must know that....Reforms have been introduced in the judicial system at the initiative of the Ministry of Justice which were not achieved during the last thirty years, as you well know. I also benefit from your support on many subjects, and I commend you for that. This is the result of the fact that we are subject to the constraints of the power given us by the voters, on the one hand, and the fact that the party has split, on the other. Nonetheless, there have been considerable achievements and there is cooperation. We have reached the midpoint of our term and while there have been achievements there is also still a great deal to be done....

Consequently, while the trend which MK Shahal recommends is a desirable one, in the given circumstances it is unrealistic. I invite MK Shahal to help introduce certain reforms which will create the conditions under which it will be possible to attain this aim together. At this stage I recommend removing the proposal from the agenda.

The Speaker, P. Sheinman: Knesset Members, it is the tradition of the House that while one of the party groups is holding its annual conference we do not vote on basic issues. Consequently we will not vote on this proposal today. I suggest that MK Rubinstein reply when the proposal is brought to the vote, though you have the right to reply today, if you wish....

A. Rubinstein (Movement for Change and Initiative): Mr. Speaker, Knesset Members, the subject on the agenda today is not the past of the DMC or the MCI but the reform of Israel's electoral system and consequently of the functioning of the government....But since certain

very serious statements have been made by the Minister of Justice I am obliged to reply....The council of the DMC reached a decision which the group led by Ministers Tamir and Yadin did not accept. I suggest that we leave it to the historians to decide who is responsible for what happened. But I do not accept having accusations made and blame apportioned here.

It was said that the DMC's platform made reference to the prime minister's authority only in a regime where one party formed the government, as in Britain. The DMC platform never advocated a regime like Britain's. On the contrary, its election material, part of which I had the honor of composing, spoke of reducing the number of parties in the coalition, in the government, to two or three. The DMC platform stated quite clearly that the British one-party system was inappropriate for Israel....In Britain itself an ever-growing section of the electorate is opposed to the electoral system there, advocating the proportional-regional system and denigrating the two-party system. The original platform of the DMC read: "Our movement thinks that the prime minister should have wide implementary powers, in accordance with the gravity and importance of his tasks. The prime minister should be enabled to choose his ministers freely. We know that in the present regime the practical significance of such powers is limited, but the principle should be determined now, before the electoral system is changed." That is the program we presented to the voters and which is now being denied....

The reason for granting the prime minister wider powers was that international experience has proved that without them there is no government, even in coalitionary regimes. It is not true to say that only in Britain do such powers exist. In the Federal Republic of Germany—it is difficult to say this, but that is one of the best-run, most efficient and democratic of modern administrations—the government has always been coalitionary and has never had an absolute majority in the Bundestag, yet the Chancellor has the full authority to appoint and dismiss his ministers. That authority is limited, of course, for political reasons, as is the case in the Scandinavian countries....

I am in favor of that authority. I am in a party which is in the opposition. I think that that authority is problematic. I am not concealing that. But in my opinion the benefit of the country must come before everything else....The main problem of modern democracy is balancing two separate forces, the desire to incorporate a wide range of views and the desire to maintain democracy in Israel. Israel has an unusual system in that the government is a mini-parliament, a discussion forum, rather than the Executive....All the democratic systems with which I am familiar resolved that through the balance of forces—a variety of opinions in the parliament and the power of implementation in the hands of the government and its head, whether by an extreme system of granting direct implementary authority to the head of the Executive or by giving ex-

tensive powers to the prime minister. It is limited in every country except for Israel. The prime minister has power. He cannot use it for political reasons. He cannot dismiss a minister if he knows that this will bring his government down.

The Deputy Prime Minister, Y. Yadin: This is hypocrisy and demagoguery.

A. Rubinstein (Movement for Change and Initiative): I am reading from the original document.

The Minister of Justice, S. Tamir: That's your interpretation.

A. Rubinstein (Movement for Change and Initiative): My interpretation has no connection with the election platform. My interpretation is based on what happens in international parliamentary practice, what happens in countries like West Germany and all the Scandinavian countries, though not in Britain.

The prime minister has the authority to dismiss a minister. He may use that authority freely and does so freely as regards the ministers of his own party. It is certainly important that he should do that. As regards ministers from the parties in the coalition, he has the legal authority to dismiss them but is restricted by political considerations. But the prevailing situation in Israel where any change in the composition of the government requires the resignation of the prime minister and the government is unparalleled anywhere in the world and has a destructive effect on Israeli democracy.

The Speaker, S. Arbeli-Almoslino: Knesset Members, the vote will be held at one of the forthcoming sittings....

Basic Law: Jerusalem, the Capital of Israel

Introduction

In the early years of the state, from 1948 to 1950, the issue of Jerusalem was paramount. The city and its immediate environs were destined to constitute a *corpus separatum* under the U.N. Partition Resolution, which the Jewish Agency, alone among all the parties concerned, had accepted. Gradually, it became clear that the international community was unwilling or unable to protect Jerusalem and its citizens, two-thirds of whom were Jewish already then. Perforce, Israel came to include the area of Jerusalem in its jurisdiction *de facto* (June 1948), subsequently *de jure*, and ultimately, in January 1950, when the U.N. General Assembly reiterated its support for internationalization, the Knesset declared, in a resolution, that "with the reestablishment of a Jewish state, Jerusalem has once again become its capital."

In 1967, after the unification of the city in the wake of the Six Day War, the municipal boundaries of the city were expanded, by decree, under an enabling law. While formal recognition of Jerusalem as the capital of Israel was still being withheld by most governments and most embassies were located in or near Tel Aviv, *de facto* all ambassadors presented their credentials and transacted their official business in Jerusalem, while fifteen embassies were actually located there.

The Basic Law: Jerusalem the Capital of Israel, proposed by the Tehiya party group, was designed, as explained by its proposer below, to strengthen the juridical basis for the city's status. Many MKs felt that it was inopportune, but did not see their way clear to opposing it since there was, in fact, near unanimity on the substance.

On 30 July 1980 the law was adopted on the second and third readings. This provoked a Security Council resolution (No. 478, of 20 August 1980) calling on all members to withdraw their diplomatic missions from Jerusalem. The fifteen countries which had maintained their embassies in Jerusalem obeyed and moved them to Tel Aviv.

Sitting 360 of the Ninth Knesset

23 July 1980 (10 Av 5740)

G. Cohen (Tehiya): Mr. Speaker, distinguished Knesset, I have the honor of bringing before the House for its first reading the proposal for the Basic Law: Jerusalem the Capital of Israel, which is the private bill

of all the Jews of Israel and the world. It is a proposal which seeks to fill a legal gap and determine the status of united Jerusalem as the capital of Israel not only *de facto*, but also *de jure*, through a Basic Law. It is a proposal which comes at the moment when it is most needed in political terms, and before even having been approved it has foiled the plans of those who seek to harm Israel and Jerusalem.

The three weeks which in Jewish history mark the period between the breach made in the wall around Jerusalem by its enemies, after a protracted siege, and the destruction of the Temple two thousand years ago ended yesterday, but the siege of Jerusalem by its enemies has not ceased for a minute since we began to rebuild our country for the third time, and is in fact tightening around us at this very moment. Jerusalem is in danger. The fact that the Jerusalem Law is being brought before the Knesset today is neither coincidental nor purely symbolic.

As will be remembered, in 1967 Israeli law, administration and jurisdiction were imposed on united Jerusalem, but to this day no law has stated explicitly, and certainly not in a Basic Law, that Jerusalem is the capital of the State of Israel. That was certainly stated in an official Knesset resolution, but not in a law. It is true that not all the capitals of the world have their status anchored in law, but no other capital is like Jerusalem, whose position as Israel's capital is called into question by almost all the capitals of the world. The lack of a Basic Law regarding Jerusalem was felt by both the Likud and the Alignment....It is, therefore, strange to hear from certain quarters that the Jerusalem Law is superfluous....

What is true is that the Jerusalem Law is not being proposed this time solely in order to fill a legislative gap. It is being proposed today—and let us not forget that we are currently involved in negotiations—also in order to close a political gap with a negative dynamic which has been created by the continual absence of an appropriate and unequivocal Israeli response to the Arab assault on Israel's sovereignty over united Jerusalem, an assault which has the enthusiastic support of the Christian world. The fact that the proposal is being brought before the Knesset today is important in that it reminds all those concerned that their schemes and hopes to wrest Jerusalem away from us are unfounded and doomed to failure....

Though fully aware of Israel's position and the Knesset resolution of 1967, which was mentioned once more in the annex to the Camp David accords, President Sadat again suspended the talks two months ago in view of the Knesset's united stand on the subject in 1980....For him the law constituted something new. The fact that the law was proposed made it clear to him that he could not deal with Jerusalem as he had intended to because, contrary to his expectations of Israel by virtue of his experience of it, Israel's attitude to united Jerusalem was very serious. Not

only is the law not superfluous, not only is it essential and timely—coming almost at the last moment, I would say—it has already been helpful rather than harmful. When Egypt and the U.S. realized yesterday, as they will today and tomorrow, that Israel was firm in its resolve, that it is they who would have to retreat or alter their tactics, they did so forthwith.

Although Sadat, who knows that the proposal will pass its first reading today, repeated yesterday that Jerusalem is an Arab city and that whatever Israel has built is of no significance, not only did he not threaten to stop the talks but even said explicitly that they would continue. The U.S., which not long ago was seeking to interfere in the Knesset's legislative process regarding the Jerusalem Law, has now switched to dropping gentle hints to us about not making things difficult for it. Not that that should lull us into a sense of security and prevent us seeing the dangers and being on our guard. On the contrary, we must always be on our guard, but perhaps this will prove to us once more that we have as much to fear from the scared sheep in our midst who cry wolf as from the wolves outside....

In the world of politics timing is of the essence....We must remember that despite what is known as normalization Israel's clock is not yet synchronized with Egypt's, let alone with the world's and the U.N.'s.... Small wonder, then, that they are all up in arms, since the Jerusalem Law and everything it implies thwarts the hopes of all those who sought to deprive us of Jerusalem. It upsets the very timetables of Presidents Carter and Sadat, and they are both intelligent enough to sense how much potential disaster it spells for their respective plans—Carter's to reach the U.S. elections without having his so-called achievement of the peace agreement marred in any way, and Sadat's of gaining the last third of the Sinai within the framework of the peace agreement....Thus, they are both interested in deferring the subject of Jerusalem to the end of the negotiations, in the hope that then Israel will be too exhausted to fight and will also compromise as regards east Jerusalem.

By proposing this bill Israel is in effect forcing them to show their hands as regards Jerusalem now, bringing both them and us face to face with the truth, even though there are those among us who prefer to avoid it. If neither Egypt nor Israel is prepared to consider relinquishing east Jerusalem, perhaps there really is nothing to discuss. It would be better for us to face that now than tomorrow, when we will be even weaker and more exhausted.

There is no one among us who accepts the false Arab claims to a religious or historic right to Jerusalem, but unfortunately there are a few among us who pretend to think that the Jerusalem Law has aroused the entire world against us, as if it was simply waiting for an excuse or provocation....I can only regret their attitude, as I regret that of those who seek to disguise their fear by claiming that this is not the right time

to propose this law....It is difficult to convince cowards. Pointing to the lessons of our long history, which proves almost mathematically that when we dared we succeeded and when we acted in a cowardly fashion we failed, will be of no avail. The argument concerning the wrong timing was doubtless presented to Moses and Herzl, and was certainly presented to Ben-Gurion in 1948....

But we must strengthen those among us who are weak and condemn those who use the excuse of timing to conceal the fact that they are ready to compromise on Israel's sovereignty in east Jerusalem, including the Temple Mount. I am referring not to MK Yossi Sarid, who makes his intentions quite clear, but to the members of Mapam....Ben-Gurion was aware of this tendency of Mapam's back in 1949, as he noted in his diary, when he decided to move the government to Jerusalem in response to the U.N. resolution regarding the internationalization of Jerusalem....Naturally, Ben-Gurion overruled Mapam just as, I am glad to note, the Alignment has decided to vote for the Jerusalem Law today....

We must be wary of the repeated statements made by Sadat, Carter and others regarding their readiness to recognize the eternal unity of Jerusalem, etc....They are intended merely to deceive us because they are resolute in their determination never to recognize Israeli sovereignty over east Jerusalem, and in the case of the U.S. over west Jerusalem either. Thus, all their statements about "the unity of Jerusalem" are just empty phrases and a cynical attempt to get us to lower our guard.

The object of the Jerusalem Law is primarily to establish Jerusalem's status as a capital—the capital of the sovereign State of Israel. By its nature, a law which determines status is more declarative than operative. Nonetheless—and I was glad to hear this today from the mayor of Jerusalem, too—it does not impede the building activities which must go on in Jerusalem, and which should perhaps be anchored in a special law, possibly to be called the Capital Law. There should be a law to determine what should be done in Jerusalem in practical, administrative and municipal terms, what should be done to protect the holy places and freedom of worship, as well as what should be done in ethnic, educational and architectural terms and perhaps what should be done with regard to taxation, too....But in order to establish buildings of stone in Jerusalem there is no need to cast stones at laws or political statements which express national positions and desires, particularly in a country born under the sign of what could be called a fairly declarative statement—"If you will it, it is no dream." And so, I would like to tell my friend the mayor of Jerusalem that poetry and pence still go together, and Jerusalem still needs both....

And so, we need both a Basic Law and bases for buildings in Jerusalem. One does not contradict the other, though they need not go hand in hand....I hope that the Jerusalem Law will be transferred to the Constitution, Law and Justice Committee and that, as a Basic Law, it will de-

termine Jerusalem's status as the capital of Israel, ensure that the city limits, as those were decided after the Six Day War, will not be altered and resolve that it is the site of the President, the Knesset, the government, the Supreme Court, and perhaps the Chief Rabbinate and the Zionist Organization too. There could be no better conclusion to this Knesset Session as regards both truth and timing...

I concluded my statement on the preliminary reading of the law by saying that in Jewish-Israeli terms, speaking of the "unity of Jerusalem" was like speaking of the unity of celestial Jerusalem, with all the spiritual and moral power it symbolizes, with earthly Jerusalem, with all the material and political power it symbolizes. Today, in conclusion, I would like to examine the concept of "celestial Jerusalem" from another point of view, one which says that only in Jerusalem is there the historic or historiosophic height from which one can see things in proportion and perspective. From that height of Jerusalem it is indeed possible to see that only in Jerusalem will Israel's fate be decided; from that height of Jerusalem it is possible to see that it has overcome and will overcome all those who attack it; but from that height of Jerusalem we also see the high price we have paid and will pay, heaven forbid, for mistakes, deviations and fears. Anyone who does not see that from Jerusalem has not yet reached it.

The secret that Jerusalem is the test is also known by our enemies, who are rising up against us at this very moment at the U.N. But they will have to accept the decision on Jerusalem's fate today not from the U.N. but from us, here, in this House. Indeed, their ears are pricked up to hear what will be said in Jerusalem this day. To all the nations of the United Nations, who are united in their desire to detach east Jerusalem from west Jerusalem, Jerusalem from Israel, the state from the nation and the nation from the world—and who will not gain their objective—the Knesset will give one reply today: the Knesset is united around united Jerusalem, its one and only capital ever since the establishment of the sovereign State of Israel. Jerusalem is not and never will be open to negotiation of any kind.

Our Sages have said that a generation which has omitted to build the Temple is as if it had destroyed it. Our generation has already missed more than one opportunity as regards Jerusalem, and has paid for that. Let us not miss the political moment which has become available to us today.

...

H. Grossman (Alignment): Madam Speaker, distinguished Knesset, a Basic Law regarding Jerusalem should be passed, but when the majority thinks that it is necessary and when it is formulated in a more comprehensive way than the proposal before us.

Can it really be said that the government does not interfere in the legislative process of the Knesset? Do I have to list all the private mem-

bers' bills which the government ensured would be removed from the agenda...? Government representatives conduct daily battles in all the Knesset committees to obstruct proposals which the government opposes, however wide the consensus which favors it...

Ahead of us lies a difficult international battle over Jerusalem. We cannot relinquish Jerusalem, neither its unity nor its being the capital of Israel. Precisely for that reason we must be careful in what we do. The government's claim of non-interference regarding the Jerusalem Law is specious and does not convince anyone....It proves that the government was not happy about the fact that this law was brought before the Knesset now, being aware of the political damage Israel and Jerusalem will suffer in consequence....It also proves that the government is no longer the leading force in politics on the basis of its practical considerations, but is being pushed and pulled by a marginal group to the margins of policy. Certain ministers, such as Deputy Prime Minister Ehrlich and the minister who is conducting the autonomy negotiations, Mr. Burg, plucked up the courage to say in public that the law was superfluous and even harmful.

What Jerusalem needs today is not the proposed law. What it needs is to become the center of Israel's national and cultural life. That means the transfer there of ministries and political centers. Reasonably-priced housing for young couples is also needed, with schools and social services. What the politicians need is courage. In order to assure the unity of Jerusalem a greater effort also has to be invested in bringing down the wall of hatred between the eastern and western parts of the city. Hatred should be eliminated and condemned, not fanned and tolerated.

Jerusalem's status as a united city and the eternal capital of Israel can be praised to the skies, and I endorse those sentiments, but I know that that is not enough. All that will not make Jerusalem stronger and more united. Statements and formulations, which sometimes do more harm than good, are not what we need. We must do something so that the Arab inhabitants of Jerusalem, the united capital of Israel, will feel themselves part of it. Perhaps we should permit them to raise their flag over the places which are sacred to Islam, or give them municipal rights. We must try and find a way of coping with the problem without betraying our principles. But when these suggestions are made the cry of treason goes up...

The proposed law states that Jerusalem is the united capital of Israel and the seat of the President, the Knesset, the government and the Supreme Court. Is that not precisely the situation today...? In what way does that law benefit us...? All it will do is cause us harm by inviting reaction and damage the delicate fabric which has already been woven. And all this is done in order to glorify MK Geula Cohen, not Jerusalem. I know that MK Cohen submitted this proposal in full awareness of its

harmful consequences. In her opinion, those political consequences are unimportant because for her torpedoing the negotiations with Egypt and isolating Israel are worthy achievements. From her point of view she is doing the right thing, and I have nothing against her. But should MK Cohen be running the country...?

Our ambassador in Washington, who can hardly be accused of having left-wing sympathies, and the ambassador to the U.N., who is certainly no leftist, complain that their job is being made even more difficult. Our ambassador in Cairo says that the law is tantamount to saying that Tel Aviv is by the sea. Is there any doubt that Jerusalem is the capital of Israel, united, the city of peace and the eternal city...? The government has been maneuvered into a corner and is giving feeble, evasive and cowardly excuses....Why is the House so afraid? We have to come out with it and say that the law is superfluous at this stage.

Things upon which Israel's security depends must be done even if they undermine our international position. I would not suggest taking world public opinion into consideration if Jerusalem's unity or position as Israel's capital were dependent on this law. But if the law is both superfluous and harmful to the peace agreement with Egypt, as well as providing the U.S. Administration with an excuse for not using its veto in the Security Council, why adopt it today? It is political suicide. My motto is neither Massada nor "Let me die with the Philistines," it is Jerusalem the capital of Israel and the city of peace....

I have heard people make the strange statement that it would have been better if the law had not been brought before the House, but since it has been it is impossible to vote against it. Why? Will it be the first law whose content is correct but whose existence is unnecessary? Certainly not. Zionism achieved many things first *de facto* and only afterwards *de jure*. In 1967 it was decided that Jerusalem should be united. The time for a Basic Law on Jerusalem will come. When it does it must be more comprehensive, more significant, have greater content and not be merely technical. The law will have to determine Israel's undisputed rights to united Jerusalem as its capital, but it will also have to guarantee the rights of the Arab inhabitants to their holy places.

If the proposed law is so important that the Prime Minister has said that he will get up from his sick bed to come to the Knesset and vote for it, why did the government not initiate it? If it is so important why hide behind MK Cohen's skirts? But it is not. In a successful parliamentary move, MK Cohen has made use of the government's weakness, the timorousness of the opposition and the fear of many of us that our loyalty to Jerusalem will be doubted....And so no one dares to vote against the law or even abstain on the vote. Thus, we live according to the anti-patriotic rule of disregarding what is good for Israel or Jerusalem, ignoring the U.S. and those who still seek Israel's benefit, and being concerned only with appearing as patriots on the home front. After abstain-

ing from voting for the law at its preliminary reading I went home and looked in the mirror and saw that in some way I had shrunk, for somewhere inside I feel defeated. In the final event, from whom do I need to obtain proof of my love for my nation? From those who are all talk and are far removed from actual Zionist fulfillment...?

Perhaps the time has come for Israel's welfare, and that alone, to be our concern, and for each one of us to act in accordance with his Zionist conscience. There is a sense of oppressiveness in the nation, a feeling that everyone is doing the wrong thing and there is no way of preventing it. There is no majority in the present Knesset which thinks that the law is necessary now. I have checked that. Very many MKs are being forced to vote for it. Anyone who votes for it on the grounds that he has no alternative is losing his public credibility and is not proving his loyalty to Jerusalem. Anyone who has doubts should express them openly. This is the moment of truth.

...

The Vote

Those in favor	65
Those against	12

(The Basic Law: Jerusalem the Capital of Israel was transferred to the Constitution, Law and Justice Committee.)

Proposal for Unilateral Autonomy in the Territories

Introduction

Moshe Dayan, who had left the Alignment before joining Mr. Begin's cabinet as foreign minister in 1977, resigned from that cabinet late in 1979, when Dr. Burg of the National Religious Party was appointed chief negotiator in the autonomy talks with Egypt. No official explanation for Dayan's resignation was given at the time, but an indication of his motivation can be found, about one year later, when Dayan, now a one-man faction ("a lone MK"), proposed a scheme for what had become known as a "unilateral declaration of autonomy."

Sitting 399 of the Ninth Knesset

24 December 1980 (17 Tevet 5741)

M. Dayan: Mr. Speaker, distinguished Knesset, I propose that the Knesset decide to establish self-government for the Arabs of the administered territories, to be based on the following principles:

a. The transfer of authority from the Military Government to the independent administration of the Arab residents of the administered territories shall not deviate from what was defined in the peace framework outlined at Camp David and signed by the Prime Minister of Israel;

b. The transfer of authority will be implemented by Israel via the Military Government independently of and not as a substitute for the negotiations being conducted by Israel, Egypt and the U.S. regarding the autonomy agreement;

c. The "source of authority" will remain in Israel's hands, and it will be empowered to revert to the status existing now in places and instances where it finds it necessary to do so;

d. No oral or written public statement will be demanded of the Arabs of the administered territories regarding their agreement to this plan;

e. The foregoing refers to self-government for people, not for territories;

f. The current authority of the security forces responsible for internal security (GSS) will remain in effect. The IDF will be the only army in the territories and will determine its bases as it sees fit in order to maintain Israel's security. Its units will be placed along all the borders—along the Egyptian border in accordance with the peace agree-

ment with it—and the border crossing for people and goods will be subject to its instructions;

g. The Arab leaders with whom Israel will communicate regarding the transfer of authority from the Military Government to the self-governing authority will be the mayors of the major Arab towns. They will be able to involve other Arab residents of the territories in their consultations. They will also be able to appoint a limited delegation to represent them at talks with Israel. If no such delegation is appointed the Military Government will be able to negotiate with those mayors who want self-government;

h. The transfer of authority will include the following civilian spheres: agriculture, health, transportation, finance, police, etc. The negotiations on this subject should be conducted in a constructive spirit. Israel will be ready to extend the necessary aid to prepare Arabs from the administered territories to fulfill the various functions, and will also be prepared to loan Israelis for that purpose, if asked to do so. Naturally, the transfer of responsibility cannot be done simultaneously in every sphere. By mutual agreement an appropriate timetable can be worked out for the various topics. When the Arabs govern themselves the Military Government will evacuate the buildings it has been occupying in the towns and hand them over to the self-governing authority;

i. The question of the sources of funds for maintaining the self-governing authority will be discussed by the parties concerned. The possibility of financial aid from Arab countries or other outside factors, whether European or American, will also be discussed, with the proviso that those funds are not used for anti-Israel activities;

j. Issues such as the allocation of water and governmental land, jurisdiction and the ties between the Arabs of the territories and Jordan will be clarified by the parties. The existing procedure will remain in force as long as nothing else has been decided;

k. While Israel proposes that the mayors in the territories accept self-government, if they decline no pressure will be put on them to agree, and the existing situation will continue.

I would like to make the following supplementary remarks:

1. The foregoing is a general outline and during a detailed discussion as well as in the course of implementation changes and additions will doubtless have to be made.

2. The framework agreement which was decided at Camp David is based on two main principles: the cancellation of the Military Government regime and the status of Israel in the administered territories. In order to ensure that the other parties to the Camp David Agreement—the U.S. and Egypt—do not change their minds on subjects which are crucial to us, namely, the IDF's presence in the territories, the non-establishment of a Palestinian state and the perception of the government of Jordan as the only party with which we are prepared to sign a peace

treaty, we must fulfill our obligations to the best of our abilities, the most important being transferring the authority of the Military Government to the self-governing authority of the Arabs in the territories. I am afraid that if we do not do this as quickly as possible there will be other proposals which will be worse for us. Moreover, it is my view that giving the Arabs of the territories the chance to govern themselves would be desirable for us even if that had not been determined in the Camp David Agreement.

3. I do not think that the representatives of the Arabs of the territories or of the Jordanian government will join the current autonomy negotiations. On the other hand, as regards our interests in the administered territories, the most important thing is that the Presidents of the U.S. and Egypt signed the framework agreement. Accordingly, we must make every effort to ensure that this agreement does not lose its authority, even if it is not signed by Jordan and the Arabs of the territories.

4. At present the main issue in our foreign policy is our relations with the Palestinian Arabs. Consequently, we must take the initiative, and I am talking about concrete action, not words. With all due respect for written agreements, the situation created on the ground is more important. As regards our joint life with the Arabs of the territories, it is in our power to change the situation even without an agreement signed by them.

The Prime Minister, M. Begin: Mr. Speaker, distinguished Knesset Members, all the signatories to the Camp David Agreement must uphold it. That is also why negotiations were held on the basis of the joint letter sent to the U.S. President by the President of Egypt and myself. It is true that the negotiations have not yet given rise to the agreement required for granting autonomy to the Arab inhabitants of Judea, Samaria and the Gaza District. But there is no reason to despair of the negotiations. There is a renewed promise that they will continue after the transition from one administration to another in the U.S. We must participate in them, and meanwhile we should not engage in unilateral experiments which embody grave dangers.

On the basis of the Camp David Agreements, the application of autonomy to the inhabitants of Judea, Samaria and the Gaza District is explicitly contingent on the election of an independent administrative authority, a "governing council," as the Agreement defines it. If no governing council has been elected the existing situation continues. There is no other interpretation of what was written and signed in the Camp David Agreements. Naturally, with all due respect, if we were to do what my friend, MK Dayan, is proposing we would ourselves be creating a precedent of deviating from what we had agreed to, from what we had signed. That is undoubtedly a very negative precedent, because in an agreement you cannot separate one section from another, leave one part in effect and change others. The agreement is a whole and must be

maintained in total. One cannot remove certain passages from their context.

Naturally, there is a security problem here. I noticed that in his proposal MK Dayan took into account the possibility that it would be necessary to return to the former situation in parts of Judea, Samaria and the Gaza District, i.e., he himself realizes that that unilateral act, outside the framework of the Camp David Agreements, on which basis we are currently conducting negotiations, could create a security problem requiring the restoration of the current situation....

As I have already explained, there is a fundamental political problem. We wanted to guarantee the principle—and I believe we did so in the Camp David Agreements—that no Arafatist state would be established in Judea, Samaria and Gaza, nor would any corridor to its establishment be created. We must not budge one inch from that position. Everyone realizes the danger to the nation and the State of Israel which that possibility involves. Consequently, we must not despair of continued negotiations. It is true that there are difficulties. This is not the only instance in which negotiations are accompanied by tense relations between the parties involved. The situation must be acknowledged, there are varying interpretations. But all that is going on during the course of negotiations.

Consequently, we must not take any unilateral action. In security and political terms it involves great danger. I therefore ask the Knesset to remove MK Dayan's proposal from the agenda.

...

The Vote

Those in favor	39
Those against	53
Abstentions	3

(The proposal to transfer the proposal to committee is not adopted.)

Proposed Basic Law: Declaration of Independence

Introduction

Israel's Declaration of Independence, adopted unanimously on 14 May 1948 by the members of the People's Council, after establishing the historical, ethical and legal rights of the Jewish people for a state of its own, proclaiming the establishment of the State of Israel and determining its name, evoked a number of basic principles which would serve as guidelines for the conduct of the state and its legally constituted authorities. At the same time it determined that a constitution would be elaborated in the future by a democratically elected constituent body.

Some Basic Laws were indeed adopted in the course of the following decades; others, notably a bill of rights and a Basic Law regarding legislation were still missing in 1980. In the absence of a legislatively privileged constitution, and for as long as such a document did not exist, a proposal was made to the effect that the Declaration of Independence be accorded that status, and that the Supreme Court be authorized to decide whether specific legislative acts conformed to the principles they enunciated.

Sitting 402 of the Ninth Knesset

31 December 1980 (24 Tevet 5741)

M. Wirshuvsky (Shinui-Center): Madam Speaker, distinguished Knesset, the object of the Basic Law: the Declaration of Independence, which I have the honor of proposing, is to solve a problem which has existed in our society for many years....I am afraid that the Ninth Knesset will not give the State of Israel a constitution or complete the work of passing Basic Laws, as the First Knesset decided should be done. In effect, to this very day the State of Israel has no constitution or juridical arrangements for protecting the individual's basic rights from the authorities, whoever they might be, or from routine, and possibly hasty, legislation by the Knesset, or sometimes from legislation deriving from the exigencies of the moment or the political situation.

In the early days of the state's existence the Supreme Court decided, quite rightly, that the Declaration of Independence, that formal expression by all sections of the nation of the foundations on which the State of Israel was based, that important and precious document, was not part of the law of the State of Israel. The Supreme Court was right in doing so,

because that act was declarative, not legislative. The upshot of that decision was that the basic principles of the Declaration of Independence were not part of Israel's legal system. In effect, when the courts, and the Supreme Court in particular, wish to interpret the laws of the Knesset they often find themselves bound by what the Knesset has decided and are not able—as is the case with the constitutions of many other countries—to examine whether the law passed at one time or another in the life of the state is compatible with the basic principles which guided those who proclaimed the State of Israel's independence. This hampers the scope of the Supreme Court as many of us would like to see it.

If we had a constitution there would probably be no need for this proposal....But because, regrettably, this House is not doing anything to bring a constitution nearer, we can, in effect, introduce legislation here by a majority of three to one or even two to one—because there is no quorum law—which impairs civil rights or is generally acknowledged to be bad but is the outcome of coalitionary pressures. I am not talking about this government but about the previous one....This topic has been raised in the past by other Members of this House in the awareness that laws were passed here which contradicted the basic principles of the State of Israel, and there is no doubt that we do have basic principles.

The relevant passage in the Declaration of Independence, the part I would like to make an operative part of our legal system, reads: "The State of Israel will be open to Jewish immigration and the ingathering of exiles. It will devote itself to developing the Land for the good of all its inhabitants. It will rest upon foundations of liberty, justice and peace as envisioned by the Prophets of Israel. It will maintain complete equality of social and political rights for all its citizens, without distinction of creed, race or sex. It will guarantee freedom of religion and conscience, of language, education and culture."

We want to live by those exalted principles. Can there be any question that those are the principles by which we live? On the other hand, can there be any question that they are not part of our constitution and that this House can, by any majority, change and restrict those freedoms?

I have often participated in discussions—primarily with youngsters but also with older people—of Israel's constitutional problems, and the subject always come up—generally in connection with the law regarding the recruitment of women—of the extent to which we should accept as a norm a law promulgated by the Knesset and which we regard as unfair and contradictory to the basic principles of the state and know to be the result of coalitionary dictates? Does one have the right to act contrary to the law in such cases...? My unequivocal answer has always been that laws must not be broken....That road leads to anarchy. On the other hand, do we have to accept a situation in which all the laws passed here, even those we know are bad and contradictory to the basic principles I

read out to you, come into effect without being examined by those whose task it is to test our laws against our basic principles...?

Must we accept a situation in which a majority of one can limit civil rights? I note with pride that over the years this has been done in very few areas, but in theory it could be used to restrict freedom of speech, movement and other liberties. This House is absolutely sovereign and is not subject to any control. But if, for whatever reason, we cannot give ourselves a constitution, even by stages, after 32 years of statehood, should we not at least restrict ourselves so that the Supreme Court, for which the entire House has the greatest respect and regards as being above the political disputes of this House and motivated solely by considerations of justice, can decide if certain of the laws passed by this House do not contradict the basic principles of the Declaration of Independence?

Why do I use the Declaration of Independence? I could equally talk of "general principles" or "natural justice," or a similar phrase. But I deliberately use the Declaration of Independence because when it was composed the entire nation, from the communists to the extreme Orthodox elements, subscribed to it, regarding it as the basic and founding covenant of the State of Israel. It was signed only after each and every word in it had been discussed. As long as we do not have a constitution, can it not serve as the basis for examination by the Supreme Court?

I think that if we decide here, at least, to transfer this proposal to the Constitution, Law and Justice Committee, or to a special committee, as the Knesset decides, for a preliminary examination, so that we can assess whether we can continue existing without a basis of that kind, we will be taking a great step. But if we vote against this proposal today, I think that we will be deviating from the sacred principle of our being the continuation of those who promulgated the Declaration of Independence.

I am not seeking to impair civil liberties in any way or to injure the feelings of any group. What I am proposing is that the Supreme Court, sitting in a special form, should be able, under certain circumstances, in response to an appeal by someone who regards himself as having been injured by legislation, to discuss the claim that the principles determined by that specific law of the Knesset contradict the principles of the Declaration of Independence, i.e., the basic principles of our life as a nation and a state. I do not think that by this we will solve all the constitutional problems, or even attain the establishment of a constitution. But by this we will create a certain situation in which the attitude to our legislative activity, on the part of both the public and us here in this House, will be a more respectful one. We will know that we have not passed laws here solely by virtue of a majority and a minority but by virtue of the knowledge and belief that we are functioning within those frame-

works, and if we are not, there is a body which we all revere which can tell us that we have erred and must review our actions.

I think that we must take that direction. As the State of Israel grows—I do not wish to say grows older—our laws multiply and the library shelves begin to be crowded with tomes concerning the law and its interpretation. There is an increasing need for the Legislature to examine itself or create the tool by which the political systems and the regime may be examined in the light of our basic principles....

I must admit that there are many laws for which I have voted, there are many I have voted against, and there are some on which I ascend this podium to speak. I understand the ways of politicians, who sometimes succeed, sometimes fail, cannot always act as they would wish and are bound by limitations which are sometimes justified and sometimes not....

In my opinion, this proposal determines principles with which no one here can disagree. No one who believes in the democracy of the State of Israel and the need for the legal supervision of matters concerning individual liberties and human rights can vote against it. All I want to do is to implement what all the parties and the entire public, by living and working in Israel, seek to accomplish—the implementation of the Declaration of Independence. I think that if we evade this issue, if we say that we will leave the Declaration, that we will wait until the time is right, not only will we not advance in the sphere in which we were once a light unto the nations, we will retreat from it. Today, in the absence of a legal arrangement of this kind, we are not the best-ordered of countries, at least on the theoretical level. Perhaps in the practical sphere Israeli democracy works better than its laws allow, but why should we leave that to one constellation of circumstances or another? Why leave it to chance? Why should we not also crystallize the experience of the 32 years of Israel's existence within our legal system?

The committee may have suggestions or criticisms regarding one paragraph or another, and I am certainly open to any suggestions....But the basis, namely, that no legislation should contradict the principles set out in the Declaration of Independence unless passed by a two-thirds majority, should remain. We can preserve those principles if we say that and if we leave it to the Supreme Court to decide on this issue. If that is done, if we put this on our books, we will have justified our existence as a Legislature, and I think that will be a jewel in the less than perfect crown of the Ninth Knesset.

The Minister of Justice, M. Nissim: Madam Speaker, distinguished Knesset, every Basic Law must be formulated with the utmost care, with attention given to every passage, sentence, word, letter and comma, even. It is not surprising that a debate of this kind concerning the constitution is difficult, sometimes even stormy. That is the case everywhere in the world and particularly in Israel, because ever since the

establishment of the state this subject has encountered problems and given rise to endless debates, disputes and doubts. There is no need to describe the deliberations of the past here today, and who knows for how long we will still continue to discuss the issue of the constitution. It is no chance that Israel's system of Basic Laws has not yet been completed and those Basic Laws which have been passed are by no means firmly established.

But to propose that the Declaration of the State of Israel be raised to the status of a constitution, when that was not the intention of its authors and signatories, is, to say the least, extremely odd. In fact, the Declaration itself determined the need to establish a constitution for the State of Israel, leaving this task to the Knesset. Thus, in no way can the Declaration of Independence, which proclaimed the establishment of the State of Israel, be accorded the status of a constitution or a Basic Law. Its authors regarded it as merely a wonderful declaration of intent, a manifesto proclaiming the establishment of the state and a guide as to how that state should conduct its life and which principles it would respect. All this was couched in the terms of a recommendation, an aspiration, objectives to strive for, not in the language of law.

The Supreme Court has also said on more than one occasion that the Declaration of the establishment of the State of Israel does not have the status of a constitution. That Declaration is relevant, when we speak of its constitutional aspects, only and solely as interpretation. If we do what MK Wirshuvsky is asking of us we will be doing something thoughtless, even dangerous, which could undermine the stability of the law, because one cannot know what effect this action, this legislation, will have on the existing law of Israel....The debate as to whether we should or should not have a constitution has to be based on a text, with paragraphs and clauses, which has been prepared for that purpose and no other.

I would like to say that in one respect MK Wirshuvsky is right, and that is that we have not yet completed our task and should do so. But we should also remember that we have nonetheless made some progress. In effect, four subjects remain on which Basic Laws should be passed: the courts, the State Comptroller, human and civil rights, and legislation, which are all in various stages of preparation or legislation....For my part, I will do all I can to further the passage of these laws....Be that as it may, MK Wirshuvsky's proposal should not be adopted. It is not worthy of taking the place of a constitution, it complicates matters, is dangerous and I propose that it be removed from the agenda.

M. Wirshuvsky (Shinui-Center): Madam Speaker, distinguished Knesset, I see that the government has mobilized all its forces in order to remove this proposal from the agenda. Regarding one aspect I am pleased, and that is that it has had to mobilize the Prime Minister for this. To him I say that you are doing something today which says that

the principles of the Declaration of Independence are something to fear. What could be more natural, in the absence of a constitution, and I made it clear that this would be a transitional stage on the road to a constitution, than that the basic principles of the Declaration of Independence, which have been and will continue to be our guiding light, should no longer be purely theoretical and formal and should be accorded a status which will enable the laws we pass in this House to be tested against them...?

The Minister of Justice mentioned the laws which are in preparation. I can tell him that the human rights law will be buried in the Constitution, Law and Justice Committee, and in its present state that is just as well. The other laws he mentioned concern public affairs rather than individual liberties....I see that my words have fallen on deaf ears, with all due respect....All the arguments put forward by the Minister of Justice make it even more urgent for this House to lay the foundations for a unified body of law, which will make it possible for individuals to test the laws of this House against the basic principles of the state. By omitting to do this we will be evading a basic problem and will be guilty of prevarication.

I appeal to all the Members of the House to ignore political and coalitionary considerations on this subject, not because I do not respect those considerations but because I maintain that if we are voting for the principles of the Declaration of Independence, which are our guiding light, we are doing something which is common to all the parties in the House. Those principles are included in the platforms of all the parties. But voting against it will create a negative attitude to legislation and to the principles which we want to see gathered together, which we want to pass on to our children and which we want to serve as our guiding light. If we do not approve this law we will be giving an imprimatur to the fact that laws may be changed from one day to the next and completely distort our original intentions. I therefore appeal to all the Members of the House, regardless of political affiliation, to regard this proposal as something constitutional which is common to the entire Knesset as the body representing the general public. I ask them at least to examine the subject in depth in the Constitution, Law and Justice Committee. Approving the proposal here will not make it law, it will merely oblige us to come to grips with the problem which we talk about but do nothing to amend.

(The motion to transfer the proposal to committee is not adopted.)

Political and Military Situation

Introduction

As the Ninth Knesset approached the end of its term, Prime Minister Begin once more delivered a statement on the political and military situation, introducing a lengthy debate. The following is one passage from the prime minister's statement, referring to the situation in Lebanon and foreshadowing events which would occupy a great deal of the attention of the following Knesset, the Tenth.

Sitting 442 of the Ninth Knesset

11 May 1981 (7 Iyar 5741)

The Prime Minister, M. Begin: Mr. Speaker, Members of the Knesset, three weeks ago the Christians of northern Lebanon reached the breaking point. Not the fighters, who have received Israel-made arms of various kinds, the best and most efficient in the world. That sacred task was begun by the government headed by MK Rabin. My government continued and even increased that essential aid, and the Christian fighters in both northern and southern Lebanon are fine, fearless fellows whose spirit has not been broken.

The civilian population was at the breaking point. The Syrians treated the population of Lebanon as the Nazis did that of Europe. While repeating what I said on former occasions, I would like to note that a vicious person has leaked information from a certain official meeting at which I allegedly said that the Syrians had treated the Christians of Lebanon as the Nazis treated the Jews. I would never say such a thing...

To this entire generation I say once more that just as God created man and man created Satan, the cruel acts of bestiality perpetrated against the Jews of Europe by the Germans under National Socialism have never been paralleled. But in this case the civilian population has been maltreated. Zahleh has been treated as Coventry was, Beirut as Rotterdam. With my own eyes I saw the Stukas—

T. Toubi (Democratic Front for Peace and Equality): It doesn't matter what you said, what matters is what you set alight. You gave them the order to open fire in Lebanon. You failed and they failed and that is why you are threatening war now. It doesn't matter what you said, what matters is what you did. You set a conflagration.

The Speaker, I. Berman: MK Toubi, there are party group statements and you will have a chance to say what you have to say. I ask you not to disturb other speakers.

The Prime Minister, M. Begin: MK Toubi, by virtue of the fact that we have both been Knesset Members since the First Knesset I ask you to grant me the freedom to speak. I thank you for that kindness....

T. Toubi (Democratic Front for Peace and Equality): Don't make war. By virtue of your being a member of the government listen to the appeal not to make war.

The Prime Minister, M. Begin: In a little while I will listen to you, for you have the freedom to speak too. But I think that I have the same right as you....And so, as I was saying, the civilian population of northern Lebanon was at the breaking point. The Syrians were shelling Zahleh and Beirut with cannon with a range of thirty miles, the heaviest Soviet cannon. Houses collapsed, burying their inhabitants, men, women and children. There was no mercy for them. There were no hospitals, water or food. Most of the Christians fled from Beirut to the mountains, but from Zahleh it was impossible to flee because the Syrians surrounded it with tanks and cannon....In Zahleh alone 500 people were killed and 1,000 wounded.

There was a day, so I heard at first hand, when they could hold out no longer. I was told that fifty men, women and children were huddled together in one room which they thought was protected. How long can fifty human beings breathe the same air? That is the reason why the Lebanese Christians were at the breaking point three weeks ago.

Then we decided not to remain on the sidelines. Our Air Force downed two helicopters. If there had been ten they would all have been downed. Then those helicopter flights over Mount Snin which had killed Christians and brought soldiers and weapons stopped, and since then there has been a substantial change. On the basis of the information which has reached us, it can be said that Israel's action on that day saved the Lebanese Christians from complete moral collapse, which would have enabled the Syrians to gain control of all northern Lebanon and then move south.

W. Haj Yahya (Sheli): And also brought the missiles there.

The Prime Minister, M. Begin: Kindly do not interrupt me, you are a very new MK.

C. Biton (Democratic Front for Peace and Equality): What, are you the schoolteacher here?

W. Haj Yahya (Sheli): I have the right to speak out.

The Speaker, I. Berman: MK Haj Yahya, you are listed to speak, I do not know why you have to interrupt.

W. Haj Yahya (Sheli): I'm not interrupting, I have the right—

The Prime Minister, M. Begin: You are a new MK, be so kind as to behave. In this context of our having saved the Christians on the day of their crisis, the greatest they have experienced in the last five years, I would like to clarify to the Knesset our moral obligation to them, as I perceive it. I would like to state that to the best of my understanding it is our moral duty to ensure that the Christians of Lebanon, in the north and the south, are not destroyed by any enemy. I know that there are those who disagree with this view. I hold fast to it.

I think that that is why we are both Jews and Zionists. When Herzl established the journal of the World Zionist Organization he called it "The World," not even "Zion," to emphasize the universal nature of our movement, the liberation movement of Israel. And when Herzl wrote his book, he noted that when the day came, if we had our own Jewish state, it would work to free the blacks. He wrote those things in the nineteenth century. One could ask what we have to do with freeing blacks....

M. Wilner (Democratic Front for Peace and Equality): Free the Palestinians. There's bondage.

The Prime Minister, M. Begin: You will not budge me one inch with your vicious interruptions....Judaism is both national and universal by nature....That is why the vision of the end of days speaks of all the nations streaming to the mountain of the Lord. That is why the philosopher and historian, Professor Klausner, spoke of Judaism and humanism. We cannot remain on the sidelines, nothing human is alien to us.

S. Aloni (Citizens' Rights Movement): At what price—our children?

The Prime Minister, M. Begin: And that is why we will continue to protect the Christian minority from destruction.

W. Haj Yahya (Sheli): See to your own country, see to Ikrit and Biram....

The Prime Minister, M. Begin: But while we do not accept the doctrine of *sacro egoismo*, we are well able to see to our own national security interests, as we do.

I will inform the Knesset as to the number of missiles brought into Lebanon and situated on the Lebanese-Syrian border. In Lebanon itself there are today five SA-6 missile batteries, with another four near the border and two on the Lebanese-Syrian border. Until the day before yesterday there was only one SA-6 missile battery on that border. This morning there are already two SA-3 batteries on the Lebanese-Syrian border. Until two days ago there was only one such battery there. There

is also an SA-9, which was brought to Lebanon by the Libyans and is also operated by them. That makes a total of fourteen batteries of ground-to-air missiles.

On Thursday, April 30, on the basis of the authority vested in me by the government, I ordered the Chief of the General Staff to destroy the three SA-6 batteries which were then in Lebanon. The action was due to start at 11 a.m. At 10:30 I was told that weather conditions did not permit this, and the action was postponed to 1 p.m. At 12:30 I was told that the weather did not permit this, and the action was postponed to 3 p.m. I was then informed once again that the weather did not permit this, and the action was postponed to the following day.

Z. Katz (Alignment): Is the Prime Minister going to continue with this lack of national responsibility?

The Prime Minister, M. Begin: I will continue with this course. Neither you nor anyone else will teach me national responsibility. Be quiet....

S. Aloni (Citizens' Rights Movement): You are starting a war. I do not want war there.

The Prime Minister, M. Begin: Kindly let me speak.

T. Ziad (Democratic Front for Peace and Equality): You want war. You have already decided on war, on bloodshed.

The Prime Minister, M. Begin: The Communists want peace. That's true in Afghanistan. They want peace....On May 1 I received a letter from Secretary of State Haig in which he asked for time in which to make use of the diplomatic route....I summoned a meeting of the Ministerial Defense Committee for Friday morning. After a thorough discussion, we decided to accede to the American request. I informed the U.S. Ambassador of this. We calculated how long it would take, because the decision was—due to the danger of the accumulation of more ground-to-air missile batteries—that we would not wait longer than three or four days, until Monday evening.

Z. Katz (Alignment): What did you decide?

The Prime Minister, M. Begin: We said that if the Americans brought us an undertaking from the Syrian government that it would remove the missiles we would be prepared to wait another week for it to fulfill its undertaking. Meanwhile additional missiles were prepared. On Tuesday morning the U.S. Ambassador requested an urgent meeting with me. He brought me a personal letter from President Reagan. Naturally, I cannot reveal its contents....I can tell the Knesset that for years no Israeli government has received such a friendly letter from a U.S. President.

M. Shamir (Tehiya): You said the same about Carter....

The Prime Minister, M. Begin: Why can't you listen patiently...? I can, however, inform the Knesset and the nation of part of my reply to President Reagan. I will read it in the English original:

And what, indeed, is the danger? In addition to all else, when our pilots embark to do what they will have to do for the sake of the most vital interests of our security, which is an integral part of the security of the free world, some of them may be downed, killed or taken prisoner. If any of them fall into captivity they will suffer the most cruel torture which, sometimes, the most valiant soldier of the battlefield is incapable of withstanding. I speak, Mr. President, in the name of experience.

These are dangers and risks we take upon ourselves by accepting a further delay of action, which we do in consideration of your personal request. As you see, Mr. President, we do not on this occasion suggest any date. But it is my solemn duty, responsible as I am for the lives of our citizens and soldiers, to emphasize that it cannot but be a relatively short period of time. I must add that the responsibility which I take upon myself is grave indeed and the risks involved are awesome. Yet, as I have already said, we have decided to inform you that your representatives have, from our point of view, additional time to try the diplomatic route.

Z. Katz (Alignment): One should speak Hebrew in the Knesset.

The Prime Minister, M. Begin: Additional time was granted to try the diplomatic route. In another two hours I will meet with President Reagan's representative, Mr. Philip Habib, who is, as his name indicates, a wise and dedicated man, and will receive a report from him of his visits to Beirut and Damascus and his meetings with Moslems and Christians and with Syrian leaders....

I would now like to make a personal appeal to the Syrian President. Let us speak as one enemy to another. That formula is not of my choosing. Almost four years ago, when I presented the new government to the Knesset, I appealed to President Sadat of Egypt, King Hussein of Jordan and President Assad of Syria and invited them to come to Jerusalem or to meet with me in their capitals or a neutral place, either in public or away from the glare of the lights, in order to discuss peace. One of them came to Jerusalem....

Naturally, there are fundamental differences on each of Israel's borders. But we want peace with all our neighbors. And that was my appeal. But since the President of Syria declined to reply, maintains a state of belligerency with Israel and claims that he will lead other Arabs—particularly those who have left the Land of Israel because they sought to rise up against us and destroy us and failed in that—into battle to destroy Israel, I have no choice but to speak to him as to an enemy.

My first appeal is: release the Jews in your country. Why should you hold them hostage? They number only 3,000 or 4,000, the surviving remnant of a once great community which made a great contribution to Jewish culture. They wish to be allowed to go free and you hold them in a ghetto and in fear. Why should you torment them in this way? Almost all the Arab countries, even Iraq, whose leader is a blood-thirsty tyrant who killed his best friends with his own hands in order to gain control of that country, let its Jews go. Yet you still detain 4,000 Jews, men, women and children, in a ghetto and do not let them go.

Some countries have learned the moral lesson of the 1930s and 1940s, such as distant Australia and Canada, which are prepared to take them in. Why should you continue to hold them in fear, in a ghetto, as hostages? Let them go....

My second appeal is: Mr. Assad, President of Syria, you have engaged in what is known as "brinkmanship." Change your course. It will bring you no dishonor. We do not want your dishonor. It will bring you honor, for you will be serving the interests of peace. Therefore, draw back from the edge of the abyss, withdraw the missiles which should not be where you have placed them, remove your soldiers from Mount Snin and return to the *status quo ante*. Then all mankind will breathe more easily and will have good reason to be grateful to you.

That is my honest, open appeal to you, without concealing anything, as one speaks to an enemy: restore the *status quo ante* in Lebanon and everything will fall back into place.

W. Haj Yahya (Sheli): Will you stop the flights over Lebanon?

The Prime Minister, M. Begin: Submit a parliamentary question and I will reply. The subject is serious enough to warrant a special question....But if, heaven forbid, this appeal falls on deaf ears, I must once again explain our national security interests.

Whoever controls Mount Snin and the skies of Lebanon will control all Lebanon up to the Lebanon-Israel border. There is no doubt of that. Then Israel will be in danger and war will be inevitable, but on the worst possible terms for Israel. Consequently, we must enable anyone of good will who wishes to solve this crisis by diplomatic means to do so. But on no account can we countenance those missiles and the conquest of the mountain, because whoever controls it controls all Lebanon. Any child who can read a map will admit that. Hence our concern, anxiety and decisions of the past and, if necessary, of the future too.

I would like to commend the leader of the opposition, MK Peres, who, after talking to me and the chairman of the Foreign Affairs and Defense Committee, MK Arens, about the ground-to-air missiles, stated that the diplomatic course should be utilized to the full, but if it were to prove fruitless we should not flinch from using military means in

order to get the missiles withdrawn. On that point there is national consensus.

W. Haj Yahya (Sheli): What kind of opposition is that?

The Prime Minister, M. Begin: We don't need you. That's what he said. Misha, didn't Shimon say that in your presence?

W. Haj Yahya (Sheli): I'm here by right, not on sufferance.

The Prime Minister, M. Begin: I didn't say that you were here on sufferance....This national agreement—

M. Wilner (Democratic Front for Peace and Equality): There is no such agreement. This is the agreement of warmongers.

The Prime Minister, M. Begin: We don't need you. We don't want your agreement. We didn't ask for it.

M. Wilner (Democratic Front for Peace and Equality): There's no such agreement—

The Prime Minister, M. Begin: Mr. Speaker, I request your protection. Mr. Wilner, why are you shouting? Go to the great hall in Moscow, you'll get thunderous applause there, everyone will stand in your honor, even Khrushchev, no, sorry—

M. Wilner (Democratic Front for Peace and Equality): You are a demagogue. You were in occupied territory and said as "the son of Hasiya" that Israel would never leave the Golan Heights. You are a warmonger. You are bringing disaster on Israel....

The Prime Minister, M. Begin: I will not raise my voice to out-shout MK Wilner. This is the Knesset, after all, and one should show respect for it. Here one should speak with mutual respect. Why all this shouting? Do you have any voters at all? Thank MK Toubi for your seat. The national agreement on this point is very important and it exists. We do not need certain party groups for the consensus....

S. Aloni (Citizens' Rights Movement): But our children serve in the army too. You've got a nerve. You're sending our children to die.

The Prime Minister, M. Begin: Ah, good day to you. Why is that lady shouting?

S. Aloni (Citizens' Rights Movement): Why aren't we needed? Don't you need our children for the war?

The Prime Minister, M. Begin: Did I say that to you? It's the Communists I don't want. You are warmly invited to join the consensus.

T. Toubi (Democratic Front for Peace and Equality): Aren't Communists needed for the war?

The Prime Minister, M. Begin: I know what Communists are needed for. You have not been to the parts of Russia I have visited. The Communists need Afghanistan, Mozambique, Angola—

T. Toubi (Democratic Front for Peace and Equality): You are distorting what the Communists want. The Communists want peace between nations while you want war and hostility and bloodshed....

The Prime Minister, M. Begin: At present there are several points of agreement between Israel and the U.S., namely:

A. Both countries and peoples are allies. When the Secretary of State was here, at a joint meeting with him and his advisors, we told him that we were not happy about the phrase "strategic asset." If it means that we are the opposite of a strategic burden, that is one thing. But what is an asset? It is a commercial term. That is why we told him that in our view we were friends and allies. That evening the Foreign Minister gave a dinner in honor of the Secretary of State where the latter said that the U.S. and Israel were allies and had "a permanent alliance."...We were very glad to hear that phrase. Both our countries agree that we have a permanent alliance.

B. The second point of agreement is our position regarding the role played by Syria in Lebanon. Both the U.S. and Israel do not regard Syria as constituting an expeditionary force for bringing peace or as a stabilizing force.

C. Both countries hold identical views regarding the terrorist organizations.

D. There must be active opposition to murderous terrorism wherever it may be.

E. We oppose the expansion of Soviet imperialism anywhere in the world, especially in the Middle East.

Those are the five points of agreement between us and the U.S., and I can say that I do not remember a time when there was such wide and deep agreement between our two peoples and countries.

There is a problem, however. The present U.S. administration, while more friendly than many of its predecessors, has decided to sell Saudi Arabia offensive attachments for the F-15 as well as AWACS airplanes, which are extremely sophisticated planes unlike any anywhere else in the world. Perhaps the Russians have something similar, I do not know. We oppose the American-Saudi deal unequivocally. There is great danger concerning the offensive attachments, particularly the additional fuel tanks for the F-15s, which are currently held in the eastern part of Saudi Arabia. But who can prevent them from landing at Tabouk, the military base just across the Bay of Solomon, just opposite Eilat, one night? Or stop them flying from Tabouk to Israel one day?

M. Shamir (Tehiya): If you had left the airfields in the Sinai that could have been prevented. But you abandoned the Sinai—

The Prime Minister, M. Begin: Alright, alright. We know that we are in disagreement....And so, it can land right opposite Eilat, though its flying range is relatively limited. If those planes receive additional fuel tanks they will be able to get to Tel Aviv and return to Saudi Arabia without landing or refuelling. That is a direct danger to the civilian population at the center of the Land of Israel. If the Saudis were to receive the AWACS, everything we did, in the air and at sea, would be known.

There have been important Americans who have said to us: what do you care? You have such a wonderful Air Force. If those planes are brought from the eastern part of Saudi Arabia to the border with Israel, such as to Tabouk, you'll simply down them. At the same time they told us that for a long time after the Saudis receive the AWACS planes they will be flown by Americans alongside the Saudis. What strange advice did we receive from Washington? That we should down planes, thereby killing both their Saudi and American crews, the latter being our friends. That is very strange advice which we cannot accept.

We were also told that we should not worry because the Saudis would get the AWACS only in another five years. So what will happen after five years? Does a nation live on borrowed time? Five years also pass, so what good does that do us...? That is why we say that we will continue to oppose the American-Saudi deal unequivocally. That does not mean that Israel must come into conflict with the U.S. There is no conflict. We are friends and allies, but sometimes even allies disagree on certain points....

I therefore have the honor of announcing that we will continue to work against this Saudi-American deal, which endangers the security of the Jewish nation in Israel. The Administration has not yet given the required statement to the Senate and the House of Representatives. If it is given there are fifty days in which to register disagreement. There is serious opposition to this transaction in both Houses. I can say without hesitation that we will appeal to all our friends in the U.S. and also ask the Congress to consider this and withhold its consent to the deal. I also have the honor of asking our great friend President Reagan to reconsider the matter and refrain from going to the House of Representatives and the Senate, thereby averting grave danger to a country whose security and welfare the U.S. genuinely wishes to uphold.

I would also like to note that Sheikh Zaki Yamani visited the U.S. and made a foolish joke about a camel and a mouse, but we will not argue with him about that, we will not go down to his level. After that, however, he returned to his country and said that the real danger to the Middle East was Israel, not the U.S.S.R. If that is so, against whom will all that sophisticated weaponry being supplied to Saudi Arabia be directed? Doubtless against the real danger, that is, Israel, not the U.S.S.R....The

situation is absolutely clear, and our American friends will rally, I am sure, to enable us to live in security and peace.

On the other hand, there is an unprecedented arms race in the Middle East, by both the West and the East, everyone competing to supply arms. Only yesterday we learned that the Chancellor of Austria, Mr. Kreisky, sold four hundred tanks to Saudi Arabia. He had originally intended to sell one hundred tanks, but the manufacturer told him to try and sell more, so he did....I have heard it on good evidence that the ruling princes of Saudi Arabia are unbelievably rich. It is a basically corrupt society which the German Chancellor has described as Germany's greatest ally after the U.S. and the Nato countries. So why not sell four hundred tanks if you can...? What can one expect of Austria which, on the day of the Anschluss, forced almost all the Jewish women of Vienna to take mops and wash the streets or the sidewalks. Austria, which many people claim was even worse than Germany during the Holocaust, if that is possible, Austria, the country of Eichmann, the country which is led by that proud Jew, Mr. Bruno Kreisky, is selling arms to Saudi Arabia.

S. Aloni (Citizens' Rights Movement): He is a head of state. Why do you talk about him in that way...?

The Prime Minister, M. Begin: I would also like to say a few words about the peace agreement between Israel and Egypt and the statement made by Dr. Ghali, the Egyptian Minister for Foreign Affairs. He said that the defense agreements between Egypt and the Arab countries take precedence over the peace treaty with Israel, and also that if war were to break out between Israel and an Arab country there is a possibility—he did retract this later, it's true—that Egypt would join forces with the Arab country. That is in direct contradiction of the terms of the peace treaty between Israel and Egypt....I hope that Mr. Ghali will realize his mistake, and that what he said was said without the knowledge and agreement of President Sadat....

I hereby say to the Americans from this podium, and the Americans will tell the Egyptians, that since it is impossible to establish a U.N. force because of the Soviet veto, an international force should be set up on the basis of the identical letter sent by President Carter to President Sadat and myself....It must be a serious force, not observers, in the south and the north, so that Israel's security and freedom of navigation in the Straits of Tiran may be preserved....That letter of President Carter's was an integral part of the peace treaty between Israel and Egypt....If that force is not set up we will remain on the Ras Muhammad-El Arish line....

There is tension, there is a crisis in the Middle East today. I would like to express the hope that despite everything everyone will act sensibly and that war, which no one wants, will not break out....We do not

want war with any Arab country. We want peace with all our neighbors. We will do everything we can so that peace may be established and war prevented....

Glossary of Political Parties and Personalities

Abba Houshi — See Houshi, Abba.

Abdullah Ibn el Hussain (1882–1951) — Emir of Transjordan (1921–1946); King of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan (1946–1951). Born in Mecca, displaced from the Hejaz by Ibn Saud, he accepted the throne at Amman from the British Mandatory Government on a temporary basis. Subsequently attempted to broaden his influence which brought him into direct confrontation with Haj Amin el Hussein, the Mufti of Jerusalem. Maintained sporadic contacts with leaders of the Jewish Agency with a view to arriving at plan which would leave the Arab parts of Palestine under Hashemite rule. In May 1948 served as pro forma commander of the regular Arab forces invading Palestine. In December 1948 convened the Jericho Meeting of Arab Notables which called for the incorporation of the West Bank in his kingdom. In 1949–1950, following the signature of the Israel-Jordan Armistice Agreement, conducted negotiations with Israel culminating in the initialling of a non-aggression pact. Because of internal and external opposition the pact was never signed. Assassinated by Palestinians upon leaving the Al Aksa mosque in Jerusalem.

Abu Ageila — Important road junction and dam, in the north of the Sinai peninsula, some 45 km. southeast of El Arish. Captured by the IDF in 1949, 1956, and 1967. Returned to Egypt and demilitarized under the Israel-Egypt Peace Treaty of 1979.

Acre — Mediterranean coastal city, at northern end of the bay which bears its name. One of the most ancient populated sites in Israel. Captured by the IDF in May 1948. Mixed Jewish-Arab population.

Abdul Hamid (1842–1918) — 34th Sultan of the Ottoman Empire and Halif of Islam from 1876 to 1909, when he was evicted from the throne by the young Turks who suspected him of conspiring against them.

Achdut Ha'Avoda-Poale Zion (Unity of Labor) — Left wing party which merged with Mapai and Rafi in 1968 to form the Israel Labor party. Following the Six Day War many of its members, including the party's spiritual leader Yitzhak Tabenkin, supported the idea of Greater Israel; however, another leader, Yigal Allon, advocated the return of some of the administered territories which would not endanger Israel's security.

Afula — Town in the Valley of Esdraelon, located near a road junction between the Coastal Plain and Galilee and the Jordan Valley. Founded in 1925 and planned as the commercial center of the region,

it came into its own only after the establishment of the State of Israel.

Aguda, Agudath Israel (or Yisrael) (Association of Israel) — Orthodox religious political party, founded at the Kattowitz convention of 1912, more traditional than the National Religious Party. Although not a Zionist party and not a member of the World Zionist Organization, it has been willing to cooperate with Zionists in areas of immigration, settlement and defense before the establishment of the state and has participated in all Knesset elections since 1948. It has participated in government coalitions but, except for the period of 1949–1952, has not accepted cabinet posts so as not to share responsibility for decisions concerning religious matters contrary to its beliefs.

Ahad Ha'am (Asher Ginsburg) (1856–1927) — Zionist leader and thinker. Born in the Ukraine, immigrated to Palestine in 1922, but visited several times before. A staunch critic of both the political and practical Zionists, he insisted on giving first priority to the establishment in Palestine of a spiritual center for the Jewish people.

Aharonowitz, Z. — See Aranne.

Akiva (Rabbi) — One of the foremost Jewish sages in the period following the destruction of the Second Temple. Mentor and supporter of Bar Kochba (q.v.).

Al Aksa Mosque — Silver-domed mosque at the southern end of the Temple Mount. Named Al Aksa — the last, most remote — because of its distance from Mecca and Medina, Islam's holy cities. Mentioned in the Qur'an and considered sacred by Muslims. Earliest remains date back to the eighth century AD.

Al Hamishmar — Daily newspaper of Mapam (United Workers' party) (q.v.).

Alexandroni — One of the six original territorial infantry brigades, taken over at its inception by the IDF from the Hagana (q.v.). Its area of recruitment and responsibility was centered on the coastal plain, north of Tel Aviv; its name derives from the Alexander Brook, which flows into the Mediterranean south of Hadera. Names of brigades served also as the cover names of their commanders.

Aliya Hadasha (New Immigration) — Political party established in 1942 by immigrants from Germany and Austria, against the background of their difficult absorption — economic and cultural. In 1948 it joined with Haoved Hazioni, a non-socialist component of the Histadrut, and some General Zionists in the establishment of the Progressive party (q.v.).

Allenby, Field Marshal Edmund Henry (1861–1936) — Commander-in-chief of the British and Allied forces who captured Palestine from the Ottoman Turks towards the end of World War I, in 1917–1918; subsequently British High Commissioner in Egypt until his retirement in 1925.

Allon, Yigal (1918–1980) — Military commander, leader of the Labor movement. Born in Kfar Tavor, Lower Galilee; from an early age member of the Hagana; one of the first soldiers of the Palmach, he served as its commander from 1945 until its disbandment in 1948. Commanded some of the outstanding operations during Israel's War of Independence (1947–49). One of the founding members of Achdut Ha'Avoda (q.v.), 1946. In 1950 entered active political life; first elected to the Knesset in 1955. Served as a cabinet minister from 1961 until 1977, in the Labor (1961–67), Immigrant Absorption (1967–69), Education (1969–74) and Foreign Affairs (1974–77) portfolios. Instrumental in the formation of the first Alignment between Mapai and Achdut Ha'Avoda in 1965, he nevertheless failed to achieve a central leadership position. In 1980 he planned to contend for the leadership of the Labor party, but died before the party conference took place. Author of the Allon Plan for Judea, Samaria and the Gaza Strip which, calling for a differentiation between security and political boundaries, would leave strategically important areas in Israel hands, while returning to Jordan the areas most heavily populated by Arabs.

Almaliah, Avraham (1885–1967) — Teacher, journalist, leader of the Sephardic community. Born in Jerusalem, banished to Damascus during World War I. Represented the Sephardic community in the National Committee of Palestine Jewry under the British Mandate, at Zionist Congresses, in the Jerusalem Municipal Council. Member of the First Knesset on the Sephardic List.

Altalena — Arms ship brought by the Irgun (q.v.) to Israel in the course of the first truce, June 1948. It was sunk by IDF artillery off the coast of Tel Aviv following a controversy in which Ben-Gurion, suspecting a coup, insisted on the immediate delivery of the arms to the government, a demand rejected by the Irgun High Command.

Altman, Dr. Arie (1902–1982) — Revisionist leader. Born in the Ukraine, immigrated to Palestine 1925, studied in the United States where he became one of the leaders of the Revisionist Zionist movement and a close collaborator of its founder, Ze'ev Jabotinsky (q.v.). From 1937 headed the Revisionist movement in Palestine. Following the failure of its list in the elections for the First Knesset and its merger with the Irgun-based Herut (q.v.) in 1950, Altman was elected to the Knesset in 1955 and served three terms.

Amalek — Biblical tribe, descendants of Esau, brother of Jacob. Enemies of the Jews in all generations.

Amman — Capital of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan.

Aqaba (Gulf of) (or Gulf of Eilat) — Continuation of the Red Sea to the northeast, adjoining the eastern shore of the Sinai Peninsula, and the western shore of the Arabian Peninsula. Israel (Eilat) and Jordan (Aqaba) possess outlets at its northern end.

Arab League — Organization of Arab states. Founded in 1945 by seven Arab states, independent or nearly independent at the time, it has come to include all independent Arab states, with the PLO raised from observer status to full membership in 1974. Recognized as a regional organization by the UN. Its decisions are not binding on its members. In 1979, following the signature of its Peace Treaty with Israel, Egypt was suspended from the League, and its headquarters were moved from Cairo to Tunis.

Arab Legion — Armed forces of Transjordan, and subsequently of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan. Commanded by a British officer, Glubb Pasha (q.v.), until 1956.

Arava — Long and narrow valley, part of the Great Rift, extending from the southern tip of the Dead Sea to the Gulf of Aqaba. The armistice line between Jordan and Israel follows its lowest points.

Aranne, Zalman (1899–1970) — Labor leader. Born in Russia, immigrated 1926. Secretary of the Tel Aviv Labor Council; member of the Central Committee of the Histadrut. In 1948 Secretary General of Mapai (q.v.); member of the Knesset 1949–1969; Minister of Education (1955–60; 1963–69). A stout follower of Ben-Gurion for many years, they parted ways over the Lavon Affair (q.v.).

Argov (Grabovski), Meir (1905–1963) — Labor leader. Born in Russia, immigrated 1925. Secretary of Petah Tikva Labor Council. Member of the National Committee of Palestine Jewry under the Mandate. Joined the British Army in 1940, served in the Jewish Brigade. Among the signatories of Israel's Declaration of Independence. Member of the Knesset 1949–1961, Chairman of Foreign Affairs and Defense Committee.

Ariav, Chaim (1895–1957) — General Zionist leader, journalist. Born Lida, Russia. Immigrated 1912. Turkish officer on the Armenian front, World War I. Director General of the Farmers' Association 1931–1951. Member of the Knesset 1951–57.

Arlosoroff, Dr. Chaim (1899–1933) — Labor leader and ideologue. Born in the Ukraine, immigrated from Germany 1924. In 1930 appointed

Head of the Political Department of the Jewish Agency for Palestine, in which capacity he negotiated with the Nazi German authorities for the *Ha'avara* — transfer of Jewish property to Palestine — in the form of German goods. His assassination, still unsolved, on the Tel Aviv beach, has given rise to an acrimonious debate between left and right whose echo resounded loudly well into the 1980s.

Ashdod — Port in the south of Israel. Named after an ancient Philistine city.

Asian Socialist Conference — Bombay 1956, coincided with the Sinai campaign. Since there were no Arab Socialist parties at the time, Israel, represented by former Prime Minister and Foreign Minister Moshe Sharett, was the only participant from the Middle East.

Attlee, Clement (1883–1967) — British Labour leader, Prime Minister from 1945 until 1951.

A-Tur — Arab quarter in the east of Jerusalem atop the Mount of Olives.

Auja-el-Hafir (Nitzana) — Ancient road junction, close to some wells, on the border between Sinai and the Negev.

Auster, Daniel (1893–1963) — General Zionist. Born in Galicia, immigrated 1914. Member of the Jerusalem Municipal Council in Mandatory times. Mayor of Jerusalem 1949–1950.

Avriel (Ueberall), Ehud (1917–1980) — Mapai, Rafi, Labor party. Born in Austria. Immigrated 1939. Active in *Ha'apala* (illegal immigration) and acquisition of arms. Israel's first diplomatic envoy to Prague, 1948. Subsequently Director General of the Prime Minister's Office; of the Ministry of Finance. After a short term in the Knesset, first envoy to Ghana and later to Zaire.

Azaniah (Eisenstadt), Baruch (1905–) — Mapai; Kibbutz Meuhad. Born in Pinsk, Russia. Immigrated from Germany 1933. Member of Kibbutz Givat Chaim; active in the kibbutz movement. Member of the Knesset 1951–69; Chairman of Knesset (Rules and Regulations; House) Committee.

Ba'al Shem Tov (Israel of Moldavia) (ca.1700–1760) — Jewish mystic; founder of the Hassidic movement.

Babi Yar — Near Kiev, Ukraine. Site near which tens of thousands of Jewish inhabitants of Kiev were massacred by German *Einsatzgruppen* soon after the German Army captured the city in September 1941.

Bader, Dr. Yohanan (Jan) (1901–) — Born in Krakov. Leader of the Revisionist party in Poland and editor of its Polish language organ. Studied law, economics, philosophy and history. Immigrated

after release from Soviet camp, 1943; jailed by British authorities for membership in Irgun. Member of the Knesset (Herut) from 1949 to 1977. Chief Opposition spokesman on economic matters; Chairman of the Committee on State Control. Member of the Interparliamentary Union.

Baghdad Pact — Informal name of the defensive alliance signed by Turkey and Iraq in 1955, subsequently joined by Great Britain, Iran and Pakistan. The U.S. participated in its committees and covered a major part of the budget, but never joined officially. Its purpose, as part of the containment strategy designed by Secretary Dulles, was the defense of the northern tier, as a link between NATO and SEATO. Iraq abandoned the organization in 1959, after which it lost its strategic significance.

Bahir, Arye (1906–1970) — Leader of kibbutz movement. Born in Odessa, Russia. Immigrated 1924; joined Kibbutz Afikim in the Jordan Valley. Member of the Knesset for Mapai until the split in 1965, when he joined Ben-Gurion in the formation of Rafi; active mainly in committees dealing with economic affairs.

Bandung Conference (1955) — First meeting of heads of state of non-aligned countries, at which the Non-Aligned movement was founded. Israel's invitation was aborted by a threat of an Arab boycott of the Conference.

Barash, Asher (1889–1952) — Born Galicia, immigrated 1914. Teacher, editor, writer. Chairman of the Hebrew Writers' Association.

Barazani, Moshe (1926–1947) — Member of Lehi (Fighters for the Freedom of Israel). Captured by British troops in the course of an operation against an army commander; denied the jurisdiction of the Mandatory court; condemned to death. Together with Meir Feinstein (Irgun) committed suicide en route to the place of execution.

Bar Kochba (Son of the Star) (Simon Bar Kozeba) — Leader of the revolt against Rome, 132 AD. After spectacular initial successes, the revolt was brutally suppressed by Emperor Hadrian. Betar, west of Jerusalem, was the last Jewish stronghold to be reduced (135 AD). Bar Kochba, his mentor Rabbi Akiva, and thousands of their followers were executed; many others sold as slaves. The revolt signified the virtual end of Jewish presence in Judea; Jerusalem was rebuilt as a city dedicated to Zeus.

Bar-Rav-Hai, D. (1894–1977) — Mapai. Lawyer. Born in Russia, immigrated after release from Soviet prison 1924. Member of the National Committee of Palestine Jewry. Delegate to various Zionist Congresses. Honorary Citizen of Haifa. Member of the Knesset

1949–65; mainly active in juridical and constitutional matters, including election proceedings.

Bar-Yehuda (Idelson), Israel (1895–1965) — Mapam. Born Yekatri-noslav, Russia. Immigrated 1926. Member of Kibbutz Yagur. Active in Petah Tikva Labor Council; subsequently in Kibbutz movement. Member of the Knesset 1949–65. Minister of Internal Affairs (1955–59); Transport (1962–65).

Bashan (Hauran) — Mountainous, basalt-covered region, east of the Jordan, north of the Yarmuk River. Includes the Golan Heights and Gebel e-Druze.

Basle Program — Program of the incipient World Zionist Organization, formulated and adopted at the First Zionist Congress held in Basle (1897). It states that "Zionism strives to create for the Jewish people a home in Palestine secured by Public Law." It remained unchanged until after the establishment of Israel, 51 years later.

Beduin — Nomadic Arab.

Beersheba (Well of the Oath) — Town in the south of Israel; capital of the Negev. Named after biblical locality, related to Abraham and Isaac. Under Ottoman and British rule, small Beduin market town.

Beer Tuviah — Moshav (cooperative village) in the coastal plain. Founded in 1887. Abandoned following an Arab attack in 1929, it was restored in 1930.

Begin, Menahem (1913–) — Herut. Born Brest-Litovsk. Studied law at Warsaw University. In 1939 appointed by Jabotinsky as Commander of the Betar movement in Poland. In 1940 condemned by Soviets to eight years hard labor; released following the Soviet-Polish agreement of 1941. Arrived in Palestine with Polish forces; after his release at the end of 1943 appointed Commander of the Irgun (q.v.). In 1944 declared revolt against the British Mandatory government; official Zionist policy at the time called for restraint until after the end of the war except on matters of illegal immigration. British authorities put a price on his head, but he was never apprehended. Revolt continued until shortly before the end of the British Mandate, at times in direct contradiction with Hagana, which led to confrontation; for a while in cooperation with Hagana and Lehi. In 1948 present on board Altalena (q.v.). Established Herut party, based on Irgun. Member of Knesset, as leader of Herut, subsequently Gahal, and ultimately Likud, from 1949 until his resignation in 1983. Minister without portfolio 1967–1970. Prime Minister, and for one year Minister of Defense, 1977–1983. Signed Peace Treaty with Egypt 1979.

Beit Jiz and Beit Sussin — Abandoned Arab villages near Latrun, on Burma Road (q.v.).

Ben-Aharon (Nissenbaum), Yitzhak (1906–) — Mapam. Born Bucovina, Rumania. Immigrated 1928. Member of Kibbutz Givat Chaim. Secretary of Tel Aviv Labor Council. Joint Secretary of Mapai. Joined British Army at beginning of war; captured on Crete and held by Germans as prisoner of war. Detained by British authorities June 1946. Member of Knesset 1949–77. Minister of Transport 1958–62. Secretary General of the Histadrut 1969–1973. The reunification of the two workers parties (1962) was to a large extent the result of his initiative. Leader of the Labor party “dovish” wing. Retired from active political life in 1977; continues propagating his ideas orally and in writing.

Ben-Eliezer, Arye (1913–1970) — Herut. Born Vilna. Immigrated 1920. Joined Betar (Brit Trumpeldor) 1926. Active in defense of Jerusalem and Tel Aviv during the riots of 1929 and 1936. Emissary of the Irgun in Eastern and Southern Europe 1937–39. During World War II in the U.S., active in the establishment of the Committee for a Jewish Army; the Emergency Committee to Save the Jewish People in Europe. Returned to Palestine 1943; joined Irgun High Command. Instrumental in appointment of Menahem Begin as Commander. Detained by British in 1944; escaped from Eritrea (1947); granted asylum by French, together with Yitzhak Shamir. Returned to Israel, June 1948. One of the founders of Herut. Member of Knesset 1949–70. Deputy Speaker.

Ben-Gurion, David (1886–1973) — Born Plonsk (then Russia), immigrated 1906. In 1912 went to Istanbul to study law. Back in Palestine, was expelled by Ottoman authorities in 1915 as enemy (Russian) alien; moved to the U.S. where he promoted idea of Jewish Army. When U.S. entered the war, joined the American Battalion of the Jewish Legion, with which he returned to Palestine. One of the founders of the historical “Le'achdut Ha'avoda” party (1919) and the Histadrut (1920). Secretary General of the Histadrut (1920–35). Chairman of the Jewish Agency for Palestine (1935–48), representing Mapai which had become the predominant party in 1933. In 1937 supported partition of Palestine as the only way towards a peaceful solution of the Palestine problem. In World War II coined the slogan: “We shall fight against Hitler as if there were no White Paper [of 1939, calling for an end to the National Home policy], and we shall fight against the White Paper as if Hitler did not exist.” Was responsible for the drafting and adoption of the Biltmore program (q.v.). Once he became convinced that the new British Labour government (1945) would continue the White Paper policy, he was active

in organization of the struggle in the areas of immigration (*Ha'apala*); settlement, and military preparations. Was the first to foresee a military confrontation with the regular armies of neighboring countries and to conceive of practical ways to prepare for the clash. Drafted and promoted Israel's Declaration of Independence. As Prime Minister and Minister of Defense (1948–53), responsible for the conduct of the War of Independence and the negotiations of the Armistice Agreements (1949); the mass immigration and absorption of the first years of the state. In 1953 retired to Kibbutz Sde Boker in the Negev. Recalled from retirement first as Minister of Defense and then also as Prime Minister, he was responsible for the Sinai Operation (1956), and its aftermath. Promoted the alliance with France. Against bitter opposition negotiated the Reparations Agreement with German Chancellor Konrad Adenauer. Resigned in 1963 in favor of Levi Eshkol. In 1964, in the wake of the Lavon Affair, split from his party to form Rafi, which gained ten seats in the elections of 1965. When his Rafi colleagues decided to merge with the Labor party, he stayed outside as the lone member of the State List. In 1969 that list won four seats. In 1970, retired from political life at the age of 84. Generally considered as the single most influential leader in the establishment of Israel and its early history.

Ben Shalom, Rafi — Member of Kibbutz Haogen. Emissary for illegal immigration; Ambassador to Rumania.

Ben-Tov, Mordechai (1900–1985) — Born Grodzisk, near Warsaw. Active in Hashomer Hatzair movement. Immigrated 1920. Founding Member of Kibbutz Mishmar Haemek. Member of Zionist Action Committee, Kibbutz Artzi and Histadrut Executive. Member of Knesset 1949–60, Mapam. Minister of Labor and Reconstruction (1948–49); Development (1955–61). Founder of *Al Hamishmar* (q.v.).

Ben-Yehuda, Eliezer (1858–1922) — The “Father of Modern Hebrew”; principal agent in the renaissance of the Hebrew language as the living vehicle of communication among Palestinian Jews, and subsequently in Israel.

Ben-Zvi, Yitzhak (1884–1963) — Mapai. Born Poltava, Russia. Immigrated 1907. Among the founders of the Bar Giora and Hashomer clandestine Jewish self-defense organizations. Studied law in Istanbul; expelled in 1915, went to the U.S. with Ben-Gurion. Returned as soldier in Jewish Legion. Active in community affairs; President of the National Committee (Va'ad Leumi) of Palestine Jewry from 1931. Member of First and Second Knesset. In 1952 elected second President of Israel, after the death of Chaim Weizmann; re-elected 1957 and 1962. Conducted extensive research on Oriental

Jewish communities. Endeavored to bring about reconciliation with Samaritans.

Berligne, Eliahu (1866–1955) — Born Mohilev, Russia. Immigrated 1907. Industrialist. Delegate to the Representative Assembly; member of Provisional Council of State for General Zionists. Signatory of Declaration of Independence.

Berlin, Rabbi Meir (1880–1949) — Born Volozin, Russia. Immigrated from the U.S. 1926. Leader of Mizrachi (Religious Zionist party); member of Jewish Agency Executive; of Va'ad Leumi. Active in defense and political affairs. After 1944 partly incapacitated because of illness.

Bernadotte, Count Folke (1895–1948) — Swedish diplomat. In May 1948 appointed by the Secretary General of the United Nations as Chief of the Truce Supervision Organization, and as Mediator for Palestine. In June 1948 presented first plan, envisaging *inter alia* the merger of the Arab parts of Palestine with Transjordan, under the rule of King Abdullah, and the inclusion of Jerusalem as well as the Negev in that Arab state, with Western Galilee to be added to the Jewish state. Soon after signing second plan, with certain modifications, killed in Jerusalem by a group identified with Lehi (q.v.).

Bernstein, Peretz (Fritz) (1890–1971) — Born Meiningen, Germany. Immigrated from Holland 1936. Leader of General Zionist, subsequently reconstituted as Liberal party. Member of Jewish Agency Executive, in charge of Department of Commerce and Trade. Editor of *Haboker*. Member of Provisional Council of State; of Knesset 1949–65. Minister of Commerce and Industry 1948–49; 1953–55.

Betar — Acronym for Brit Josef Trumpeldor. Zionist youth movement, founded 1923, affiliated with Revisionist party. Its mentor was Ze'ev Jabotinsky; its program called for immediate Jewish statehood; military preparedness; "Hadar," a code of honor and personal behavior. Its anti-socialist stance led to clashes with Histadrut affiliated youth movements. A major recruiting ground for the Irgun, it was outlawed by the British authorities in Palestine.

Beth Guvrin (Jovrin) — Kibbutz in the Judean foothills, 14 km. from Kiryat Gat. Named after an ancient Jewish and more recent Arab settlement on the same site.

Beth Hanoun — Arab town in the north of the Gaza Strip.

Bethlehem — Arab town in the Judean mountains, 7 km. south of Jerusalem. Site of the biblical town by the same name, birthplace of King David. Sacred for Christianity as site of Nativity of Jesus.

Bevin, Ernest (1881–1951) — British Labour leader. Foreign Secretary 1945–51; played a central role in formulation and implementation of British policy on Palestine. Attaching major importance to British relations with Arab Middle East, many of his decisions and pronouncements have been perceived as anti-Zionist, at times even as anti-Semitic.

Bialik, Chaim Nachman (1873–1934) — Born Brody, Ukraine. Immigrated from Germany 1924. Poet, author, editor and publisher. Principal poet of the Jewish renaissance.

Biltmore Program — Resolution adopted by an extraordinary Zionist Conference, which took place at the Biltmore Hotel in New York in May 1942, after the real dimensions of the Holocaust became known. It urged that "Palestine be established as a Jewish Commonwealth integrated in the structure of the new democratic world (after World War II)." This was the first time that the Zionist Organization officially demanded a Jewish state, by implication accepting the partition of Palestine.

Bilu'im — Movement of Palestine pioneers who spearheaded the First Aliya (1882). Acronym of "Beth Ya'akov L'khu V'nelkha" (House of Jacob, come ye and let us go — Isaiah, ch. 2). Founded in Kharkov as a reaction to the pogroms of that year.

Bir-Hama; Bir Hasneh — Egyptian strongholds in Eastern Sinai.

Birobidzhan — Jewish autonomous region in Eastern Siberia. Established 1928 with the idea of providing a territorial solution to the Jewish problem in Russia, in direct competition with Zionism. In spite of considerable propaganda and pressure, its Jewish population at its peak (1934) numbered 20,000, many of whom left. It never became a cultural center and is generally considered as a failure, even by Soviet authorities.

Blood Libel — Accusation levelled against Jews, claiming that they used Christian blood for their Passover ritual and killed Christian children for that purpose. First enunciated at Norwich, England, in 1144, it was repeated over and over again in spite of repeated condemnation and disauthorization by the highest secular and ecclesiastical authorities.

Boger, Dr. Haim (1876–1963) — Born in Crimea, immigrated 1906. Co-founder and for many years Headmaster of the Herzlia Gymnasium, Tel Aviv, first Hebrew language secondary school. Member of the Second Knesset for the General Zionists.

Borochov, Ber (1881–1917) — Founder and theoretician of the Poalei Zion movement, synthesizing Socialism and Zionism.

Brandeis, Louis Dembitz (1856–1941) — Jurist, Zionist leader. Born in Louisville, Ky. First Jewish Justice of the Supreme Court of the U.S. Attracted to Zionism fairly late in life, he became the uncontested leader of American Zionism. In 1917, prior to the Balfour Declaration, negotiated with American, British and French governments. Was offered, but declined, the presidency of the World Zionist Organization (1920). A split with European Zionists headed by Weizmann brought about his withdrawal from active leadership. He continued his Zionist activities, particularly with the practical work of economic development. His insistence on national funds being devoted to the development of infrastructure, with private initiative and capital responsible for micro-economic construction, gained greater acceptance in later years.

Brest-Litovsk (Brisk) — Town near the Polish-Russian border. Center of Jewish learning. Site of the German-Russian Peace Treaty at the end of World War I.

Bukharin, Nikolai Ivanovich (1888–1938) — Russian Communist leader, chief theoretician after Lenin's death. Purged and executed 1938.

Bunche, Dr. Ralph Johnson (1904–1971) — American diplomat, senior United Nations official. In 1947 served as Secretary of the UN Special Committee on Palestine. In 1948 Special UN Representative; after assassination of Count Bernadotte (q.v.), appointed Acting Mediator for Palestine. Active in the negotiation of Armistice Agreements between Israel and its neighbors (1949), for which he was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize (1950).

Burg, Dr. Shlomo Yoseph (1909–) — Born in Dresden, Germany; immigrated 1939. Leader of Hapoel Hamizrachi; Mizrachi; National Religious Party (Mafdal). Member of Knesset 1949–88. Deputy Speaker in First Knesset. From Second Knesset (1951) until 1988 held cabinet posts, with brief intervals, holding the portfolios of Health, Post and Communications, Welfare, Interior, Religious Affairs.

Burla, Yehuda (1886–1969) — Born in Jerusalem. Teacher, writer, editor. Active in the promotion of Sephardic literature. Director of the Histadrut Department for Arab Affairs.

Cadogan, Sir Alexander — British civil servant; Permanent Undersecretary of the Foreign Office 1938–1945; first Permanent Representative to the United Nations.

Cahana (Kahana), Rabbi Kalman (1910–) — Born in Brody, Poland; immigrated 1938. Leader of Poalei Agudat Israel (q.v.). Member of

Kibbutz Hafetz Haim. Member of Provisional Council of State, and of the Knesset 1949–81. Deputy Minister of Education and Culture 1961–66.

Chamberlain, Sir Neville (1869–1940) — British political leader; Conservative. Prime Minister 1937–40. Issued White Paper on Palestine (May 1939) considered as betrayal of British obligations towards the Jewish National Home. Signed Munich Pact with Hitler, believing that it would bring "Peace in our time."

Circassians — Tribe from the Caucasus whose territory was handed over to the Russians by the Ottoman Turks in 1829. After several revolts lasting until 1859, many, particularly from among the Muslim Circassians, fled to the other parts of the Ottoman Empire. Renowned for their martial and equestrian prowess. In Israel there are several hundred in two villages in Galilee.

Clayton, Brigadier Sir Iltyd Nicholl — British officer attached to the Middle East Office in Cairo during and after World War II. Active in the formation of Arab League (q.v.) and formulation of postwar British policy in the Middle East.

Coastal Plain — Undulating, often sandy, strip of territory running north to south parallel to the Mediterranean Coast of Israel. About 100 km. in length, its width varies from 14 to 30 km. Includes major population centers of the country.

Cohen, Idov (1909–) — Born in Rumania, immigrated 1940. Leader of Haoved Hazoni (q.v.); subsequently Progressive party, and finally Liberal party. Member of Knesset (Progressive Party) 1949–63.

Cohen (Cahan), Yaakov (1881–1960) — Hebrew writer, linguist. Born in Sluzk, Russia; immigrated 1934. Active in Revisionist, subsequently Jewish State party. President of PEN Club.

Cohen (Cagan), Rachel (1888–1982) — Born in Odessa, immigrated 1919. President of WIZO-Women's International Zionist Organization. Member of the First Knesset on behalf of WIZO; of the Fifth on behalf of Liberal party. Active in social welfare issues and women's rights.

Cohen-Maguri, Chaim (1912–) — Herut. Member of the First to the Sixth Knessets.

Cominform — Communist Information Bureau; established 1947 by Communist parties of Soviet Union, Eastern Europe and Italy. Dominated by Russia; dissolved itself in 1956 to placate Marshal Tito of Yugoslavia who had been expelled.

Conciliation Commission — Established by UN General Assembly in 1948 to find agreed solution for Palestine question; consisted of representatives of France, Turkey and the U.S. Convened Lausanne Conference (1949) which proved futile. Dormant for many years.

Cook, Hillel (Peter Bergson) (1915–) — Born in Lithuania, immigrated 1924. Member of Irgun (1931) and its Command (1937). Irgun Representative in U.S. 1940–48. Active in promotion of Committee for a Jewish Army (1941–43); Emergency Committee to Rescue the Jewish People in Europe (1943–45). Member of First Knesset (Herut); retired from political life as a result of difference of opinion with the leader of the party.

Copeland, Sir Reginald (1884–1952) — Professor of British Colonial History. Member of the Royal Commission for Palestine (Peel Commission) 1936–37; formulated the idea of partition of Palestine which became the majority recommendation of that Commission.

Council of State (Provisional Council of State) (14 May 1948–25 January 1949) — Provisional representative and legislative body of Israel; replaced by the First Knesset, whose election it initiated and supervised.

Council of Four Lands — Regional Jewish self-governing authority, established towards the end of the sixteenth century, comprising four Polish provinces. Based in Lublin.

Creech-Jones, Sir Arthur (1891–1964) — British Labour leader and cabinet member. Colonial Secretary of State, subsequently Secretary 1945–1950.

CSSR — Czechoslovak Soviet Socialist Republic.

Cunningham, General Sir Alan Gordon (b.1887) — Last British High Commissioner for Palestine 1945–1948.

Dahab — Oasis and Beduin fishing village in Sinai, 150 km. south of Eilat.

Dan — Kibbutz in Eastern Galilee, named after ancient nearby biblical town.

Dardara — Kibbutz in the east of the Hula Valley at the foot of the Golan Heights.

Davar — Histadrut daily newspaper, founded by Berl Katznelson in 1925.

Dayan, Moshe (1915–1981) — Born in Kibbutz Degania. Military and political leader. Mapai and Rafi. Chief of the General Staff (1953–

58); conducted Sinai Campaign. Member of Knesset 1959–81. Minister of Agriculture 1959–64. Appointed Minister of Defense on the eve of the Six Day War (1967); replaced in the aftermath of the Yom Kippur War (1974). Minister of Foreign Affairs 1977–79; played central role in the negotiation of the Camp David Accords and the Israel-Egypt Peace Treaty.

Dayan, Shmuel (1881–1968) — Born in Russia, immigrated 1908. Active in Moshav movement. Member of Knesset.

Dayanim — Judges of Jewish religious courts.

Day of Atonement — See Yom Kippur.

DDR — German Democratic Republic.

De Haan, Jacob Israel (1881–1924) — Born in Holland, immigrated 1919. At first a Dutch Socialist, then a Zionist, ultimately a member of the ultra-Orthodox community of Jerusalem and relentless opponent of the Zionist movement. When he carried the struggle against Zionism outside of Palestine, he was killed by a group linked to the Hagana.

Defense (Emergency) Regulations — Regulations issued by the Executive without prior Parliamentary authorization, on the basis of emergency legislation carried over from the British Mandatory government.

Degania — Kibbutz at the southern tip of the Sea of Galilee, 10 km. south of Tiberias. First kibbutz in the country; scene of major battle with invading Syrian Army, 1948.

Deir Yassin — Former Arab village on the western outskirts of Jerusalem. Captured by Irgun and Lehi units in April 1948; five of the attackers lost their lives in the operation, against about 120 Arabs, many of them women and children. The “massacre” was immediately condemned by the Jewish Agency. Presented by Arab spokesmen as typical of Jewish tactics (which it was not), it spurred the Arab exodus from other locations in Palestine.

Dimitrov, George M. (1882–1949) — Bulgarian Communist leader. Secretary General of the Cominform (q.v.).

Dinur (Dinaburg), Professor Ben Zion (1884–1973) — Born in the Ukraine, immigrated 1921. Teacher, authority on Jewish history. As Minister of Education (1951–55), presented Obligatory Education Law envisaging *inter alia* the abolition of the different “streams” (ideological tendencies). Introduced the law establishing the Holocaust Memorial Authority (Yad Vashem), which he headed 1953–59.

Doar Iuri — Improvised motto on postage stamps, used in April and May 1948, after the breakdown of Mandatory postal services, and before those of the newly-established state were properly organized.

Dobkin, Elyahu (1898–1976) — Born in Russia, immigrated 1932. Member of Jewish Agency Executive; Head of the Youth and Hechalutz (Pioneer) Department.

Druse — National-religious Arabic-speaking minority, occupying mainly mountainous areas in Lebanon, Syria and Israel. Split from Islam in eleventh century, the principles of their religion are made known only to a select group of elders. In Israel they live in a number of villages and towns in Galilee and the Carmel, to which some villages in the Golan Heights have been added in 1967. The number about 1 percent of the total population. Close relations with Jews have been established over the years. In 1948, after a brief clash in which Druse troops from Syria sided with Arabs, non-aggression between Jews and Druse, subsequently cooperation, were agreed upon. Since 1957 the Druse community voluntarily adopted obligatory military service for its young men. Many Druse military and police personnel have distinguished themselves in the line of duty.

Dubnow, Simon (1860–1941) — Born near Moghilev, Russia; shot by German soldiers in Riga, Latvia. Historian, theorist of Jewish autonomism or Galut nationalism, founder of Folkspartei (People's party). In later years drew closer to Zionism.

Dunam — Land measurement unit equivalent to 1000 sq. meters.

Dushinsky, Rabbi Josef Zvi (1868–1948) — Born in Hungary, died in Jerusalem. Immigrated 1933, when appointed Chief Rabbi of Orthodox Jerusalem. Close to the extreme anti-Zionist faction of that community (Neturei Karta, the Guardians of the Walls), he nevertheless approved of the rabbinical decree issued during the siege of Jerusalem permitting defense preparations on the Sabbath.

Duvdevani, Yechiel (1896–1988) — Kibbutz Meuhad activist. Member of First Knesset for Mapai.

Eban, Abba (Aubrey) (1915–) — Diplomat; leader of Mapai, subsequently Labor party; writer and lecturer. Born in South Africa. From 1946 member of Jewish Agency Political Department; Permanent Representative to the UN 1948–59; Ambassador to Washington 1959–60. Member of Knesset 1961–87. Minister of Education and Culture 1960–63; Deputy Prime Minister 1963–66; Foreign Minister 1966–74. Chairman of Foreign Affairs and Defense Committee of the Knesset 1984–87. One of the best known

Israeli political leaders worldwide, his books and articles have been translated into many languages.

Economic Union — Arrangement envisaged under the Partition Resolution of 29 November 1947 by which the three successor states in Mandatory Palestine — the Arab state, the Jewish state, and the international enclave — would continue with one currency and within a customs and tariff union.

Edom — Mountainous country, also called Mt. Se'ir, given to Esau and his descendants. Extended from Dead Sea to the Gulf of Aqaba.

Ehrenburg, Ilya (1891–1967) — Russian Jewish novelist and journalist. Extreme opponent of Zionism. Active in the Jewish Anti-Fascist Committee in World War II.

Eilat — Port at the head of the synonymous Gulf. Mentioned in the Bible under different names, including Etzion Gever, where King Solomon equipped and dispatched his fleet. Part of the Jewish state under Partition, it was occupied by the IDF in March 1949.

Ein Gedi — Kibbutz near an oasis on the western shore of the Dead Sea, 17 km. north of Massada.

Ein Gev — Kibbutz on the eastern shore of the Sea of Galilee, 10 km. northeast of Zemach junction. Site of heavy fighting against Syrian invaders in 1948 when it constituted the only Jewish outpost to the east of the Sea.

Ein Harod — Two kibbutzim by the same name, close to each other, in the Valley of Esdraelon near the Afula-Baisan Road.

Ein Kerem — Quarter in the southwest of Jerusalem. Formerly an Arab village. Identified with biblical Beit Hakerem.

El-Arish — Mediterranean coastal town in Sinai. Center of local administration. At the beginning of the twentieth century its region was considered suitable for Jewish settlement by some British officials. Thorough investigations and lengthy negotiations had negative results. In 1949 IDF troops reached its outskirts in the course of Operation Horev designed to dislodge the Egyptians from Palestine. Captured by the IDF in 1956 and again in 1967.

El-Gafgafa (Bir) — Road junction and communications center in the center of the Sinai Peninsula.

El-Hamah — Ancient baths in the Yarmuk riverbed in the south of the Golan Heights, 10 km. southeast of Zemach. Demilitarized under Israel-Syrian Armistice Agreement 1949.

Eliash, Dr. Mordecai (1892–1950) — Born in the Ukraine, immigrated 1919. Lawyer and diplomat. First Israel Minister to the Court of St. James, 1949.

Eliashar, Elyahu (1899–1981) — Born in Jerusalem. First President of the Sephardic Community Council in Jerusalem. Member of First and Second Knesset for Sephardic List.

Emes Publishing House — Official Yiddish language publishing house in the Soviet Union.

Erem, Moshe (1896–1978) — Born in Russia, immigrated 1924. Leader of left wing Poalei Zion. Member of Knesset for Mapam.

Eritrea — Former British colonial territory in East Africa where camps for Palestinian Jewish detainees were established in the 1940s.

Es-Salt — Town in Transjordan; regional center, near Hijaz Railway.

Etrog — Citrus fruit used for liturgical purposes during the Feast of Sukkot (Tabernacles).

Etzion Bloc — Group of four Jewish settlements in the Hebron mountains, 20 km. south of Jerusalem. Captured by the Arab Legion following prolonged battle on 14 May 1948.

Even Yehuda — Village in the Sharon Valley, 8 km. southeast of Netanya.

Faisal, Ibn Abd el-Aziz (1905–1975) — King of Saudi Arabia 1964–1975.

Faluja Pocket — Enclave near the Faluja road junction in the Judean foothills in which an Egyptian brigade was besieged from October 1948 until its release under the Armistice Agreement. Gamal Abd el-Nasser served as operations officer of the Brigade.

Farouk, King (1920–1965) — King of Egypt 1936–52, when ousted by Free Officers.

FDR — Federal Republic of Germany.

Fedayeen (Fedayun) — Moslem commando soldiers, literally: suicide squads. In the 1950s, until the Sinai Campaign, Palestinian guerillas and terrorists were trained and directed against Israel by Egyptian Intelligence, primarily from the Gaza Strip.

Feinstein, Meir (1927–1947) — Member of Irgun; wounded and captured in the course of an operation against the Jerusalem railway station. Condemned to die, committed suicide together with Moshe Barazani (q.v.).

Fellaheen — (Arabic) Farmers.

Fishman (Maimon), Rabbi Judah-Leib Hacoheh (1876–1962) — Born in Bessarabia, immigrated 1913. Leader of Mizrachi. Member of Jewish Agency Executive from 1935. Minister of Religious Affairs in Provisional Government and several subsequent governments until 1961. A political activist, served on several occasions as mediator between Hagana, Irgun and Lehi.

Flavius, Josephus (37–95?) — Jewish historian and soldier; chronicler of the Jewish revolt against the Romans and the destruction of the Second Temple 71 AD.

Frank, Yaacov Israel (1925–) — Member of Eighth Knesset.

Friedmann-Yellin, Nathan (1913–1978) — Born in Russia, immigrated during World War II. Engineer. Member of Lehi Command; condemned to imprisonment after the killing of Bernadotte. Member of First Knesset heading the list of Fighters for the Freedom of Israel. In 1958 initiated short-lived Semitic Movement for Arab-Jewish reconciliation; henceforth advocated dovish positions.

Garin (literally nucleus) — Group organized for the purpose of establishing a new agricultural settlement.

Gahal (Acronym: Gius Hutz Laaretz; recruiting from abroad) — IDF soldiers in the War of Independence who immigrated mainly from DP camps in Europe and detention camps on Cyprus during the war.

Galilee, Sea of — Part of the Jordan Rift Valley, bordering on Lower Galilee. Lowest freshwater lake on earth.

Galili, Israel (1910–1986) — Born in the Ukraine, immigrated 1914. Leader of Achdut Ha'Avoda, subsequently Mapam, Labor party. Chief of the Hagana Command 1946–48. Deputy Minister of Defense 1948. Member of Knesset 1949–77. Minister without portfolio 1966; 1974–77.

Gaon of Vilna (Gaon Rabbi Elijah) (1720–1803) — Jewish scholar, rationalist. Opponent of Hassidism, whose perceived superstitions he condemned. At the height of the controversy (1781), he excommunicated the Hassidim and forbade intermarriage with them.

Gaza Strip — Southernmost section of the coastal plain of former Palestine, held by Egyptians at the end of the War of Independence. Forty km. long; varies in width from 6 to 13 km.

Gemara (Talmud) — Formulation and codification of the oral exegesis of Jewish law, finalized in the sixth century in Jerusalem and Babylon.

General Zionists — During the first decades of the Zionist Organization, a vague term applied to all those who did not have a specific (such as socialist or religious) agenda in addition to the Basle Program. Subsequently organized as a separate group, including the majority of diaspora members of the Organization, they were still relatively weak in Palestine where they came to represent middle class interests. In the 1940s they split into two groups—A and B—over the twin issues of more or less activist, combative attitudes towards the Mandatory government and its policies, on the one hand, and the Socialist-dominated Histadrut, on the other. In the elections for the First Knesset, group A constituted the Progressive party; group B, the General Zionists. United for a number of years after 1961 under the name of Liberal party, they split again when one part, basically former group B, joined Herut in 1965, in the formation of a joint list (Gahal). The former Progressives continued as Independent Liberals.

Geneva Convention — In fact, conventions: a series of international conventions signed in Geneva designed to alleviate human suffering, particularly at the time and in the aftermath of war. The first convention, signed in 1864, initiated the Red Cross.

Genihowski, Eliahu Moshe (1903–1971) — Born in Poland, immigrated 1932. Hapoel Hamizrachi. Member of First and Second Knesset.

Gerar — Ancient settlement in the southwest of Israel near the synonymous valley.

Gesher — Kibbutz in the Jordan Valley, 10 km. south of Zemach, near the confluence of the Jordan and Yarmuk Rivers. Site of heavy fighting against the invading Iraqi Army in 1948.

Gil (Lifshitz), Yaakov (1908–) — Born in Tiberias. Military chaplain, Chief Rabbi of the Jewish Brigade Group during World War II. Member of First Knesset for General Zionists.

Gilboa — Mountain range between the Esdraelon and Beisan Valleys, some 18 km. long and 9 km. wide.

Gilead — Mountainous region to the east of the Jordan River, some 105 km. in length, from the Yarmuk River to the Heshbon River, north of the Dead Sea.

Glubb (Pasha), Sir John Bagot (1897–) — British officer; Deputy Commander of the Arab Legion 1930–38; Commander-in-chief 1938–56.

Goebbels, Josef (1897–1945) — German National Socialist Propaganda Minister 1933–45.

Gold, (Rabbi) Wolf (1889–1956) — Born in Russia, immigrated 1924. Mizrachi Leader. Co-founder, American Union of Orthodox Rabbis; Member of Provisional Council of State.

Goldmann, Nahum (1894–1982) — Born in Lithuania, immigrated 1964. Co-founder of World Jewish Congress; Jewish Agency Representative in Geneva; President of the World Zionist Organization. Active in soliciting support for Partition in 1947; instrumental in negotiation of German Reparations. Later extremely critical of Israel and its policies, advocating mutual Palestinian-Israel recognition.

Goldrat, Avraham (1911–1980) — Born in Poland, immigrated 1933. Young Agudat Israel activist in Poland; member of First Knesset on behalf of Religious Front.

Goshen — Fertile part of Egypt, probably in the northeast of the Delta, occupied by Israelites according to Bible.

Gottwald, Klement (1896–1953) — President of Czechoslovakia 1948–1953.

Govrin, Akiba (1902–1980) — Born in Russia, immigrated 1922. Mapai, Labor party. Member of Knesset 1949–69; Minister without portfolio 1963–64; Tourism 1964–66.

Grabowsky, Meir — See Argov.

Granowsky (Granott), Dr. Abraham (1890–1962) — Born in Russia, immigrated 1922. Active in Jewish National Fund (KKL); Chairman of the Board 1945; President 1960. Member of the First Knesset on behalf of the Progressive party.

Greenberg, Uri Zvi (1895–1981) — Born in Galicia, immigrated 1924. Hebrew and Yiddish poet. Poet of the pioneers at one time, he later developed a mystical nationalist philosophy. Member of First Knesset for Herut.

Gromyko, Andrei Andreyevich (1909–1988) — Russian diplomat; Permanent Delegate to the UN 1946–48; Deputy Foreign Minister 1949–52; Foreign Minister 1957.

Grotewohl, Otto (1894–1964) — Communist party leader and Prime Minister of the DDR (1949–64).

Gruenbaum, Yitzhak (b.1879) — Zionist leader in Poland; Member of the Siem 1919–1930, one of the organizers of the Minorities Bloc; immigrated 1933. Member of the Zionist Executive (General Zionists); Minister of Internal Affairs in Provisional Government (1948–49).

Guildhall Speech — Speech delivered by Sir Anthony Eden (later Lord Avon), British Foreign Secretary, on 9 November 1955, calling for a compromise adjustment between Israel's borders at the time and those assigned it under the UN Partition Resolution.

Gulf of Solomon — See Eilat.

Ha'aretz — Israeli daily newspaper, founded as *Hadashot Haaretz* in 1919. For many years the only morning paper not affiliated with any political party.

Habibi, Emil (1922–) — Palestinian, later Israel Communist Arab leader. Member of the Knesset representing Maki and Rakah.

Hacohen, David (1897–1984) — Born in Russia, immigrated 1907. Mapai, Labor. First Ambassador to Burma. Member of the Knesset; Chairman of Foreign Affairs and Defense Committee.

Hadar Hacarmel — Commercial center of Haifa, on the western slope of Mount Carmel halfway between the lower city and the peak.

Hadassah — Women's Zionist Organization of America. Founded by Henrietta Szold, it first dispatched medical personnel to Palestine in 1913. Directs a network of humanitarian institutions in Israel, the most important being the Hadassah Hospital Medical Center in Jerusalem.

Hadera — Town in the north of the Sharon; originally an agricultural settlement founded in 1890.

HaDor — Hebrew daily newspaper, owned by Mapai.

Hagana — Clandestine Jewish self-defense organization in Palestine, founded at the initiative of the Histadrut in 1920 for the purpose of protecting Jewish life and property against attacks by Arabs as a result of the inadequacy of protection provided by British authorities. Following the establishment of the state it was converted into the IDF.

Hager, (Rabbi) Menachem Mendel (1889–1954) — Born in Bukovina, immigrated 1943. Mizrahi member of Provisional Council of State.

Haifa — Port and industrial center in the north of Israel.

Haj (Mohamed) Amin el-Husseini (1895–1974) — Grand Mufti of Jerusalem; radical Palestinian and Muslim leader. Active in anti-Jewish riots of 1920–21, 1929, 1936–39. During World War II recruited Muslims for Nazi Germany, and declared a war criminal. Opposed Partition in 1947 and headed violent Palestinian resistance to its implementation in its early phase.

Hakim, (Bishop) George (1908–) — Born in Egypt. Head of the Greek Catholic community in the north of Israel.

Halakhah — Jewish religious law.

Hamashbir (or Hamashbir Hamerkazi) — Central cooperative sales organization for productive enterprises linked with or owned by the Histadrut.

Hamizrachi — Religious Zionist party established in 1902 with the aim of securing "Eretz Israel for the people of Israel according to the Torah of Israel." It envisages, in the ultimate stage, a Jewish state governed according to Halakhah, but considers the present day secular state as a precursor of that state. Participated in most government coalitions from 1956 as a part of the National Religious Party.

Hammarskjold, Dag (1905–1961) — Swedish economist and diplomat. Secretary General of the United Nations from 1953 until his death in an accident. Active in connection with the Suez Crisis in 1956, and instrumental in establishment of the UN Emergency Force (UNEF).

Ha'Oved Hatzioni — Non-socialist workers party, merged with the Progressive party in 1948.

Hapoel Hamizrachi — Religious labor organization, established in 1921. Cooperated with Mizrahi on political matters; merged with it in 1956 to form the National Religious Party.

Harari, Yizhar (1908–1978) — Born in Jaffa. Progressive, subsequently Independent Liberal, ultimately Labor party. Lawyer. Member of the First to the Eighth Knesset. Active in Foreign Affairs, and Law and Constitution Committees. In 1951 proposed the formula that Israel would have a written constitution developed gradually, which has been accepted since.

Harzfeld, Abraham (b.1888) — Born in Russia, immigrated 1914. Mapai, Labor. Active in land purchases and settlement. Member of Knesset 1949–65.

Hashemite — Arab clan, from which sprang the Prophet Mohamed, according to tradition. The Sharif of Mecca was one of its descendants.

Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan — Since 1949, the territory on both banks of the Jordan River controlled by the Hashemite King Abdullah (until 1951); by Tallal (1951–52); by Hussain (1952–).

Hashomer Hatzair — Jewish youth movement formed in 1913 when various local Zionist groups in Galicia (then under Austro-Hungarian

rule), and Poland (then under Tsarist Russian rule) combined. Subsequently spread to other diaspora countries, and established a series of kibbutzim in Palestine, federated in Kibbutz Artzi. During World War II members of the organization stood out in partisan and resistance units. In 1946 Hashomer Hatzair formally became a political party in Palestine, and in 1948 it participated in the formation of Mapam.

Hasmoneans (Maccabees) — Jewish family of the second and first century BCE which led the opposition to Syrian dominance and Hellenizing tendencies and in the restoration of Jewish political and religious life.

Hassan Beck — Quarter of Jaffa, named after the synonymous mosque.

Hassan Hanifas, Salah (1918–) — Born in Shefaram. Druse leader. Member of Second and Third Knessets, heading an Arab list linked with Mapai.

Hatikva (The Hope) — Anthem of the Zionist movement and national anthem of the State of Israel. Written by Naftali Herz Imber about 1880. The melody is based on a Moldavian folk melody.

Hatzohar — See Revisionists.

Hayarkon Street — North-south artery parallel to the shore of Tel Aviv. In 1948 seat of the Hagana High Command; central committee of Mapai, subsequently Labor party.

Hazan, Yaakov (b.1899) — Born in Russia. Hashomer Hatzair, Mapam leader. Knesset Member from 1949. Foreign Affairs and Defense Committee.

Hebron — Ancient town in Judean mountains, 36 km. south of Jerusalem. Believed to have been the seat of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob. Its Jewish community was massacred or expelled in 1929. Captured by IDF in 1967, a new community was subsequently established in nearby Kiryat Arba.

Heletz — Moshav in the Lahish region; nearby is the first modest oil field discovered in Palestine.

Hermon (Mount) — Highest mountain range in the Levant, on the borderline between Israel and Syria. Scene of heavy fighting in the course of the Yom Kippur War. Its peak, in Syria, reaches 2814 m.

Herut (party or movement) — Israel political party founded by the Irgun in 1948. Advocates the unification of Eretz Israel within its historic boundaries and the promulgation of a written constitution. In 1965 entered a parliamentary and electoral bloc with the Liberal party (Gahal); in 1977 Gahal joined with two more groups — the Free

Center and the Movement for Greater (literally: the complete) Israel — to form the Likud bloc, which won a plurality in the elections of 1977. Its undisputed leader from 1948 until his retirement in 1983 was Menahem Begin.

Herzl, Benjamin Zeev (Theodor) (1860–1904) — Born in Budapest, died in Vienna. Prophet of the Jewish state; father of political Zionism and founder of the World Zionist Organization. Originated the Basle Program. In accordance with his will, his remains were transferred to Jerusalem after the establishment of the state in 1949.

Hibat Zion (Hovevei Zion) — Movement established in 1882 in reaction to pogroms in Russia, for the purpose of encouraging Jewish settlement in Palestine and achieving a Jewish national revival there.

Histadrut — General Federation of Labor, founded 1920 in Haifa. In 1985 close to 1.5 million members. The Histadrut is at one and the same time a trade union, a mutual aid society, a productive economic system and a center of cultural and sports activities. The Histadrut Conference, its supreme institution, is elected once every four years by proportional representation. Mapai, and subsequently the Labor party or Alignment, have been in control throughout, and all Secretaries General have come from its ranks.

Horeb (Operation) (22 December 1948–7 January 1949) — One of the last operations undertaken by the IDF in the course of Israel's War of Independence, designed to expel the remaining Egyptian invading forces from Israeli territory.

Horthy, Nicholas (1886–1957) — Hungarian admiral and statesman. Headed counterrevolutionary forces during Bela Kun regime; regent of Hungary 1920–44; forced by Germans to resign.

Hosni Zaim (1889–1949) — Born in Aleppo, Kurdish descent. Syrian Army officer, appointed Chief of Staff May 1948. Undertook first military coup in Syria in March 1949; in June of the same year elected President; in August 1949 toppled in another coup, condemned to death and executed.

Hoter-Yishai, Aharon (1905–) — Born in Russia, immigrated 1913. Lawyer. Active in Hagana. Served in Jewish Brigade during World War II. IDF Advocate General.

Houshi, Abba (1898–1969) — Mapai-Labor leader. Born in Eastern Galicia, immigrated to Palestine 1920. Secretary of Haifa Labor Council 1931–51; Mayor of Haifa 1951–69. Member of Arab Department of Histadrut; maintained close relations with Arab and Druse population of Haifa and the North.

Husan — Arab village in the Judean mountains, 7 km. west of Bethlehem.

Hussein, Ibn Tallal (1935–) — King of Jordan since 1952.

Husseinis — Followers of Haj Amin el Husseini, Mufti of Jerusalem (q.v.).

Hyat, Victor — Christian Arab businessman and leader in Haifa. In 1948 member of the Arab Emergency Committee, attempted to prevent the exodus from the city.

Hyrceanus (Jochanan) — Son of Simeon the Hasmonean; ruled from 135–105 BCE.

Ibn-Saud, Abdel-Aziz (1880–1953) — Chief of the Wahabi Sect; captured Mecca and Medina 1924, Jeddah and the rest of the Hejaz 1925; proclaimed King 1926. In 1932 changed name of his Kingdom to Saudi Arabia.

Ichilov, Ezra (1907–1961) — Born in Petah Tikva. Leader of Farmers Union, General Zionists. Member of Second to Fourth Knessets.

Idelson, Beba (1895–1975) — Born in Russia, immigrated 1926. Active in Women Workers' Organization, its Secretary General from 1930. Member of the Provisional Council of State and of the Knesset on behalf of Achdut Ha'Avoda, later Mapai. Deputy Speaker.

IDF — Israel Defense Forces.

IL — Israel Pound.

Ilyushin — Soviet-made military airplane, fighter bomber.

Immigration Ordinance (1941) — British Mandatory decree drastically limiting Jewish immigration into Palestine.

Iraq el-Manshya — Arab village, military outpost in the South; towards the end of the War of Independence part of the Faluja Pocket.

Iraq Suedan — British police fortress, of the type designed by Teggart and named after him, in the southern coastal plain. Fulfilled a central role in the battle for the besieged Negev in 1948; attacked seven times by IDF before its capture from Egyptians.

Irgun Zvai Leumi (National Military Organization) — Clandestine military organization founded in Jerusalem in 1931 following a disagreement within the Hagana. From 1936 linked politically with the Revisionist movement. Dissolved upon the establishment of the IDF in May 1948, it continued its existence in Jerusalem until September. In June 1948 its last commander, Menahem Begin, established the Herut movement adopting the IZL's emblem.

Isaac — Son of Abraham. Biblical figure; forefather of the Jews.

Isaiah — Son of Amoz. One of foremost prophets. Lived in Judea at the time of the First Temple.

Ismailiya — Town in Egypt; halfway station along the Suez Canal and administrative center of the region. Named after the Khedive Ismail, during whose reign the Canal was inaugurated.

Itton Rasmi — Official Gazette of British Mandate. Renamed *Reshumot* in Israel.

IZL — See Irgun Zvai Leumi.

Jabotinsky, Vladimir (Ze'ev Yona) (1880–1940) — Born in Odessa, Russia. Political leader, writer, journalist. Immigrated as a soldier in the Jewish Legion towards the end of World War I; jailed in 1920 by British authorities. Released in 1921, he joined the Zionist Executive in London. Died in U.S. in 1940. Founder of Betar movement; of New Zionist Organization (Zohar, the Revisionists). Considered ideologue and precursor of Herut.

Jacob — Son of Isaac. Biblical figure; forefather of the Jews.

Jaffa — Ancient port on the Mediterranean Coast, south of Tel Aviv. Part of the municipal area of Tel Aviv.

Jaljulya — Arab village in the Sharon Valley, 4 km. east of Kfar Saba.

Jarjoura, Amin (b.1894) — Member of Knesset.

Jarrah (Sheikh) — Arab quarter in the northeastern part of Jerusalem, astride the road to Mount Scopus. Scene of heavy fighting in 1948 and of the liquidation of a convoy of Jewish medical personnel in April 1948.

Jebel Libneh — Mountain in the northern part of the Sinai peninsula; site of battles in 1956 and 1967.

Jenin — Arab town on the border of Samaria and the valley of Esdraelon.

Jericho — Ancient city in Palestine north of the Dead Sea.

Jerusalem — City in the Judean mountains, selected by King David as capital of his united kingdom, ca.1000 BCE. Holy city of the three monotheistic religions; capital of Israel.

Jewish Agency (for Palestine) — Recognized under the Mandate as a public body for the purpose of advising and cooperating with the administration of Palestine in matters related to the establishment of the Jewish National Home. Until 1929 it was the World Zionist Or-

ganization which acted in that capacity; subsequently non-Zionists were also incorporated. In 1948 the functions of the Jewish Agency were taken over by the Israel government. In 1952 it was reconstituted with responsibility for immigration and absorption.

Jezreel Valley — Elongated, fertile valley between Galilee and Samaria.

JNF — Jewish National Fund.

Johnston Plan — Plan for distribution of the waters of the Jordan and its tributaries among Lebanon, Syria, Jordan and Israel, formulated by Eric Johnston (1896–1963) at the request of President Eisenhower in 1953.

Jordan — River, 250 km. in length, running from north to south along the Syrian-African rift.

Jordania — Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan.

Joseph, Dr. Bernard Dov (1889–1980) — Born in Canada, came to Palestine in 1918 as soldier in Jewish Legion. Lawyer. Mapai. From 1936 Legal Adviser to the Jewish Agency. Military Governor of Jerusalem 1948–49. Member of First, Second and Third Knessets. Minister of Supply and Rationing 1949–50; subsequently Communications, Trade, Development. Minister of Justice 1961–65.

Josiah (640–609 BCE) — King of Judah.

Judah — Jacob's third son, forefather of the tribe of the same name.

Judea Capta — Name given to the province of Judea after its subjugation by the Romans in 70 AD.

Kafr Qasem — Large Arab village on the border of the Sharon Valley and Samaria, 8 km. northeast of Petah Tikva.

Kahane, Kalman — see Cahane.

Kalkilya — Arab town on the border of the Sharon and Samaria, about three km. east of Kfar Saba.

Kaplan, Eliezer (1891–1952) — Born in Minsk, immigrated 1923. Labor leader. Engineer. Treasurer of the Jewish Agency from 1933; Israel's first Minister of Finance, from 1948 until shortly before his death.

Kartiya — Abandoned Arab village in the South, located near the Egyptian-occupied belt separating the Negev from the rest of Israel.

Kasher (Kosher) — Proper; food which complies with Jewish dietary laws; hence *Kashrut*.

Kattowitz Conference — Conference of Hovevei Zion (q.v.), held in Kattowitz in 1884.

Katznelson, Dr. Abraham (1888–1956) — Born in Russia, immigrated 1924. Physician. Mapai. Member of the Provisional Council of State from Jerusalem. First Director General of the Ministry of Health.

Kaukji, Fauzi el — Arab military commander. Born in Tripoli, Lebanon. Graduate of Ottoman Military Academy. Commander of volunteer units from neighboring countries during Palestine riots 1936; Commander of Arab Liberation Army 1948.

Keren Hayesod (Palestine Foundation Fund) — One of the major fundraising and financial institutions of the World Zionist Organization, founded in London 1923.

Kesse, Yona (1907–1985) — Born in Russia, immigrated 1926. Hapoel Hatzair and Mapai. Secretary General of Mapai in the early 1940s. Member of the Knesset from 1949.

Kfar Saba — Town in the south of the Sharon Valley, founded 1903.

Kfar Szold — Kibbutz northeast of the Hula Valley, founded 1942.

Kfar Vitkin — Moshav in the Sharon, 6 km. north of Netanya, founded 1930.

Kinot — Elegies, normally in a religious liturgical context.

Kiryat Anavim — Collective settlement in the Judean mountains, 10 km. west of Jerusalem. Founded 1920.

Klausner, (Prof.) Josef (1884–1958) — Born in Lithuania, immigrated 1919. Historian, editor and publicist. From ideological standpoint close to Revisionism, yet never officially member of the Revisionist party.

Klivanov, Jacob (1887–1966) — Born in Russia, immigrated 1921. Lawyer. Member of the Second and Third Knessets for General Zionists.

Knesset Record — Record of Knesset Plenary Proceedings, equivalent of British Hansard.

Kol (Kolodny), Moshe (1911–1989) — Born in Russia, immigrated 1932. Founder of Hanoar Hatzioni; Progressive party, which developed into Liberal party. Head of Youth Aliya (Immigration) Department of the Jewish Agency 1947–64. Member of Provisional Council of State; signed Declaration of Independence. Member of First to Eighth Knessets; Minister of Development and Tourism 1965; Minister of Tourism 1969–74.

Kosoi (Kosoy), Yona — See Kesse.

Kulturkampf — German: Conflict of Cultures, 1873–87. Conflict between the German government and the Roman Catholic Church. Applied to the potential conflict between the government of Israel and Jewish religious authorities.

Kunteila — Road junction in eastern Sinai, about 45 km. northwest of Eilat.

Kuseima (El-Kuseima; Kuzeima) — Oasis, road junction and Beduin settlement on the border between Sinai and the Negev, 25 km. southwest of Nitzana.

Lake Success — Resort in southeast of New York State; temporary headquarters of the United Nations 1946–1951.

Lamm, Josef Michael (1899–1976) — Born in Galicia, immigrated 1939. Lawyer. Labor Zionist leader in Austria. Detained in Dachau 1938–39. Organized immigrants from Central Europe. Member of the Knesset for Mapai. Judge.

Land Transfer Regulations — Mandatory regulations limiting or prohibiting the transfer of land to Jews in most of Palestine.

Landau, Haim (1916–1981) — Born in Cracow, immigrated 1935. Engineer. Irgun Chief of Staff 1945–48. Member of First to Ninth Knessets for Herut. Active in Foreign Affairs and Defense. Minister of Development 1967–70; Transport 1977–81.

Lankin, Eliahu (1914–) — Born in Russia, immigrated (from China) 1933. Member of Irgun. Detained in Eritrea 1944. Irgun Commander in Europe 1947. Commander of the Altalena (q.v.). Member of the First Knesset for Herut.

Latrun Road — Section of Jerusalem-Tel Aviv road passing beneath the Latrun monastery and police fortress.

Lausanne (Conference) — Israel-Arab Conference convened in the summer of 1939 by the UN Palestine Conciliation Commission.

Lavon (Lubianiker), Pinchas (1904–1976) — Born in Eastern Galicia, immigrated 1929. Lawyer. Founder of the Gordonia Youth Movement. Co-Secretary of Mapai 1938–39. Secretary General of the Histadrut 1949–51, 55–61. Minister of Agriculture 1950–52; Minister of Defense in Moshe Sharett government 1953–55, when he was replaced by Ben-Gurion. In 1961 raised the question of responsibility for the “Mishap,” the activation of an underground cell in Egypt, known as the Lavon Affair. Forced to resign, he abandoned Mapai to found the “Min Hayesod” movement.

Law and Administration Ordinance (1948) — One of the first items of legislation adopted by the Provisional Council of State, regulating governmental processes, also known as the “Little Constitution.”

Law of Return — Law permitting Jews anywhere to immigrate to Israel and become Israeli citizens, adopted in 1949.

Lawrence, Thomas Edward (Lawrence of Arabia) (1888–1935) — Born in Wales; British Intelligence officer, credited with guiding the Arab uprising against the Turkish government in the Hejaz in June 1916.

Lehi — Hebrew acronym of Lohamei Herut Israel, Fighters for the Freedom of Israel. Underground resistance group in pre-state Israel referred to as the Stern gang, after its founder Abraham (Yair) Stern. Was formed by breakaway Irgun members in 1940, in the aftermath of the Irgun decision to cease its attacks against the British administration for the duration of the war against Hitler.

Lemberger, S. — Member of the Knesset for Aguda.

Levin, Isaac Meir (Rabbi) (1894–1971) — Born in Poland, immigrated 1940. Head of Aguda in Israel and Chairman of World Aguda Executive. President of the Jewish community of Warsaw. Minister of Welfare in First Government 1949–51. Member of the Knesset until his death.

Litvinov (Wallach), Maxim Maximovich (1876–1952) — Soviet Foreign Commissar 1930–39; Ambassador to the U.S. 1941–43.

Livneh (Liebenstein), Eliezer (1902–1975) — Born in Lodz, Poland; immigrated 1920. Journalist. Ahdut Ha'Avoda, later Mapai. Secretary of Haifa Labor Council 1923; Editor of Hagana clandestine weekly 1942–47. Member of Knesset for Mapai 1949–55. Criticized for building a “villa,” deemed unworthy of a Labor leader, left the party. After Six Day War of 1967 one of the founders of Greater Israel Movement.

Lod (Lud; Lydda) — Town on the border between the Shefela and the coastal plain. Mentioned in the Bible as part of the territory of Benjamin. Major Jewish center of learning after the fall of Jerusalem (70 AD). Under British Mandate, regional center and railway junction. Captured by IDF in July 1948.

Lod Airport — International airport of Palestine and subsequently Israel, named after nearby town. Today Ben-Gurion Airport.

Lowenstein, Meir David (b.1901) — Merchant and importer. Aguda leader. Member of Provisional Council of State and of First Knesset.

Lubyanka — KGB headquarters and prison in Moscow, associated with torture and terror.

Lulav — Palm branch used for liturgical purposes during the Feast of Sukkot (Tabernacles).

Luria (Lurie), Zvi (1906–1968) — Born in Poland, immigrated 1925. Hashomer Hatzair, subsequently Mapam. One of the founders of Kibbutz Ein Shemer and leader of Kibbutz Artzi—the kibbutz movement linked with Hashomer Hatzair. Member of Va'ad Leumi, National Committee of Palestine Jewry; of the People's Directorate; of Provisional Council of State. Subsequently Member of Jewish Agency Executive, with seat in New York.

Luz (Luzinsky), Kadish (1895–1972) — Born in Bobruisk, Russia; immigrated 1920. Co-founder of Deganya B in the Jordan Valley. Secretary General of Hever Hakevutzot (Organization of Kevutzot, small collective settlements). Member of Knesset for Mapai 1951–69; Minister of Agriculture 1955–59; Speaker of the Knesset 1959–69, in later years elected unanimously.

Ma'abarot — (literally: transit camps). Temporary, makeshift settlements established in the early 1950s to house massive immigration, consisting of tents, barracks made of wood, asbestos, or corrugated iron. Some survived for decades, constituting a social, ecological, economic, and ultimately a political problem.

Machpela (Cave of) — Cave in Hebron, identified as the burial place of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob; sacred for Jews and Muslims.

Magen David (Shield of David) — Six-cornered star; Jewish symbol incorporated into the flag of the Zionist movement and subsequently that of Israel. Sometimes used as abbreviation for Magen David Adom (Red Magen David), Israel equivalent of Red Cross.

Maidanek (Majdanek) — Near Lublin, Poland. Major German concentration and extermination camp (1942–45) in which about 360,000 persons, mostly Jews, perished through “gradual annihilation” or immediate extermination.

Maimon (Rabbi) — See Fishman.

Maimonides (Rambam—Moses ben Maimon) (1135–1204) — Rabbi, physician, philosopher. Born in Cordova, Spain; died in Cairo. Codified Jewish law; provided spiritual guidance to the perplexed. Foremost religious leader and thinker.

Majdal (literally: tower, in Arabic) — Normally refers to Arab town abandoned in 1948, near which Migdal Ashkelon was established in the 1950s.

Maki (acronym for Israel Communist Party) — Established in 1948 through merger of several groups, both Jewish and Arab. Recognized the new state, its flag and anthem; denied bond between Israel and diaspora; insisted on Arab right to establish state in territory allotted under UN Partition Resolution. In elections from 1949 to 1965 gained 3–6 seats out of 120. In 1965 split between primarily Jewish group inclining to Zionist views and opposing Soviet all-out anti-Israel stance, which retained the name “Maki,” and the remainder of the party, consisting primarily of Israel Arabs: Rakach (acronym for New Communist List). In 1965 and 1969 Maki gained one seat; in 1973 it merged with Moked.

Malaya — Former British Crown Colony in the southern part of the Malay Peninsula; population mostly Moslem; since 1963 part of the Federation of Malaysia.

Manara — Kibbutz in Upper Galilee, near the Lebanese border, 2 km. west of Kiryat Shmona.

Manasseh — In the Bible, younger son of Josef; also applied to the area allotted to that tribe: partly in the Carmel, partly in Transjordan.

Mandate — Instrument created by the League of Nations in 1919 under which “advanced nations” could be entrusted with the administration of territories, formerly controlled by Germany or Turkey, “inhabited by peoples not yet able to stand by themselves under the strenuous conditions of the modern world.” Palestine came under a British Mandate in 1920 with the responsibility for giving effect to the Balfour Declaration in favor of the “establishment of a National Home for the Jewish people in Palestine.”

Mandatory Government — The British government administering Palestine and Transjordan under the Mandate (q.v.).

Mandelbaum House — House in Jerusalem which under the Armistice Agreement of 1949 remained in no-man's land, on the border between Israel-controlled and Jordan-controlled territory; near it was the Mandelbaum Gate, the only authorized entry point from the one to the other. The meetings of the Mixed Armistice Agreements took place nearby.

Ma'oz Haim — Kibbutz in the Beit Shean Valley, 5 km. to the east of the city of Beit Shean (Beisan).

Mao Tse Tung (1893–1976) — Leader and a founder of Chinese Communist Party; first Chairman of Chinese People's Republic.

Mapai (acronym for Mifleget Poalei Eretz Israel—the Party of Eretz Israel Workers) — Socialist Zionist party. Founded upon the merger

of Achdut Ha'Avoda and Hapoel Hatzair in 1930, it constituted the central and dominant political force in the Labor movement, in the Yishuv of Palestine, in the Zionist movement, and later in the State of Israel. In 1965 joined with the reconstituted Achdut Ha'Avoda-Poalei Zion to form the first Alignment, which in 1968 merged with Rafi to form the Israel Labor party. As long as Mapai existed, all the Prime Ministers, all Presidents but one, all Knesset Speakers but one, all Secretaries General of the Histadrut belonged to that party.

Mapam (acronym for Mifleget Poalim Meuhedet—United Workers party) — Zionist Socialist party formed in 1948 through merger of Hashomer Hatzair and Achdut Ha'Avoda (q.v.). In the early years followed a pro-Moscow policy, which it disavowed after Stalin's death. For many years a partner of Mapai in the Knesset and government, it advocated a more Marxist socio-economic program; greater neutrality in foreign policy; greater restraint in defense; a more forthcoming attitude to Palestinian Arab demands.

Mareshah (Tel) — Ancient settlement in the Shefela, 2.5 km. south of Beit Govrin.

Marlin, Shmuel (1910–) — Born in Kishinev; Secretary of Revisionist Party Executive 1933–38. During World War II cooperated with Hillel Cook (q.v.) in the U.S. Immigrated 1948. Member of the First Knesset for Herut.

Marshall, George C. (1880–1959) — American Army officer and statesman. Chief of Staff 1939–45; Secretary of State 1947–49, during which time initiated the Marshall Plan for which he was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize. Secretary of Defense 1950–51.

Massada — Ruins of castle overlooking the Dead Sea. Founded by the Hasmoneans and fortified by Herod, it was held by Jewish Zealots from 66 to 73 CE, three years after the fall of Jerusalem. They preferred suicide to surrender, and thus became a symbol in Jewish history.

Mazor, Eliahu (1889–1973) — Born in Poland, immigrated 1940. President, Jewish community of Warsaw 1933–38. Industrialist. Member of First Knesset for Religious Front (Agudat Israel).

Megiddo — Kibbutz in the west of Esdraelon Valley; near ancient Tel, remains of one of the earliest and most important fortified towns in the country, located at the mouth of the Valley of Iron (Wadi Ara), at a junction of the Via Maris linking Egypt with Syria and Mesopotamia.

Megillat Hamedina — Name proposed but not used for the Official Gazette of the newly established State of Israel.

Meir (Meyerson), Golda (1898–1978) — Born in Russia, educated in the U.S., immigrated 1921. Labor leader; fourth Prime Minister of Israel. Active in the Histadrut; Secretary Women Workers' Council 1928; Head of Histadrut Political Department 1936. In 1946 appointed acting Head of Jewish Agency Political Department when Sharett (Shertok) (q.v.) detained by British authorities. Met, in vain, with King Abdullah of Jordan to achieve an agreement. First Israel Ambassador to Moscow 1948. Member of the Knesset 1949–74. Minister of Labor 1949–56; of Foreign Affairs 1956–66. In 1966 appointed Secretary General of Mapai. Upon the death of Levi Eshkol in 1969 was elected Prime Minister. Although Mapai retained a reduced plurality in the Knesset in elections of 1974, and even though the Commission of Inquiry did not find her personally responsible for the surprise at the beginning of the Yom Kippur War, she resigned from the government and from the Knesset in the wake of that war in 1974.

Mekor Haim — (literally: source of life) — Jewish quarter in the southwest of Jerusalem, originally an agricultural settlement. Surrounded by Arab quarters, it was isolated during several months at the beginning of 1948 until relieved in the course of a Hagana operation at the end of April of that year.

Menora (literally: candelabrum) — The seven-branched candelabrum used in the Temple of Jerusalem, symbolically included in the official emblem of the State of Israel.

Meridor, Ya'acov (1913–) — Born in Poland, immigrated "illegally" in 1932 through Lebanese border. Commander of the Irgun 1941–43. Member of the First, Third, Fourth, Fifth and Sixth Knessets for Herut. After years of intensive economic activity, elected to the Tenth Knesset in 1981; Minister of Development in the first Begin government 1977–81.

Meteor — French-made fighter plane, utilized by Israel Air Force from 1955.

Metulla — Rural settlement in Upper Galilee, on the border with Lebanon, at the northern tip of the finger of Galilee, founded in 1896 by immigrants from Russia.

Mevo Betar — Cooperative moshav, smallholder settlement, 10 km. southwest of Jerusalem; established 1950 by Herut.

Migs — Soviet-made fighter planes, used increasingly by Arab air forces from 1955 onwards, upgraded over the years from the MiG-15 to the MiG-23 model.

Michoels, S. — Soviet Jewish writer. Active in the Anti-Fascist Committee during World War II, was accused of cosmopolitanism and executed in 1953.

Mikunis, Shmuel (1903–1982) — Born in Russia, immigrated 1921. Actor and co-founder of the Haohel Theater. Trained as an engineer in France. From 1939 Secretary General and leader of the Palestine Communist party; retained that position after most Arab members abandoned the party in 1943. Member of the People's Council, and the Provisional Council of State in 1948. Member of the Knesset from First to Sixth Knessets, heading the Israel Communist List.

Mindszenty, Josef (Cardinal) (1892–1975) — Catholic Primate of Hungary. Imprisoned for anti-German activities during World War II. Opposed Communist regime in Hungary; arrested on charges of treason 1948. Released in October 1956, took refuge in the American Embassy; ultimately permitted to emigrate to Austria.

Mintz, Benjamin (1903–1961) — Born in Lodz, Poland; immigrated 1925. One of the founders of Poalei Agudat Israel (q.v.), and its leader for many years. Member of the Provisional Council of State. Member of the First to the Fourth Knessets. Deputy Speaker. Joined government as Minister of Posts in 1960, against strong opposition and violent, often very personal, attacks.

Mishmar Haemek — Kibbutz in the west of the Esdraelon Valley, 6 km. northwest of Megiddo junction. Founded 1936. Scene of heavy fighting in April 1948.

Mishmar Hayarden — Rural settlement in Upper Galilee, on the West Bank of the Jordan River, near the Bridge of the Daughters of Jacob. Founded 1890. Captured by Syrians in 1948. Reestablished in 1949, in demilitarized zone.

Mitle — Strategic mountain pass in the western part of the Sinai Peninsula.

Mizrachi — See Hamizrachi.

Moab — Ancient nation in hilly region east of Dead Sea, sporadically at war with the Hebrews.

Moetzet Hamedina — Hebrew for (Provisional) Council of State.

Morgenthau, Henry Jr. (1891–1967) — U.S. Secretary of Treasury 1934–45; author of plan for converting German economy after World War II. Initiated War Refugee Board to rescue victims of Nazi oppression. Opposed U.S. arms embargo against Israel. General Chairman of the United Jewish Appeal 1947–50; Honorary Chairman 1950–53.

Morrison-Grady Plan (Cantonization Plan) — British proposal for a solution of the Palestine problem, presented by Herbert Morrison in July 1946, calling for federalization under overall British Trusteeship.

Moses — Lawgiver of Israel; the leader who led his people out of bondage in Egypt to the Promised Land of Canaan.

Mosque of Omar — Erroneous name for the Dome of the Rock, on the site of the ancient Jewish Temple in Jerusalem. According to both Jewish and Muslim tradition it was here that Abraham prepared to sacrifice his son. Present structure established after Muslim conquest of Jerusalem in 638; converted successively into a basilica and again a Muslim holy site.

Motza — Jewish settlement 5 km. west of Jerusalem, on the Tel Aviv highway. Founded 1860. Scene of massacre of Jews by Arabs in 1929, and of heavy fighting in 1948.

Mount of Olives — East of the Old City of Jerusalem; site of major Jewish cemetery whose beginning dates back to ancient times. In Christian tradition Gethsemane is located on its slope.

Mount Scopus — Northeast of Jerusalem, on continuation of Mount of Olives ridge. Traditionally observation point of attacking Roman legions in 70 AD. After World War I, the Hebrew University was established there. Remained behind Arab Legion lines after the War of 1948.

Mufti (of Jerusalem) — See Haj Amin el Husseini.

Munich — Capital of Bavaria. Site of Hitler's party headquarters. Scene of Munich Pact (September 1938), signed by Germany, Italy, Great Britain and France, permitting Germany to occupy the Czech Sudetenland. Neville Chamberlain, British Prime Minister, proclaimed that the Pact had brought his countrymen "peace in our times"; it is generally considered as nadir of European and especially British appeasement of Hitler.

Myerson, Golda — See Meyerson.

Mystere — Advanced French-made fighter plane, delivered to Israel in the 1950s; characterized by its high ceiling and radius of action.

Nablus (Neapolis) — Large Arab town north of Jerusalem, near the site of the Hebrew city of Shechem. Built by Emperor Hadrian in the second century AD.

Nahal — IDF formation, whose soldiers combine military training and operations with agricultural work. Responsible for the initial stage of establishment of many new rural settlements.

Namir (Nemirovsky), Mordechai (1897–1975) — Born in Russia, immigrated 1924. Secretary of Achdut Ha'Avoda 1926–29; later Mapai. Member of First to Sixth Knessets 1951–69. Secretary General of Histadrut 1951–56; Minister of Labor and Housing 1956–59. Mayor of Tel Aviv 1959–69.

Naphtali, Peretz (Fritz) (1888–1961) — Born in Berlin, immigrated 1933. Active in German Socialist party; Chairman of German League for Labor Palestine. Economist. Represented Mapai in the first three Knessets. Minister without portfolio 1951–52; Minister of Agriculture 1952–55; Minister of Social Welfare 1959, when he retired from government and Knesset because of ill health.

Nazareth — Arab town in Lower Galilee; sacred to Christianity as site of Jesus' childhood and annunciation.

Nebi Daniel — Site sacred for Muslims in Judean mountains, 6 km. southwest of Bethlehem, near Hebron Road. Scene of heavy battle between Jewish convoy and Arabs in March 1948, culminating in the surrender of the convoy defenders.

Nebo — Mountain in Transjordan from which Moses saw the Holy Land; adopted name of an IDF officer in 1948.

Nebuchadnezzar — King of Babylonia (605–562 BCE). In 597 BCE he quelled revolt of Judea and set Zedekiah on throne. In 586 BCE he destroyed the First Temple in Jerusalem and took king and notables captive, thus beginning the Captivity.

Necho (Pharaoh) — King of Egypt (609–593 BCE), of 16th Dynasty. After fall of Nineveh in 612 BCE, he took Palestine and Syria after battle of Megiddo.

Negba — Kibbutz in the southern coastal plain, 12 km. east of Ashkelon. Founded 1939. Site of heavy battle in 1948 when Egyptian troops tried repeatedly to subdue it in the effort to open the road to the north.

Negev — Southernmost and largest region in Israel, mostly arid, comprising about one-half of the country.

Nes Ziona — Town, formerly village, in the center of the coastal plain, founded in 1883. In 1948 headquarters of the southern front.

Netanya — Coastal town in the Sharon, named after philanthropist Nathan Strauss. Founded 1928.

Nir (Rafalkes), Nahum (1884–1968) — Born in Warsaw, immigrated 1925. Lawyer. Member of Provisional Council of State. Member of the First, Third, Fourth and Fifth Knessets representing first Mapam and later Achdut Ha'Avoda. Deputy Speaker throughout, he served briefly as Speaker (1959) owing to rare joining of forces of opposition parties at both ends of the House.

Nirim — Kibbutz in the western Negev, founded 1946. Attacked and nearly destroyed by Egyptian invading forces in 1948.

Nisanov, Ezekiel (1886–1911) — Born in Caucasian Mountains, immigrated 1905. Co-founder of Bar Giora and Hashomer, Jewish clandestine self-defense organizations.

Nitzana (Auja el-Hafir) — Oasis near the Negev-Sinai border; administrative center under Ottoman and British rule. Captured by IDF in December 1948. Demilitarized under Israel-Egypt Armistice Agreement; seat of the Mixed Armistice Commission until 1956.

NKVD — Soviet secret police; forerunner of the KGB.

Nordau, Max (1849–1923) — Born in Hungary, died in Paris. Author, physician and Zionist leader. One of the earliest and most effective supporters of Theodor Herzl.

Nukrashi (Pasha) (1888–1948) — Prime Minister of Egypt 1945–1948. Outlawed Moslem Brotherhood; assassinated by one of its members in December 1948.

Nurock, (Rabbi) Mordechai (1884–1962) — Born in Latvia, immigrated 1947. Leader of Latvian Jewry; for a while Prime Minister of Latvia. Member of the Knesset 1949–62, representing Mizrachi (United Religious Front); beginning in 1952 served for some time as Minister of Posts.

The Observer — British daily newspaper.

⓪g — King of Bashan; giant, conquered by Israelites.

⓪lmert, **Mordechai** (1911–) — Born in Russia, immigrated via China 1933. Head of Settlement Department of the Herut movement. Member of the Third and Fourth Knessets.

⓪mar (581–644) — Second Caliph; converted to Islam in 618, in his reign Islam became an imperial power.

⓪ren, **Mordechai** (1905–) — Born in Galicia, immigrated 1929. Left wing Mapam leader. Detained and condemned by Czechoslovak authorities. His trial had major impact on pro-Soviet orientation of Mapam.

Orenstein, Mordechai — See Oren.

ORT (Organization for Rehabilitation through Training) — Jewish vocational training agency, founded in Russia 1880, for purpose of ameliorating condition of Jewish masses through modern vocational training. Eventually established branches in Israel (1949); in many European, North African and Asian, and more recently Latin American countries. Although dedicated primarily to Jews, has been active also among the general population.

Palmach (Hebrew acronym for shock troops) — Hagana formation, established in 1941 to prepare for the eventuality of British evacuation of Palestine under Axis military pressure. Based on full-time service, dedicated partly to agricultural work, hence its emblem: two ears of wheat and a sword. Subsequently served as the reserve force at the disposal of the Hagana High Command; also comprised specialized units, including nuclei of clandestine Air Force and Navy. During War of Independence consisted of three brigades involved in some of the heaviest fighting. Its headquarters dissolved in October 1948, by order of Ben-Gurion.

Partition Plan — Plan for the partition of Palestine, adopted by the General Assembly of the UN on 29 November 1947.

Pasha (Glubb) — See Glubb Pasha.

Passfield (Lord) (former Sidney Webb) — British Colonial Secretary. In the wake of the Arab riots of 1929, and pursuant to the Hope-Simpson Report which concluded that the economic absorptive capacity of Palestine had been exhausted, issued White Paper, reinterpreting Balfour Declaration and drastically arresting the development of the Jewish National Home.

Peel Commission — Royal commission appointed by British government in May 1936 under the chairmanship of Viscount Peel. The majority recommended the partition of Palestine into Arab and Jewish states, with Jerusalem and a corridor leading to it remaining under British rule. The Jewish state was to comprise all of Galilee, the Valley of Esdraelon, and part of the coastal plain; altogether 1,000 sq. mi. (2,500 sq. km.).

People's Council — Representative Assembly established in Palestine in May 1948, comprising 37 members drawn from Jewish Agency and from National Committee; upon the declaration of independence became Provisional Council of State.

Peri, Eliezer (1902–1970) — Born in Galicia, immigrated 1926. Co-founder of Kibbutz Merhavia. Mapam representative in First and

Second Knessets; abandoned the party following the establishment of the Alignment between Mapam and Israel Labor party.

Persitz, Shoshana (1893–1969) — Born in Russia, immigrated 1925. Publisher, educator. Member of Tel Aviv Municipality. Member of the First to Third Knessets representing General Zionists; chairperson of Education and Culture Committee.

Petah Tikva — City in the central coastal plain, 10 km. east of Tel Aviv. Founded 1878 as first Jewish agricultural settlement in modern times. City since 1937.

Petlyura — Ukrainian nationalist leader, responsible for widespread atrocities against Jews in the aftermath of Russia's defeat in World War I.

Pharaoh Necho — See Necho.

Pinkas, David Zvi (1895–1952) — Born in Hungary, immigrated 1925. Mizrahi. Member of Provisional Council of State and of the First and Second Knessets. Chairman of Finance Committee. In 1952 Minister of Communications.

Pisga (literally: peak) — Mountain east of the Jordan.

PKP (Hebrew acronym for Palestine Communist party) — See Maki.

Plehve, Vyacheslav K. (1864–1904) — Russian Minister of Interior; responsible for repressive and anti-Semitic policies; met with Herzl to discuss Zionist solution for Jewish problem.

Poalei Agudat Israel — Aguda (q.v.) Workers' Organization, set up in Poland in 1922; initiated activities in Palestine in 1925. While identified with Aguda on religious matters, advocates cooperation with secular workers' organization and service in the IDF. In most elections ran on joint list with Aguda. In 1960 joined Coalition against the advice of the Aguda Council of Sages.

Poalei Zion — Hebrew for Workers of Zion. Jewish Socialist-Nationalist Workers' party which first emerged in 1901 when widespread associations of Zionist workers met in Minsk. Movement which sought to combine political Zionism with the class interests of the Jewish proletariat and the realization of socialism. After several splits and mergers combined with other parties to establish Mapai (q.v.) in 1930. Ben-Gurion and Ben Zvi (q.v.) were among its early adherents.

Port Said — Port in Egypt, on the Mediterranean, at the northern entrance of the Suez Canal, founded 1859.

Pogromchik (Russian) — Participant in attack on Jews.

- Praesidium** (of the Knesset) — Knesset body comprising the Speaker and his deputies.
- Procopius** (d.562) — Byzantine historian.
- Progressives** — Political party in Israel, established in October 1948 through unification of Haoved Hatzioni, Aliya Hadasha and the Union of General Zionists (A) (q.v.).
- Provisional Council of State** — Legislature of Israel from 14 May 1948 to 14 February 1949.
- Provisional Government** (Cabinet) — Government of the State of Israel from 14 May 1948 to 7 March 1949.
- Raab** (Family) — Co-founders of Petah Tikva (q.v.).
- Rachel's Tomb** — Tomb of Jacob's favorite wife, near Bethlehem.
- R.A.F.** — Royal Air Force.
- Rafael, Yitzhak** (1914–) — Born in Poland, immigrated 1935. Hapoel Hamizrachi, Mafdal (National Religious Party). Head of Jewish Agency Immigration Department 1948–54; member of the Second to the Eighth Knessets. Deputy Minister of Health 1961–65; Minister of Religious Affairs 1974–77.
- Rafah** (Rafiach) — Arab town in the south of the Gaza Strip, astride the Egyptian border.
- Ramallah** — Arab town in the northern Judean mountains, 13 km. north of Jerusalem.
- Ramat Rachel** — Kibbutz in the south of Jerusalem; founded 1926. Destroyed by Arab attackers in 1929; suffered during the riots of 1936–39; captured by Egyptian irregular troops and destroyed, subsequently recaptured, in 1948; rebuilt in 1952.
- Ramle** — Town on the border of the Shefela and the coastal plain; established in 717 as the center of Muslim rule.
- Ras al-Nakab** — Promontary, 10 km. northwest of Eilat (q.v.).
- Ras Natzrani** — Bulge on the coast of the Gulf of Eilat, opposite the island of Tiran; Egyptian stronghold from which navigation in the Tiran Straits was interdicted.
- Rathenau, Walter** (1867–1922) — German Jewish industrialist and statesman; Minister of Reconstruction 1921, and Foreign Minister 1922. Assassinated by German nationalists.
- Raziel-Na'or, Esther** (1911–) — Born in Russia, immigrated 1923. Active in IZL. Member of First to Eighth Knessets.
- Recanati, Abraham** (1888–1980) — Born in Saloniki, Greece; immigrated 1934. Active in Revisionist movement. Member of First Knesset, Herut.
- Rehavia** — Jewish quarter in west Jerusalem, founded 1921.
- Rehoboam** (King) (932–914 BCE) — Son of Solomon; under him the northern tribes revolted and formed the new Kingdom of Israel.
- Reilly** (General) — American soldier, head of the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization in Palestine.
- Remez, Aharon** (1919–) — Born in Palestine; first Commander of the Israel Air Force. Member of the Third Knesset.
- Remez, David** (1886–1951) — Born in Russia, immigrated 1913. Achdut Ha'Avoda, subsequently Mapai. Secretary General of the Histadrut 1935–45; first Minister of Transportation; subsequently Minister of Education.
- Repetor, Berl** (1902–1989) — Born in Russia, immigrated 1920. Achdut Ha'Avoda, later Mapai, then Mapam. Active in Histadrut. Member of the Provisional Council of State and of the First Knesset for Mapam.
- Revivim** — Kibbutz in the northern Negev, 25 km. south of Beersheba; established 1943.
- Rhee, Singman** (b.1875) — President of the Republic of (South) Korea 1948–60.
- Rhodes Lines** — Armistice lines established by the Armistice Agreements signed on the island of Rhodes in 1949.
- Ribbentrop, Joachim von** — German Foreign Minister under Hitler 1938–45.
- Riftin, Ya'akov** (1907–1978) — Born in Poland, immigrated 1929. Hashomer Hatzair and Mapam. Member of the Knesset 1949–65. Upon the establishment of the Alignment with the Labor party left Mapam and established Independent Zionist left-wing party, which failed in Histadrut elections.
- Rimalt, Dr. Elimelech** (1907–1987) — Born in Galicia, immigrated 1939. Educator. General Zionist. Member of the Knesset 1951–77. Chairman of the Education and Culture Committee, active in promoting educational reform. Minister of Posts 1969.
- Ringelblum, Dr. Emanuel** (1900–1944) — Born in Galicia. Educator, historian. Poalei Zion leader and an organizer of the Warsaw Ghetto revolt. Killed by Gestapo.

Rishon Lezion — Town in central coastal plain, 8 km. south of Tel Aviv, founded 1882.

Rokach, Israel (1889–1959) — Born in Jaffa. Electrical engineer. General Zionist. Mayor of Tel Aviv 1936–53. Member of First to Third Knessets. Minister of Interior 1953–55. Deputy Speaker 1957–59.

Rosen (Rosenblueth), Pinhas (Felix) (1887–1978) — Born in Germany, immigrated 1931. Lawyer. President of German Zionist Organization. Leader of Progressive party, subsequently Liberal, ultimately Independent Liberal Party (q.v.). Member of the First to the Sixth Knessets. First Minister of Justice.

Rosenberg, Ethel and Julius — Condemned to death for conspiring to transmit atomic secrets to the USSR during World War II; executed June 1953.

Rosh Ha'ayin — Urban settlement, 4 km. east of Petah Tikva, established in 1950.

Rosh Hanikra — Promontory on the Mediterranean, on the border between Israel and Lebanon.

Rothschild, (Baron) Edmond de (1845–1934) — Banker, philanthropist, patron of scientific and cultural projects and supporter of settlement projects in Palestine.

Rubin, Dr. Hanan (1908–1962) — Born in Germany, immigrated 1933. Hashomer Hatzair, then Mapam. Member of the First to the Fifth Knessets.

Rubin, Reuven (b.1893) — Born in Rumania, immigrated 1912. One of Israel's foremost painters. Israel's first Ambassador to Romania.

Rude Pravo — Czech daily newspaper; official organ of Czech Communist party.

Rutenberg, Pinchas (1879–1942) — Born in Ukraine, immigrated 1919. Electrical engineer. Participated in aborted attempt at revolution in Russia 1905. Active in Jewish self-defense; commander of Tel Aviv during riots of 1921. In the same year obtained concession for utilization of kinetic energy of the Yarmuk-Jordan catchment area. Founder of Palestine Electrical Corporation 1923. Maintained close contact with Emir Abdullah.

Sa'id Nuri (1888–1958) — Iraqi officer and statesman. Trained in Turkish Military Academy, joined Arab revolt under Faisal 1916; first chief of staff of Iraqi Army 1921. From 1930 served 14 times as Prime Minister. Negotiated treaty with Great Britain ending the British Mandate and establishing Iraqi independence. Conceived

the Fertile Crescent concept calling for the unification of Syria, Iraq, Transjordan and Palestine under Hashemite rule, with a measure of autonomy for Palestine Jews. Autocrat; anti-Communist; assassinated in the course of the 1958 revolt which brought Hashemite rule in Iraq to an end.

Safed — City in Upper Galilee; one of the three main Crusader fortresses. In the sixteenth century, center of Jewish mysticism (Kabbala). Its Jewish quarter was attacked by Arabs in 1929, and again in 1936. Besieged at the beginning of the War of 1948, it was relieved by the Palmach, in an operation which resulted in the capture of the Arab parts of the city.

Salame — Arab village, on the eastern outskirts of Tel Aviv. Served as base for attacks against the city in 1947–48; subsequently abandoned.

Samaria — Northern section of the central highlands of Palestine, named after the city of Samaria (Shomron, later Sebastia), capital of the biblical Kingdom of Israel. From 1949 to 1967 mostly in Jordanian territory; in the wake of the Six Day War came under Israel military government.

Samuel, Herbert (Sir, later Viscount) (1870–1963) — Leader of British Liberal party; first Jewish member of British Cabinet. First British High Commissioner for Palestine 1920–25. During World War I contributed to the formulation of Balfour Declaration. As High Commissioner laid foundations of Mandatory administrative system. Appointed Haj Amin al-Husseini (q.v.) as Mufti of Jerusalem. During his tenure the quota system for Jewish immigrants, based on the economic absorptive capacity of the country, was introduced by the Mandatory government.

Sanhedrin (Hagedola, the Great) — Supreme Jewish juridical and legislative body in Jerusalem, during the period of the Second Temple; perished with the destruction of the Temple.

Sapir, Josef (1902–1972) — Born in Jaffa. Agronomist. Active in Farmers' Union, leader of Jewish Citrus Growers. Leader of the "bourgeois" center-right, and their representative on Hagana High Command. Mayor of Petah Tikva 1940–51; Member of the Knesset for General Zionists, later Gahal, from 1949 until his death. Minister of Transport 1952–55; Minister without portfolio 1967–70.

Sapir (Koslowsky), Pinchas (1909–1975) — Born in Poland, immigrated 1929. Mapai. Active in Mekorot (water company). Director General of Ministry of Defense 1948–53; of Finance 1953–55. Minister of Commerce and Industry 1955–64; of Finance 1964–74.

Sarafand (Zerifin) — Major British, subsequently IDF military base in the coastal plain, 3 km. northeast of Ramle.

Saris (Shoresh) — Arab village about 19 km. east of Jerusalem, astride the Jerusalem-Tel Aviv road. Base for several attacks against Jewish convoys to the besieged city; captured by Hagana in May 1948. Cooperative Jewish settlement since end of that year.

Saud (Ibn Abdel Aziz) (1901–1969) — King of Saudi Arabia, following his father's death, from 1953 until his ouster and expulsion from the Kingdom in 1964.

Scopus — See Mount Scopus.

Second Temple — Temple built in Jerusalem at the end of the fifth century BCE by exiles returned from Babylon; enlarged by Maccabees in the second century BCE; rebuilt completely by Herod at the beginning of the Common Era; destroyed by Romans following the capture of Jerusalem in 70 CE.

Sefer Torah — Scroll containing the handwritten Hebrew text of the five books of Moses, the Pentateuch, used by Jews for liturgical purposes.

Sejera (Ilania) — Cooperative village in Lower Galilee, near vital road junction. Founded 1899 as an agricultural estate; served as transit station for many young immigrants, including David Ben-Gurion, and birthplace of Hashomer (q.v.). In 1948 site of heavy fighting with Arab Liberation Army, which attempted to isolate Galilee from the rest of the country.

Sephardim — Descendants of Jews expelled from Spain and Portugal at the end of the fifteenth century.

Serlin, Joseph (1906–1974) — Born in Bialistok, Poland; immigrated 1933. Lawyer. General Zionist, then Liberal. Member of the Knesset 1949–74. Deputy Speaker of Second, Fifth and Sixth Knessets. Minister of Health 1952–55.

Seventh Brigade — Armored infantry brigade, established in May 1948, to serve as strategic reserve; involved soon afterwards in heavy fighting against the Arab Legion (q.v.) for the road to Jerusalem.

Sha'ag (Zwebner), Abraham Chaim (Rabbi) (1883–1958) — Born in Jerusalem. Co-founder of Mizrachi in Palestine. Member of National Committee of Palestine Jewry, active in social welfare. Member of First Knesset, National Religious Front.

Sha'ar Hagai (Bab el-Wad) — Entrance from the Shefela going up the Judean mountains to Jerusalem.

Sha'ar Hagolan — Kibbutz in the Jordan Valley, about 2 km. southeast of the Zemach junction.

Shapira, Moshe (Chaim) (1902–1970) — Born in Grodno, Russia; immigrated 1926. Leader of Hapoel Hamizrachi; subsequently President of National Religious Party, established in 1956. Deputy member, later member of the Executive of the Jewish Agency from 1935 to 1948, responsible for immigration. Minister of Immigration and Health in Provisional Government. Member of the Knesset 1949–70. Member of Cabinet almost continuously, holding at various times the portfolios of Minister of Interior, Social Welfare, and Religious Affairs.

Sharef, Ze'ev (1906–1984) — Born in Romania, immigrated 1925. Secretary of the Cabinet 1948–57; Director General, Prime Minister's Office 1957–59; Member of the Knesset 1965–74; Minister of Commerce and Industry 1966; concurrently Minister of Finance as of 1968; Minister of Housing 1969–74.

Sharett (Shertok), Moshe (1894–1965) — Born in Kherson, Russia; immigrated 1906. Mapai. Studied law in Constantinople, served briefly in Turkish Army 1915; after World War I continued his studies in London. Head of Political Department of the Jewish Agency 1933–48. Member of the Provisional Council of State. Member of the Knesset 1949–65. First Foreign Minister of Israel 1948–56. Prime Minister 1953–55. Resigned following disagreements with Ben-Gurion. Chairman of the Jewish Agency Executive 1961–65.

Sharm el-Sheikh (Ophira) — Southern tip of the Sinai Peninsula, controlling the Straits of Tiran. From 1971 to 1982 site of urban Jewish settlement.

Shattner, Mordechai (1904–1964) — Born in Galicia, immigrated 1924. Mapai. Member of Kibbutz Ein Harod. Active in Va'ad Leumi.

Shazar (Robashov), Zalman (1889–1974) — Born in Russia, immigrated 1924. Third President of Israel. Poalei Zion; Achdut Ha'Avoda; later Mapai. Historian and journalist. Subeditor, later editor of *Davar*. Member of the Knesset 1949–59; Minister of Education and Culture 1949–50; President 1963–73.

Shechem (Nablus) — Arab city in the Samarian mountains; settled continuously from Canaanite period.

Sheffer, Ze'ev (1891–1964) — Born in Russia, immigrated 1913. Mapai. Member of Kibbutz Ayelet Hashachar. Member of the Hagana Command. Deputy Speaker of the Second Knesset.

Sheikh Jarrah — Arab quarter in northeast Jerusalem, astride the road to Mount Scopus; site of massacre of passengers of Jewish convoy in April 1948, and of heavy fighting thereafter, as well as in 1967.

Sheinkin, Menahem (1871–1924) — Born in Russia, immigrated 1906. Early Zionist leader. One of the founders of Tel Aviv.

Shenhavi, Mordechai (1900–) — Born in Russia, immigrated 1919. Mapam. Member of Kibbutz Mishmar Haemek. Active in development of kibbutz industry.

Shertok (Shertock), Moshe — See Sharett.

Shimoni, David (1886–1956) — Born in Russia, immigrated 1909. Hebrew poet.

Shishak (Sheshonk I) — Egyptian king of the 22nd Dynasty, died ca.924 BCE.

Shitrit, Bekhor Shalom (1895–1967) — Born in Tiberias. Mapai. Police officer under the British Mandate. Lawyer. Chief Magistrate of Tel Aviv 1945. Minister of Police and Minorities in Provisional Government. Member of the Knesset from 1949 until his death; Minister of Police 1948–66.

Shofar — Ram's horn used by Jews for liturgical purposes.

Shofman, Josef (1903–1978) — Born in Warsaw, Poland; immigrated 1940. Lawyer, industrialist. Revisionist party; Herut. Member of the Knesset 1955–69; Ambassador to Venezuela 1970.

Shostak, Eliezer (1911–) — Born in Poland, immigrated 1935. Herut; subsequently Merkaz Hofshi, La'am, Likud. Secretary General of National Workers' Union, linked with Revisionist party. Member of the Knesset since 1951. At various times Deputy Speaker. Minister of Health 1977–84.

Shulhan Arukh — Codification of Jewish law, completed in the sixteenth century by Rabbi Josef Karo of Safed.

Sinai — Peninsula and land bridge between Asia and Africa.

Slansky, Rudolf — Leader of Communist party and Vice Premier of Czechoslovakia; tried in 1952 for "Trotskyite, Titoist and Zionist" activities, found guilty and executed.

Sneh (Kleinbaum), Moshe (1909–1972) — Born in Radzyn, Poland; immigrated 1940. General Zionist, subsequently Mapam, ultimately Communist. Physician. Head of Hagana High Command, 1942–46. Director of Jewish Agency European Office 1946–47. Member of the Knesset 1949–65, and again from 1969 until his death, representing

Mapam until the Prague Trials (see Slansky) in 1953; subsequently the Communist party; ultimately the New Communist Party (Maki; q.v.) which considered Israel's actions in the Six Day War as legitimate self-defense.

Sobibor — Major Nazi concentration and extermination camp in Poland 1942–45.

Sodom — Biblical city, at the southern end of the Dead Sea. Site of major mineral extraction plant. In 1948 isolated for over six months. Used figuratively as incarnation of evil, particularly parsimoniousness.

Sokolov, Nahum (1859–1936) — Early Zionist leader; founder and editor of the Zionist movement weekly 1907; President of the World Zionist Organization 1931–36.

Solomon's Gulf — see Eilat, Gulf of.

Sprinzak, Joseph (1885–1959) — Born in Russia, immigrated 1910. Leader of Hapoel Hatzair, moderate left wing political party; subsequently one of the founders and leaders of Mapai (q.v.). Chairman of the Zionist Action Committee. Secretary General of the Histadrut 1945–49. Speaker of the Provisional Council of State. First Speaker of the Knesset 1949–59. Largely responsible for the Knesset rules of procedure and conduct.

Stamper, Joshua (1852–1908) — Born in Hungary, immigrated 1869. Co-founder of Petah Tikva 1878.

Stamper, Shlomo Yitzhak (1877–1961) — Son of Joshua. Born in Jerusalem. Chairman of the Petah Tikva Local Council and its first Mayor.

Star of David — Six-cornered star; since Middle Ages a Jewish symbol used in synagogues and cemeteries; subsequently utilized in the distinctive badge, the yellow star, to differentiate between Jew and non-Jew. Constitutes part of the flag of the Zionist movement and the State of Israel.

Sten gun — Submachine gun developed in Great Britain during World War II for relatively cheap mass production; one of the first products of Israel's fledgling arms industry.

Sternberg, Benzion (1894–1962) — Born in Bukovina (later Romania); leader of Revisionist party in Romania; immigrated 1940. Member of Provisional Council of State.

Stuermer, Der — Virulent anti-Semitic and pornographic weekly, published in Nuremberg, Germany from the early 1920s to 1945, by Julius Streicher, executed as war criminal following Nuremberg trial.

Success (Lake) — See Lake Success.

Sudanese (Cushites in the Bible) — Citizens of the Sudan; some participated in the War of 1948 in the ranks of the Egyptian Army.

Sukenik, Elazar (Professor) (1889–1953) — Born in Poland, immigrated 1912. Archeologist. In 1947 identified Dead Sea Scrolls and purchased some of them. Father of Yigael Yadin (q.v.).

Sutzkever, Abraham (1913–) — Born in Lithuania, immigrated 1947. Yiddish poet. During World War II active in the Vilna Ghetto; escaped and joined partisans.

Tabib, Abraham (1889–1950) — Born in Yemen, immigrated 1907. Active in Organization of Yemenites. Member of Va'ad Leumi, representing Yemenites, and from 1944 Mapai. Member of First Knesset.

Tallit — Prayer-shawl, made of white cloth with dark stripes, with tassels at the four corners, worn by Jews during prayer.

Tamad (Bir) — Oasis in western Sinai.

Targum Yonatan — Translation of the Bible into Aramaic.

Tashah — The year 5708 of the Hebrew calendar, coinciding mostly with 1948.

Tel-al-Muteila — Hill northwest of the Sea of Galilee, near the mouth of the Jordan River. In May 1951 site of bitter battle with Syrian forces trying to establish a foothold to the east of the river.

Tel Aviv — Coastal city in the center of Israel, founded in 1909. First Jewish city; name taken from the Hebrew translation of Theodor Herzl's utopian novel *Altneuland*. In 1950 merged with neighboring Jaffa.

Templars — Fundamentalist Protestant religious sect; took its name from a medieval monastic order active at the time of the Crusades. During the second half of the nineteenth century Templars from southern Germany immigrated to Palestine where they established a series of agricultural settlements and urban quarters.

Temple Mount — Site of the First and Second Temple in Jerusalem; since the Arab conquest of the city in the seventh century partly occupied by the Dome of the Rock and the Mosque of el-Azhar.

Tewfik Toubi (1922–) — Born in Haifa. One of the leaders of the National Liberation League-Palestine Arab Communist organization in the 1940s; joined Israel Communist party in August 1948. Member of the Knesset since its inception representing Israel Communist party, subsequently the New Communist List (Rakach); ulti-

mately Hadash-Front for Democracy and Peace. Member of World Peace Council. Publisher of Communist weekly.

Tiberias (Lake of) — See Sea of Galilee, also known as Kinneret or Lake of Galilee, after the main town on its shores.

Tiran (Straits of) — Waterway connecting the Red Sea with the Gulf of Eilat.

Tirat Zvi — Kibbutz in the Beisan Valley. Founded in 1937; named after Rabbi Zvi Kalisher, early proponent of religious Zionism. Scene of heavy fighting in 1938 and 1948.

Titoists — Followers of Josip Broz Tito, leader of Yugoslavia after the World War II; proponent of Marxism independent of the Soviet Union.

Titus (ca.40–81 CE) — Roman emperor who captured and destroyed Jerusalem 70 CE.

Titus' Arch — Erected in Rome by Titus' successor to commemorate his triumph over the Jews.

Tnuva — Cooperative marketing organization for agricultural products sponsored by the Histadrut.

Torah — Hebrew name for the Pentateuch, the first five books of the Bible; also used to denote the sum total of Jewish religious teachings.

Toubi, Tewfik — See Tewfik Toubi.

Transition Act — One of the first laws adopted by the Provisional Council of State, to regulate the constitutional arrangements of the new State of Israel; also known as the "Little Constitution."

Transjordan — Area of Palestine east of the Jordan River.

Triangle — Heartland of Samaria, including the towns of Tulkarm, Kalkilya and Nablus.

Trotskyites — Followers of Leon Trotsky (1879–1940), Communist leader who advocated "permanent revolution," or "pure Communism."

Truce Supervision Organization (UNTSO) — Organization established by resolution of the United Nations Security Council, in May 1948, to supervise the truce in Palestine; subsequently charged with similar tasks concerning armistice, separation of forces and other arrangements. Its first chief was Count Bernadotte (q.v.).

Tuchazevsky, Marshall — Russian general during World War II.

Tulkarm — Arab town on the border between the Samarian mountains and the Sharon Valley, 14 km. east of Netanya.

Tzemah — Town at the southern tip of the Sea of Galilee; near junction of road coming from the south, following the Jordan River, and one following the circumference of the lake.

UJA (United Jewish Appeal of America) — Fund-raising arm of organized North American Jewry, for the development of the Jewish National Home in Palestine, later Israel, and the relief and reconstruction of distressed Jewish communities throughout the world.

Um el Fahm — Arab town, between Hadera and Afula, overlooking the Iron Valley.

UN Emergency Force — Military force established by the United Nations in November 1956, to facilitate and supervise the withdrawal of British, French and Israeli forces from Egypt; its first chief was the Canadian General E.L.M. Burns.

Ussishkin, Menahem (1863–1942) — Born in Mogilev, Russia; immigrated 1919. Engineer. Active in Hovevei Zion (q.v.) from 1885, joined Zionist movement at its inception. Spokesman of Russian Zionists, participated in all Congresses. Leader of practical Zionists who emphasized importance of practical work in Palestine over political and diplomatic work elsewhere. Led revolt against Herzl over Uganda (1904); major opponent of Partition in 1937. From 1919–23 presided over the representative body of Palestine Jewry. Chairman of Jewish National Fund 1923–42.

Va'ad Leumi (National Committee) — Executive of the statutory Jewish community in Palestine, recognized by the British Mandatory government as the official spokesman of the community; elected by the annual sessions of the elected assembly (Asefat Hanivcharim), its composition reflected the relative strength of the political parties.

Vampire — British-made jet fighter-bomber, supplied to Egypt in considerable quantities from 1949 to 1956.

Vardi (Rosenblum), Herzl Naftali (1903–) — Attorney, journalist. Born in Kovno, Lithuania; immigrated 1935. Joined Zionist Revisionist party at its inception; member of Provisional Council of State; signatory of Declaration of Independence.

Vilenska, Esther (1918–1975) — Born in Vilna, Lithuania; immigrated 1938. Active in Palestine, later Israel Communist party from 1940; editor of its organ *Kol Ha'am* (Voice of the People). Member of the Second, Third and Fifth Knessets.

Vilna (Vilnius) — Capital of Lithuania from 1323. Held at different periods by Russia, Germany, Poland. Its large Jewish population was virtually exterminated in the Holocaust.

Vilna Gaon (1720–1797) — Rabbi Elijah, the Gaon (Genius) of Vilna. Outstanding Jewish scholar; founder and leader of the Mitnagdim (opponents), who decried the mysticism, and what they perceived as the superstition and primitiveness of the Hassidic movement, restoring learning to its traditional central place, while trimming from it some of its overly scholastic aberrations.

Wadi Ara — Narrow valley connecting the coastal plain with the Valley of Esdraelon; part of the historical Via Maris linking Egypt with Syria and Mesopotamia. At its northern end is Megiddo (q.v.). Occupied by Iraqi troops in 1948, it was transferred to Israel under the Armistice Agreement of 1949.

War of Independence — First Israel-Arab War, waged in Palestine from the morrow of the UN Partition Resolution (29 November 1947) to the signature of the last Armistice Agreement, between Syria and Israel (20 July 1949). Local Arabs were soon joined by volunteers from neighboring countries; after Israel's Declaration of Independence on 14 May 1948 regular Arab forces invaded the country. The original Arab objective was the prevention of the establishment of a Jewish state; subsequently its elimination, and when that proved blatantly impossible, the reduction of its size; none of these was achieved.

Warhaftig, Zerach (1906–) — Born in Volkovisk, Byelorussia; immigrated via Poland, Lithuania, Japan and the U.S. in 1947. Attorney and scholar. Hapoel Hamizrachi; National Religious Front. Member of Va'ad Leumi; head of its Legal Department. Member of Provisional Council of State, and of the First to the Ninth Knessets 1949–81. Minister of Religious Affairs 1962–74.

Wehrmacht — Armed forces of the German Reich.

Weinstein, Baruch (1898–1982) — Born in Balta, Russia; immigrated 1923. Journalist. Revisionist party; after 1948 joined General Zionists.

Weizmann, Dr. Chaim (1874–1952) — Born in Motel, Russia; immigrated 1949. Professor of Chemistry. Joined Zionist movement in 1901; active in Democratic Fraction. Became British citizen in 1910. During World War I, working for British Admiralty, created synthetic acetone vital for production of explosives. Helped to procure the Balfour Declaration (q.v.). President of the Zionist Organization 1920–31, 1935–46. During World War II, advocated the estab-

lishment of a Jewish military formation to fight in Allied ranks. After the war opposed active resistance to British presence and policy in Palestine. His influence waned as Great Britain ignored its obligations towards the Jewish National Home. In 1948 invited to join the Provisional Council of State as its President; elected first President of Israel in February 1949, an office he occupied until his death.

Weizsaecker, Richard von — President of the Federal Republic of Germany; previously Mayor of Berlin; Member of the Bundestag representing Christian Democratic Union; President of the Evangelical Church. Active in the German-Israeli Parliamentary Group, has maintained his interest in Israeli and Jewish matters also while holding the office of President.

Western Land of Israel (Cisjordania) — Part of Palestine lying west of the Jordan River.

White Paper (1939) (MacDonald White Paper) — Statement of policy on Palestine issued by the British government on 17 May 1939, so called after the then Colonial Secretary Malcolm MacDonald. It provided for drastic reduction in Jewish immigration, with a total of 75,000 over five years after which further immigration would require Arab consent; prohibition of the sale of lands to Jews in some, and its severe limitation in other parts of the country, and the establishment of an independent Palestine with a two-thirds Arab majority after an interim period of 10 years. Rejected by Jews unanimously as a betrayal of solemn undertakings, and by most Arabs as not going far enough, it nevertheless served as a basis for British policy during the crucial years of the Holocaust and World War II.

Wiedergutmachung (Reparations) — German term used to denote the material reparations made to Jewish and other victims of Nazi brutality and greed.

Wilenska, Esther — See Vilenska.

Wilna — See Vilna.

Wilner, Meir (1918–) — Born in Vilna, Poland; immigrated 1938. Joined Palestine Communist party in 1939; elected to the Central Committee in 1944. Member of the Provisional Council of State and cosignatory of Declaration of Independence. Member of the Knesset since 1949, representing Israel Communist party; after split in 1965, joined the mainly Arab New Communist List (Rakach), together with Tewfik Toubi. As Secretary General he headed the party's parliamentary list. Only continuously serving member from 1948 to 1989.

WIZO — Women's International Zionist Organization, founded in London in 1920, with the aim of uniting Jewish women for the purpose of establishing and maintaining social welfare, child care and educational institutions in Palestine, later in Israel. Active in Israel and throughout the Jewish world, with the exception of the U.S.

Wolfson, David (1856–1914) — Born in Lithuania; died in Hamburg, Germany. Merchant. An advocate of ideas akin to those of Hovevei Zion, became one of Herzl's early adherents and trusted lieutenants. Second President of the World Zionist Organization 1905–11. Founder and Chairman of the Jewish Colonial Trust, the financial instrument of the WZO 1899–1914.

Ya'ari (Wald), Meir (1897–1987) — Born in Galicia, immigrated 1920. Member of Kibbutz Merhavia and foremost formulator of the principles of the Kibbutz Artzi, calling for a far-reaching collectivist approach in all spheres of life 1927; together with Ya'akov Hazan (q.v.), leader of movement for over 50 years. Co-founder of Mapam (q.v.), and for many years its Secretary General. Member of the Knesset 1949–73. Advocating Zionist Marxism, he qualified his outright pro-Soviet orientation only following the Jewish doctors' trials in Moscow and the Oren trial (q.v.) in Prague in the mid-1950s.

Yad Mordechai — Kibbutz in the southern coastal plain, named after Mordechai Anilevitz, commander of the uprising in the Warsaw Ghetto. Founded 1943; capture by Egyptian Army after heavy fighting in May 1948; subsequently recaptured and rebuilt.

Yad Vashem (Heroes' and Martyrs' Authority) — Israel official authority for the commemoration of victims of the Holocaust, established in Jerusalem in accordance with a law adopted in 1953.

Yadin (Suknik), Yigael (1917–1984) — Born in Jerusalem. Professor of Archeology; second Chief of the General Staff of the IDF 1949–52; politician. Active in the Hagana (q.v.) from early youth; Chief of Operations during War of Independence (q.v.); much of the time Acting Chief of Staff. Formulated and implemented the principles of Israel's reserve system-citizens' army. Resigned as Chief of Staff following differences with Ben-Gurion over budgetary allocations 1952. As archeologist was responsible for the excavation at Massada and Hatzor, as well as the purchase and partial deciphering of the Dead Sea scrolls. In 1976 one of the founders of the Democratic Movement for Change, as a centrist political force. Having won 15 seats, Yadin joined Begin's first government as Deputy Prime Minister and Chairman of the Ministerial Committee on

Welfare; participated in peace negotiations with Egypt. DMC disintegrated, and in 1981 Yadin returned to his archeological pursuits.

Yaffe, Bezalel (1868–1925) — Born in Grodno, Russia; immigrated 1909. Early adherent of Zionist movement in Russia; head of the Jewish Community Board of Jaffa-Tel Aviv; member of the Va'ad Leumi (q.v.).

Yariv, S. Sh. (Saba shel Yariv—Yariv's grandfather) — Nom de plume used by Ben-Gurion, after his first grandson.

Yarkon River — River crossing the coastal plain, 30 km. in length, flowing into the Mediterranean north of Tel Aviv.

Yarmuk River — Largest river in Transjordan; separates Golan from Gilead, it flows into the Jordan south of the Sea of Galilee.

Yasif (Kufr) — Large Arab rural settlement, 8 km. east of Acre.

Yassin (Dir) — See Dir Yassin.

Yehuda, Zvi (1888–1964) — Born in Russia, immigrated 1906. Co-founder of first kibbutz, Degania, and later of first moshav, Nahalal. Member of First Knesset, Mapai.

Yellin-Mor (Friedmann), Nathan (1913–1979) — Born in Poland, immigrated 1941. Leader of Lehi: Fighters for the Freedom of Israel; detained by British authorities. After the murder of Bernadotte (q.v.) detained by Israel. Amnestied, elected to First Knesset heading the Freedom Fighters' List. While most former members of Lehi subsequently joined Herut, Yellin-Mor advocated a pro-Soviet orientation and close cooperation with Palestinians.

Yemenites — Jews originating from Yemen, in the southwest of the Arabian Peninsula.

Yemin Moshe — Jewish quarter in Jerusalem; first to be established in the mid-nineteenth century outside the Old City walls. Named after its sponsor Sir Moses Montefiore. In 1948 scene of heavy fighting.

Yeshiva — Jewish religious institution of higher learning; while authorized to ordain Orthodox rabbis, frequented by many to study for study's sake, in accordance with Orthodox precepts.

Yevsekzia (Yevrei Sekzia) — Jewish section of the Soviet secret police (NKVD; KGB). Manned largely by Jews, who were widely condemned as renegades.

Yishuv — Jewish population of Palestine.

Yisrael (Agudat) — See Agudat Israel.

Yivo — Jewish scientific organization, dedicated to humanities and social sciences, including the history of Jews in Eastern Europe. Originally in Poland, it managed to transfer some of its archives and personnel to the U.S.

Yotvata — Kibbutz in the Arava, 40 km. north of Eilat; established by Nahal (q.v.) in 1951; handed to civilian settlers in 1957.

Yunichman, Shimshon (1907–1961) — Born in Poland, immigrated 1935. Physician. Revisionist, subsequently Herut. Member of the Third and Fourth Knessets.

Za'im, Hosni — See Hosni Za'im.

Zebulun — Tribe of Israel, descendent from fifth son of Jacob; believed to have settled on the Mediterranean coast, in the vicinity of the Bay of Acre.

Zhid — Pejorative term applied to Jews in Russia and Poland.

Zichron Ya'akov — Town in the southern part of Mount Carmel; founded in 1882 by immigrants from Romania, and named after Baron James de Rothschild. In 1902 venue of the first representative assembly of the Yishuv (q.v.); during World War I center of NILI, a small clandestine organization active on behalf of the British behind Ottoman lines.

Zimri — Army commander in ancient Israel, who killed his king and inherited him (1 Regum, Chapter 16); prototype of hypocrisy and ingratitude.

Zion, Hovevei — See Hovevei Zion.

Zion, Poalei — See Poalei Zion.

Zion Square — Square in the center of the Jewish part of Jerusalem.

Zionist Congress — Parliament of the Zionist movement created by Herzl. At first it met every year (1897–1901); then every second year (1903–13; 1921–39); after World War II at irregular intervals.

Zionist Executive — Elected by Zionist Congress to carry on the day-to-day operations of the movement.

Zisling, Aharon (1901–1964) — Born in Russia, immigrated 1904. Member of Kibbutz Ein Harod. Mapai; after split in 1944 leader of Achdut Ha'Avoda, then Mapam. Minister of Agriculture in Provisional Government and cosignatory of Declaration of Independence. Member of First and Second Knessets.

Zwebner (Sha'ag), A.H. — See Sha'ag.

Index

- A-Tur, 974, 1030, 2439
- Abdullah Ibn el Hussain, 87, 89, 93-94, 107, 123, 153, 182, 192, 204-05, 207-08, 210, 218, 240-41, 243, 245, 248, 257, 279, 281-82, 286-87, 415-16, 429, 431-32, 435, 503, 506, 509-11, 554-56, 564-65, 567-68, 571-77, 580, 590-93, 2128, 2190, 2435, 2469, 2478
- Abramov, S.Z., 1170, 1622-23, 1709-13, 1765-66, 2002-04
- Abramowitz, Y.M., 2284-86
- Abu Ageila, 307, 311-12, 319, 973-74, 987, 1019-21, 1046, 1087, 1557, 1606, 2435
- Abu Dhabi, 2007
- Abu Rodeis, 1975, 1978-79, 1982, 1990, 1996, 2325
- Abuhatzira, A., 1880-81
- Achdut Ha'Avoda-Poale Zion, 843, 845, 871, 873, 876, 997, 1031, 1040, 1054, 1064, 1090, 1109, 1125, 1254, 1296, 1313, 1358, 1365, 1414, 1467, 2435
- Acre, 79, 395, 415, 1270, 2126, 2435
- Addis Ababa Conference, 1384
- Aden, 1507, 1541, 1561, 1782; Jews of, 450, 1591, 1593-94
- Adenauer, Konrad, 703, 712, 715, 723-24, 734, 736-37, 740, 937, 940, 1125-26, 1129, 1199, 1321, 1354-56, 1371, 1386, 1447
- Afghanistan, 872
- Afula, 500, 947, 1606, 1730, 2435
- Agranat, Shimon, 1877, 1889, 1964, 1966, 1972, 1974, 2038, 2367, 2397
- Aguda, Agudat Israel, 2, 4, 37, 52, 76, 184, 247, 252, 280, 604, 607, 707, 726, 837, 843-44, 914, 916, 968, 1040, 1064, 1136, 1139, 1222, 1251, 1313, 1358, 1517, 1527, 1724, 1773, 1788, 2063, 2101, 2116-17, 2152, 2291, 2293-94, 2386, 2436, 2455, 2465, 2468, 2475
- Ahad Ha'am, 347, 2436
- Aharonowitz, Z., 556-58, 580-83, 600-02
- Al Aksa Mosque, 564, 1920, 2174, 2190, 2435-36
- Al Hamishmar*, 315-17, 330, 474, 601, 606, 763, 774-75, 777, 779, 798, 802, 1174, 2043, 2436, 2443
- Albania, 1386
- Aleppo, 1593
- Alexandria, 823, 1011, 1146, 1507, 1979
- Alexandront, 137, 2436
- Algeria, 941, 1458, 1507, 1632, 1682; Jews of, 720, 1592-93
- Algrabli, M., 2360
- Aliya Hadasha, 2436
- Allenby, Edmund Henry, 2437
- Allon, Yigal, 891-96, 1050-54, 1096, 1110, 1411, 1626, 1642-45, 1671-72, 1676-67, 1750, 1753-56, 1763-65, 1808, 1850, 1924, 1959, 2020-23, 2026, 2028-30, 2041-47, 2089, 2145, 2147, 2149, 2235-36, 2268-70, 2364, 2366, 2435, 2437
- Allon Plan, 2041-47, 2133, 2148-49, 2437
- Almaliah, Avraham, 472-73, 495-96, 553-54, 572, 2437
- Aloni, S., 1903-05, 1926-28, 1954-55, 1959, 1995-96, 2008-10, 2038-40, 2063, 2089, 2100-01, 2103, 2120-21, 2141-43, 2150, 2208-10, 2227-29, 2244, 2248, 2261-63, 2287-88, 2347, 2367, 2426-27, 2430, 2433
- Altalena, 135-78, 217, 250, 264, 387, 389, 445, 637, 729, 829, 1324, 2101, 2437, 2441, 2464
- Alterman, Nathan, 943-46, 955, 1601
- Altman, Arich, 97-99, 122-23, 207-08, 223, 236-38, 281-82, 300-01, 321, 323, 733, 738, 1228-30, 1280, 2437
- Alzuabi, Saif Aldin, 1809-12
- Amalek, 295, 727, 738, 1356, 1436, 2280-81, 2438
- Amar, M., 2109, 2375
- American Credit Loan, 451-85
- American Jewish Congress, 1741
- Aminadav, 947
- Amir, J., 2059
- Amit, Meir, 1971, 2294
- Amman, 87, 89, 306, 569, 582, 681, 890, 909, 1592, 1606, 1847, 2438
- Amorai, A., 2151
- Anatot, 1732
- Anglican Church, 88, 109
- Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry, 34
- Angola, 1254-59, 2018
- Anielewicz, Mordecai, 1368
- Aqaba, 288, 308, 310-11, 318, 508, 1086, 1104, 2438
- Arab Higher Committee, 35
- Arab League, 96, 111, 119, 198, 242, 273, 290, 581-82, 671, 900, 1025, 1471, 1492, 2438, 2447
- Arab Legion, 27, 36, 63, 79, 90, 109, 137, 193, 197, 256, 292, 306, 317, 432, 575, 890, 954, 967, 1031, 1602-03, 1612, 2128, 2438, 2452, 2454, 2471, 2480
- Arab Workers' Congress, 415
- Arafat, Yassir, 1860, 1968, 1980, 2000, 2018, 2027, 2033, 2126, 2205, 2305, 2328, 2335, 2417
- Aramco, 1074
- Aranne, Zalman, 800, 1167-69, 1271, 2438
- Arava, 499, 687, 2249, 2438

- Arbeli-Almoslino, S., 1708, 2052-54, 2160-61, 2236, 2265, 2405
- Arens, M., 1989-93, 2068-70, 2134, 2242-45, 2340-41, 2343
- Argentina, 800, 1078, 1132, 1143, 1619, 2025, 2281
- Argov (Grabowski), Meir — see also Grabowski, 667-68, 691, 734, 837-39, 907, 1000, 1144, 1313, 1358, 1373-74, 1376-77, 2438
- Argov, Nehemia, 1119-19
- Ariav, Chaim, 827, 907, 1038, 1097, 1099, 2438
- Arlosoroff, Chaim, 140, 146, 2438-39
- Armistice Agreements, 497-543, 571, 580-81, 587, 592, 663-667, 669-73, 677, 685, 690, 859, 876, 892, 902, 906, 934, 947-50, 954, 963, 976-77, 985, 988, 990, 1001, 1004, 1024-25, 1027, 1043-44, 1047, 1051, 1058, 1071-72, 1074-75, 1078, 1080, 1086, 1088, 1090, 1098, 1110, 1112, 1298-1300, 1302-03, 1312, 1339, 1506, 1508, 1517, 1522, 1533-34, 1537, 1542, 1563-64, 1569, 1577, 1588, 1595, 1605, 1859, 1980, 1986, 1995, 1997, 2095, 2124-25, 2435, 2442, 2446, 2451-52, 2467, 2477, 2487
- Arzi, R., 1620
- Asch, Shalom, 1440
- Ashdod, 292, 2125, 2439
- Ashkelon, 1812, 2125, 2244
- Assad, Hafez, 1827, 1848, 1862, 1868, 1945-46, 1950, 1992, 2086, 2221, 2428-29
- Assad, S., 2343-44
- Association of Architects in Israel, 1116
- Athens, 1764, 1850, 1860
- Atshi, Z., 2128, 2237, 2308-09, 2379
- Attasi, 1606
- Attlee, Clement, 104, 2439
- Auja-el-Hafir (Nitzana) — see also Nitzana, 437, 2439
- Auschwitz, 726, 733, 814, 1247, 1353, 1431-34, 1438, 2033, 2244, 2278
- Auster, Daniel, 59, 279-80, 299, 2439
- Australia, 564, 935, 1063, 1078-79, 1549, 1880, 2069, 2429; Jews of, 707
- Austria, 544, 641, 643, 1112, 1350, 1490, 1763-74, 1999, 2053, 2207, 2433; Jews of, 1283-85; reparations, 1283-85, 1771
- Avivim, 1911, 1934
- Avizohar, M., 1690-91, 1706-08, 1746-47
- Avneri, U., 1479, 1546, 1607, 1513-14, 1625-29, 1637-38, 1656-57, 1666-67, 1681, 1687-90, 1693, 1695, 1713-14, 1717, 1728, 1749-50, 1762, 1771-72, 1787-88, 1823-25, 1831, 2305, 2313-16, 2324, 2326, 2328-29, 2334, 2337-38, 2340, 2350, 2360-63, 2365, 2367, 2370, 2375, 2383, 2389, 2393
- Avniel, B., 1267
- Avriel, Ehud, 779, 2439
- Azaar, Samuel, 823, 825, 1618
- Azariah, Baruch, 772-73, 1083, 1085, 1165-67, 1606-07, 1627-28, 2439
- Ba'al Shem Tov, 76, 2439
- Bab el Mandeb, 1491, 1541, 1791, 1829-30
- Babi Yar, 2439
- Bader, Yohanan, 561, 583-84, 589, 598-600, 617, 639, 733-35, 765, 789-90, 795, 801, 838, 912, 932, 1009, 1056-57, 1068, 1073, 1082, 1084-91, 1093-96, 1108, 1111, 1161, 1174, 1176-85, 1203, 1216-19, 1225, 1424-26, 1476-77, 1654, 1663, 1673, 2071-75, 2439-40
- Badian, G., 2327
- Baer, Israel, 1228-31, 1408
- Baghdad, 414, 1150, 1270, 1439, 1458, 2024, 2305-06, 2329
- Baghdad Pact, 893-94, 897, 954, 990, 1034, 2440
- Bahir, Arye, 568, 682-83, 2440
- Bakka, 500
- Baku, 248
- Bandung Conference, 856, 991, 2440
- Bank of Israel, 1547, 2073-74
- Bar Giora, 2443, 2473
- Bar Kochba, 611, 862, 925, 1748, 1752, 2440
- Bar-Rav-Hai, D., 650, 1456, 2440
- Bar-Yehuda, Israel, 596-97, 603, 616, 668, 733, 773, 838, 1014, 1085, 1096, 1099, 1185, 1234-37, 1407, 1697, 2440
- Baram, M., 1517, 1645-46, 1773-74, 1788, 1821, 1872
- Baram, U., 2278-79
- Barash, Asher, 727, 2440, 2452
- Barazani, Moshe, 558, 2440
- Barkat, Reuben, 9, 1689, 1727, 2078
- Barzilai, I., 1270-73, 1276, 1307-08, 1324, 1331, 1351-53, 1378, 1382-85, 1387-88, 1407, 1414, 1444-50
- Bashan (Hauran), 505, 576, 582, 587, 1586, 2440, 2473
- Basle, 546, 595, 602, 694, 1370, 1389, 2441, 2454, 2459
- BBC, 1301
- Beba, S., 1099
- Beduin, 23, 248, 426, 428-29, 432, 576, 1018, 1522, 1779, 2399, 2441
- Beer Tuviah, 428
- Be'eri, Y., 1880, 2005-07, 2009
- Beersheba, 292-94, 296, 309, 320, 804, 1053, 1081, 1206, 1730, 2125, 2441
- Begin, Menahem, 27-28, 331, 343, 353-55, 359-60, 365-66, 391-99, 501-02, 551-52, 561, 563-65, 574-77, 582, 584, 587, 589, 681-5, 722-31, 736, 738-39, 742, 765-70, 809, 839, 864, 887-91, 908-12, 923-26, 940, 952-55, 957, 965, 977-81, 1019-21, 1028-32, 1144, 1151-56, 1165, 1242, 1266, 1278, 1309, 1327, 1332-35, 1341, 1344-45, 1347-49, 1359-63, 1374, 1378, 1386, 1395, 1405-12, 1423, 1425, 1430-40, 1451, 1460, 1462, 1496-97, 1500, 1518-21, 1555-58, 1576, 1607, 1626, 1700-03, 1727-32, 1780-83, 1809, 1815-18, 1826-28, 1830, 1848-53, 1868-72, 1891-97, 1908-09, 1915-18, 1926-27, 1930, 1967-69, 1979-82, 1996, 2016-19, 2041-45, 2058, 2060, 2070, 2083-90, 2112-16, 2122-32, 2135, 2138, 2144-52, 2175-81, 2188-95, 2197, 2211-17, 2232-38, 2244, 2256, 2269-74, 2301-09, 2318-32, 2334, 2337-39, 2348, 2357-58, 2360, 2366-67, 2382-86, 2416-17, 2424-34, 2441, 2459-60
- Beirut, 1934, 2027-28, 2237, 2424-25
- Beisan, 1730-31
- Beit Carmel, 775
- Beit Guvrin, 291, 293-96, 2444
- Beit Hanoun, 294, 2444
- Beit Jiz, 109, 132, 2442
- Beit Shemesh, 1642
- Beit Sussin, 109, 132, 2442
- Belgium, 118, 642, 1063, 1078-79, 1112, 1253-54, 1259, 1436, 1879, 2069
- Belgrade Conference, 1272-73
- Belzec, 1431
- Ben-Aharon, Yitzhak, 526-28, 562-63, 585-86, 627-28, 690-91, 748-51, 763-64, 789-92, 799, 832-34, 838, 891, 1031-32, 1034-36, 1728, 1851, 2442
- Ben-Ami, M., 653, 658-59
- Ben-Eliezer, Arye, 459-61, 533-35, 543, 628-30, 937-40, 965, 1000-02, 1137-38, 1144, 1154, 1161-62, 1207-11, 1245-47, 1278-79, 1375-76, 1396, 1425, 1430, 1462, 1474, 1512-15, 1523-24, 1629, 2442
- Ben-Elissar, E., 2151, 2188
- Ben-Gurion, David, 2, 9, 27-28, 37-46, 52-59, 63-65, 72, 75, 78-92, 97, 106-110, 129-38, 140, 148, 166-78, 180, 182-83, 193-97, 217-19, 223-24, 226, 261-65, 275-78, 289-97, 327-34, 336-37, 343, 372-82, 433-50, 497-501, 512-18, 535-43, 545-50, 560-61, 578, 595-96, 607-13, 617, 621-22, 640-44, 703-08, 739, 744, 746-47, 759-60, 773-89, 825-39, 843-61, 878-81, 910-12, 917-21, 929-36, 941-52, 962-66, 970-77, 1002-13, 1016-18, 1021-22, 1041-46, 1060-62, 1066-84, 1106-12, 1114-16, 1128-30, 1135-37, 1141, 1146-51, 1169, 1225, 1230-33, 1238-42, 1248-51, 1317, 1326-32, 1335-38, 1361, 1371-73, 1375-79, 1469-72, 1486-88, 1555, 1576, 1626, 1658, 1833-42, 1926, 1964, 2086, 2183, 2442-43, 2465, 2490
- Ben-Israel, G., 1158, 1183, 1185, 1406-07, 1410
- Ben-Meir, I.S., 1609
- Ben-Meir, Y., 1989, 2100, 2144, 2223-24, 2359-63, 2370
- Ben Shalom, Rafi, 764, 774-75, 2443
- Ben-Tov, Mordechai, 57, 59, 163, 673-76, 737, 808, 1256-59, 1261, 1322-26, 1328, 1424, 2443
- Ben-Yaakov, Zalman, 837
- Ben-Yehuda, Eliezer, 347, 571-73, 2443
- Ben-Yehuda, Y., 2328
- Ben-Zvi, Yitzhak, 28, 59, 165, 175, 179-81, 285-86, 301, 737, 1835, 1842, 2443-44
- Bennet, Max, 823
- Berligné, Eliahu, 59, 154-55, 284-85, 310, 2444
- Berlin, 740, 763, 769
- Berlin, Rabbi Meir, 138-40, 173, 175, 177, 181-84, 214-16, 2444
- Berman, I., 2425-26
- Bernadotte, Folke, 89-91, 96, 108, 116-20, 122, 127, 131, 134, 149, 198, 204-13, 216-18, 240-42, 245, 250, 261-70, 275, 277-88, 290, 307, 411, 431, 541, 548, 554, 567, 2444, 2446, 2453, 2485
- Bernstein, Peretz, 59, 597-98, 657, 678-79, 691, 757-59, 864-65, 956-58, 981-84, 1032-33, 1091-92, 1109, 1111, 1139, 1233-34, 1265-66, 2444
- Besor, 1643
- Betar, 726, 765, 1626, 1893, 2440-42, 2444, 2461
- Beth El, 1855, 2126
- Bethlehem, 564, 576, 681, 923, 953, 980, 1606, 1633, 1732, 1865, 1969, 2126, 2148-49, 2189, 2267, 2328, 2383, 2444, 2476
- Bevin, Ernest, 88, 91, 95, 104, 106, 120, 128, 130-31, 133-34, 169, 205, 241, 270, 275, 278, 283, 287, 309, 314, 316, 320, 423, 448-49, 476, 501, 506, 510-11, 567, 574-75, 580, 776, 909, 1729, 2445
- Bialik, Chaim Nachman, 347, 2445
- Bibi, M., 1869, 1871-72
- Biltmore Program, 269, 508, 1838, 2442, 2445
- Bilu'im, 345, 921, 2445
- Bir-Hama, 987, 2445
- Bir-Hasneh, 974, 2445
- Biram, 2426
- Birobidzhan, 711, 2445
- Biton, A., 1616
- Biton, C., 2089, 2314, 2321, 2390, 2425
- Blaustein, J., 1233-42
- Blood Libel, 2445
- B'nai Brith, 1238-39, 1241
- Bnei Brak, 1560, 1730
- Boger, Haim, 718, 2445
- Bombay Conference, 983, 2439
- Border Patrol, 1016-17, 1511, 1524
- Bormann, M., 2275
- Borochov, Ber, 765, 2445
- Bourguiba, Habib, 1442, 1452, 1490, 1592
- Brandeis, Louis Dembitz, 347, 2446
- Brazil, 1384, 2073
- Bresk, 730
- Brest-Litovsk (Brisk), 776, 2446
- Brezhnev, 1867, 2126, 2321
- Brown, Harold, 2130
- Bukharin, Nikolai Ivanovich, 767, 2446
- Bulgarian, Gospodin, 998, 1001-02, 1004-05, 1029-30, 1038, 1090

Bulgaria, 1266, 1587, 2449
Bull, O., 1529
Bunche, Ralph Johnson, 305, 428, 499,
500-01, 519, 521, 524, 1098, 2446
Bundists, 105
Burg, Shlomo Yoseph, 9, 585-87, 697-98,
2055, 2099-2103, 2446
Burla, Yehuda, 97, 2446
Burns, 1273
Burns, E.L.M., 2486

Cadogan, Alexander, 244, 565, 2446
Cahana (Kahana), Rabbi Kalman, 59,
75, 412-13, 604, 960-62, 1421-23, 1897-98,
2056-57, 2286-87, 2446-47
Cairo, 201, 306, 823, 825, 856, 1011-12,
1031, 1146, 1270, 1439, 1458, 1507, 1592,
1602, 1606, 1843, 1847, 1931, 2177, 2192
Cairo Conference, 575
Callahan, J., 2101, 2351

Camp David Accords, 12, 2122, 2231-74,
2295, 2297, 2299, 2305, 2311, 2318, 2320-
23, 2332-33, 2335, 2337-38, 2341-42, 2351,
2354, 2359-61, 2366-67, 2371-72, 2376,
2381-82, 2407, 2414-17, 2449

Canada, 943, 1076, 1078-79, 1315, 1480,
2429, 2486; Jews of, 707
Carmel, Moshe, 27, 1131, 1162-63, 1418,
1424, 1450-53, 1851

Carter, Jimmy, 13, 2084, 2094, 2105, 2108-
09, 2114, 2131-32, 2134, 2137, 2139-40,
2145, 2154, 2163, 2188, 2191, 2194, 2211,
2225, 2231, 2233-35, 2238-40, 2247, 2249-
52, 2254, 2265, 2268, 2271, 2295-2318,
2321, 2343, 2351, 2360, 2377, 2385, 2408-
09, 2427, 2433

Castro, Fidel, 2126
Chamberlain, Neville, 510, 735, 891,
1028, 1440, 2368, 2447, 2471

Charapkin, 2086
Chile, 2105
China, 628, 634, 638, 680, 688, 1471, 1483,
1485, 1514, 1536, 1539, 1543, 1656, 2025,
2227, 2325, 2467

Churchill, Winston, 575, 642, 725, 895,
900, 1029, 1405, 1629

Circassians, 576, 2087, 2447
Citizens' Rights Movement, 1878, 1958-
59, 2010, 2386

Clayton, Iltyd Nicholl, 575, 2447
Clementis, Vlado, 771, 773, 775
Cohen, Eli, 1618-19

Cohen, Geula, 1732, 2011-14, 2045, 2091,
2134-35, 2232-34, 2266-68, 2301-03, 2406-
10

Cohen, Haim, 1146, 1226, 1416
Cohen, Idov, 101-02, 239-40, 471-72, 553,
606-07, 618-19, 1111-12, 2447

Cohen, M., 1601
Cohen, Rachel, 59, 173, 304, 417-18, 2447
Cohen, Yaakov, 727, 2447

Cohen-Maguri, Chaim, 637, 913, 1067,
1069, 1074, 1078-80, 1082, 1103-04, 1108,
2447

Cohen-Sidon, S. 1592-94
Cominform, 2447

Communist party, 2, 4, 37, 47, 131, 317,
335, 409, 414-15, 435, 581, 763, 774, 777-
78, 834, 873, 877, 880, 902, 911, 962, 967,
969, 995-98, 1002, 1004, 1014, 1039, 1041,
1063, 1103, 1126-28, 1141, 1199, 1223,
1280, 1282, 1309, 1320, 1453, 1455, 1501,
1545, 1591, 1600, 1785-86, 1808, 1925,
2430, 2456, 2467, 2470, 2482-86, 2488

Conciliation Commission, 2448
Congo, 1269

Conservative Judaism, 2131
Constantinople, Treaty of, 1043
Constituent Assembly — see Knesset,
1st

Cook, Hillel, 2448, 2468
Copeland, Reginald, 575, 2448
Copt, 2000

Coren, I., 1739-41, 1756-57
Corfu, H., 2152, 2357, 2386
Costa Rica, 1078

Council of Four Lands, 2448
Crech-Jones, Arthur, 34, 2448
Crimea, 711, 759

Cunningham, Alan Gordon, 63, 2448
Cyprus, 93, 101, 228, 244, 332, 1386
Czechoslovakia, 96, 216, 249, 272, 483,
486-89, 510, 641, 754-83, 802, 843, 858,
861, 870-71, 882-84, 886, 893, 897, 900,
924, 926, 942, 946, 955, 961, 970, 974, 990,
1025, 1034, 1050, 1066, 1266, 1587, 1763-
64, 1766, 1768, 2017, 2368, 2455, 2471,
2473, 2478, 2482; Jews of, 603, 774

Dachau, 2288
Dahab, 974, 2448
Daily Herald, 978
Daily Telegraph, 1353
Damascus, 432, 692, 671, 1270, 1439, 1458,
1592-93, 1602, 1606, 1790, 1795, 1868,
1920, 1941, 1952

Dan, 387, 542, 553, 997, 2448
Dardara, 522-23, 528, 532, 666, 2448
Davar, 315, 762, 831, 1153, 1170, 1234,
1260, 1271, 1473, 1623, 2042, 2448, 2481

Dawalibi, 1300-01
Dayan, Moshe, 825, 1088, 1146, 1153-54,
1171, 1174, 1202-06, 1211, 1511-12, 1525,
1542-43, 1576, 1501-03, 1634-36, 1678-82,
1732, 1736-37, 1830-32, 1853, 1877, 1889,
1918-20, 1951-54, 1959, 1964, 2083, 2109-
11, 2142-43, 2148, 2157-62, 2229-30, 2380-
82, 2414-16, 2448-49

Dayan, Shmuel, 790, 2449
De Gaulle, Charles, 1572, 2039
De Haan, Jacob Israel, 146, 2449

Dead Sea, 271, 276, 283, 311, 387, 499, 520,

846, 948, 955, 2468, 2483
Defense (Emergency) Regulations,
2449

Degania, 63, 432, 1643, 1645, 1649, 2449
Deir Yassin, 161, 514, 2385, 2449

Democratic Movement for Change
(DMC), 2083, 2091, 2093, 2096, 2101,
2110-11, 2115-16, 2291-93, 2386, 2398,
2400, 2402-04, 2489-90

Denmark, 1063, 1078; Jews of, 262
Der Spiegel, 1445, 1447
Der Sturmer, 772, 2483

Dimitrov, George M., 769, 772, 2449
Dimona, 1642
Dimona Reactor, 1473-81

Dinur, Ben Zion, 810-22, 2449
Djibouti, 1542
Doar Ivri, 2450

Dobkin, Elyahu
Dobrynin, 1868
Dreyfus, Captain, 766

Drobes, M., 1857, 1903, 2044, 2059-60
Druckman, H., 2300-01, 2312
Druse, 11, 14, 948, 998, 1565, 1648, 1650,
1700, 1928, 2087, 2450, 2458

Dubnow, Simon, 813, 2450
Dulles, John Foster, 771, 807, 830, 836,
862, 872, 886, 913, 940, 989, 1041, 1047-
48, 1055, 1073, 1088-90, 1092, 1098, 1104,
2134, 2440

Dushinsky, Rabbi Josef Zvi, 184, 2450
Duvdevani, Yechiel, 2450

e-Din, Zahr, 1301
Eban, Abba, 9, 556, 664, 673, 682, 805,
1047, 1086, 1456-63, 1475, 1479-80, 1482-
88, 1491, 1536-41, 1546-50, 1572, 1656,
1680, 1877, 1955-59, 1986-89, 2033, 2115,
2141, 2244, 2349-52, 2450-51

Economist, 1492
Ecuador, 675, 686
Eden, Anthony, 830, 909, 947, 956, 978,
983, 991, 1090, 1109, 1360, 2456

Edom, 541, 2451
Egypt, 63, 86, 89-90, 111, 116, 137, 188, 204,
206, 243, 248, 273, 278, 288, 290-96, 305-
09, 311-14, 316, 318, 320, 323-24, 326,
331-32, 335, 343, 387, 395-96, 414-15, 497-
99, 501-03, 508, 513, 519, 527, 529, 532,
536, 541-42, 581-82, 630, 634, 636, 641,
800, 823-24, 843, 856, 858-59, 861-63, 865,
869-75, 877-78, 880, 882-84, 886-90, 893-
94, 897-98, 900-01, 908, 910, 923-24, 926-
27, 934, 941-43, 946-50, 952, 955, 961-64,
967, 969-77, 980, 982-83, 985-91, 993-99,
1001-08, 1011-15, 1019, 1022, 1024-28,
1030-31, 1033-34, 1036-50, 1052, 1054-63,
1065-69, 1071-75, 1077, 1079-81, 1086,
1088-95, 1097-98, 1101, 1103-05, 1108,
1111-12, 1146, 1150-52, 1246, 1298-99,
1301, 1306, 1312, 1323, 1346-63, 1366-72,

1374, 1385, 1406, 1427, 1438, 1442, 1446,
1448-50, 1454, 1459, 1486, 1489, 1502,
1507, 1511-15, 1530, 1533, 1536, 1541-42,
1551-71, 1576-81, 1584-87, 1595-96, 1600-
05, 1612, 1618, 1631-32, 1634, 1637-38,
1678-82, 1726-28, 1731, 1733-38, 1742,
1763, 1775-78, 1781-82, 1786-87, 1790-96,
1800-03, 1805-06, 1810, 1812, 1814, 1816-
17, 1820, 1822, 1826-32, 1843-49, 1854-55,
1857-60, 1863, 1867, 1872, 1892-93, 1906,
1909, 1931, 1933, 1939, 1942-43, 1945-48,
1950, 1952-55, 1961-62, 1968, 1975-98,
2000, 2002, 2018-19, 2021-22, 2025, 2032-
37, 2043, 2045, 2094-95, 2109, 2123-25,
2127-28, 2139, 2142, 2146, 2148, 2156,
2158-61, 2163-88, 2190-94, 2196, 2198,
2201, 2203, 2209-31, 2233-36, 2241-46,
2248-49, 2251-55, 2257-60, 2262, 2264,
2268, 2270-74, 2281, 2295-98, 2300, 2305-
07, 2311-13, 2318-86, 2408, 2412, 2414-16,
2428, 2433, 2435, 2437, 2451-53, 2459-62,
2464, 2472-73, 2475-76, 2486, 2489; Jews
of, 249, 450, 823, 1011-15, 1323, 1591-94;
Peace Treaty with, 8, 12, 1339, 2318-86,
2435, 2438, 2441, 2449

Ehrenburg, Ilya, 798, 800-01, 803, 2451
Ehrlich, S., 1850

Eichmann, Adolf, 1132, 1141-45, 1188-93,
1195-98, 1230, 1283, 1321, 1335, 1354,
1435, 1933-34, 1936, 2278, 2281, 2288,
2433

Eilat, 271, 276, 311, 315-18, 471-72, 497,
499, 506, 517, 541-42, 553, 848, 886, 890,
895, 927, 947, 970-71, 974, 982, 987, 989,
1036, 1040, 1047, 1052-53, 1060-61, 1067,
1077, 1081, 1083, 1087, 1093, 1095, 1106-
09, 1111, 1470, 1491, 1545, 1557, 1578,
1584-85, 1729, 1791, 2240, 2243-44, 2254,
2262, 2431-32, 2438, 2451; Gulf of, 902,
973-74, 991, 1022, 1024, 1026, 1032-34,
1036-37, 1040-41, 1045, 1049, 1054-55,
1062, 1065, 1068-69, 1071-72, 1074-79,
1081, 1089, 1093, 1104, 1108, 1111, 1565,
1570, 1572, 1582, 2045, 2242, 2340, 2438;
Straits of, 1006, 1008, 1022, 1026, 1030,
1037, 1039-40, 1043, 1047, 1050, 1057,
1060-61, 1087, 1091, 1098, 1573

Eilon Moreh, 2127
Ein Gedi, 499, 541, 2451
Ein Gev, 522-23, 528, 532, 666, 2451
Ein Harod, 390, 805, 2451
Ein Kerem, 428, 2451

Eisenhower, Dwight D., 771, 801, 807,
980, 998, 1004, 1006-07, 1021, 1029-30,
1037-38, 1041, 1045, 1048, 1056-58, 1063,
1078-79, 1088, 1092, 1102, 1104-05, 2288,
2462

El-Arish, 293, 305, 973-74, 987, 990, 1019-
21, 1031, 1038, 1046, 1054, 1060, 1087,
1557, 1602, 2047, 2201, 2217, 2248, 2272,
2324, 2336, 2433, 2435, 2451

El-Basos, 974
El Bireh, 2148
El-Cafgafa (Bir), 974, 2451
El-Hamah, 681-83, 688, 2451
el-Nous, Izzat, 1301
El-Ofra, 974
Elazar, David, 1889, 1939
Election Campaign Financing, 1659-77
Electoral Reform, 1327, 1877-88, 2095, 2101, 2291-94
Eliad, N., 1681, 1705-06, 1745-47, 1922-23, 1930, 1970-71, 2064
Elias, A., 220
Eliash, Mordecai, 2452
Eliashar, Elyahu, 422-25, 602-03, 639-40, 2452
Eliav, A. 1772-73, 1813-15, 2066-67, 2106-09, 2112, 2206-08, 2226-27, 2259-60, 2286
Elzuabi, S.A., 875
Emes Publishing House, 799, 2452
Entebbe, 28, 2067, 2093
Erem, Moshe, 411, 797, 802, 2452
Erez, 1945
Erhard, Ludwig, 1427, 1429, 1435-36, 1438, 1443, 1446-47, 1455, 1458
Eritrea, 121, 2452
Es-Salt, 505, 2452
Eshel, T., 2257
Eshkol, Levi, 28, 1173-76, 1215-17, 1266, 1285, 1402-04, 1427-30, 1477, 1488, 1495-96, 1506-09, 1515-16, 1522-23, 1526-29, 1534, 1551-55, 1576-80, 1582-90, 1594, 1597, 1619-20, 1623-24, 1642-49, 1964, 2086, 2108, 2183, 2364
Ethiopia, 1047, 1269, 1542, 1802, 2126
Etzion airfield, 2372
Etzion Bloc, 43, 63, 87, 103, 187, 432, 575, 1945, 2045, 2255-56, 2335, 2370, 2452
European Community (EEC; Common Market), 1263-67, 1461, 1483, 1485, 1539, 1542, 1547
Even Yehuda, 947, 2452

Faisal, Ibn Abd el-Aziz, 95, 508, 2125, 2179, 2452
Faluja, 293-94, 308-09, 320, 497, 2452, 2460
Farouk, King, 94, 153, 294, 416, 435, 976, 2452
Fatah, 1506-07, 1511-12, 1554, 1560, 1563, 1634, 1694, 2027
Feinberg-Sereni, A., 1852
Feinerman, U., 1910
Feinstein, Meir, 558, 2452
Ferder, H., 399-402
Fighters party, 569
Fischer, J., 1410, 1419, 1492
Fishman, Rabbi Judah-Leib Hacohen, 58-59, 297-98, 350, 375, 2453
Flavius, Josephus, 215, 612, 2453
Ford, Gerald, 1978-79, 2108, 2217, 2268
Foreign Affairs, 2041-42, 2046-47

Formosa, 2002
France, 118, 365, 107, 486-87, 520, 642-43, 672, 681-82, 703, 705-06, 722, 724-26, 771, 800, 804, 807, 894, 908-09, 924, 933, 940-41, 943, 956, 959, 969, 979, 982, 986, 989, 991, 993, 996, 999, 1001-04, 1006, 1011, 1024, 1032, 1037-39, 1041, 1047, 1057, 1063, 1065, 1068, 1076, 1078-79, 1087-88, 1101, 1103-05, 1112, 1126, 1220, 1270, 1274, 1277, 1281, 1303-04, 1306-07, 1309, 1311, 1347, 1384, 1436, 1439, 1442, 1451, 1460, 1476, 1478, 1480-81, 1485, 1487, 1496, 1502, 1508, 1514, 1536, 1538, 1542, 1572, 1597, 1626, 1682, 1688, 1729, 1779, 1782, 1788, 1886, 1912-13, 1918, 1920, 1924, 2017, 2024-26, 2028, 2046, 2053, 2153, 2192, 2263, 2284, 2469, 2471; Jews of, 1694, 2278; Vichy, 1321, 1842
Frank, Josef, 771, 773, 775
Frank, Yaacov Israel, 2453
Free Center (party), 1670, 1761, 1773, 1788, 1872, 2403, 2458, 2482
Friedman, Milton, 2073, 2105
Friedman, S., 2062
Friedmann-Yellin, Nathan, 2453
Fuchs, K., 1230

Gadna, 50
Gahal, 1176, 1467, 1517, 1576, 1580, 1650, 1654-56, 1709, 1727, 1749, 1760-61, 1773, 1788, 1804, 1809, 1818, 1871-72, 2071, 2441, 2454, 2458, 2479
Galilee, 79, 87, 89-90, 150-51, 196, 200, 204, 261, 268-71, 276, 278-79, 285-86, 332, 382, 387, 395, 414-15, 447, 506, 508, 541, 848, 857, 966, 1034, 1106, 1312, 1575, 1643, 1778, 1841, 1911, 1915, 1925, 1948, 1950, 2007, 2114, 2249, 2261-63, 2450, 2480, 2485; Sea of (Lake Tiberias), 432, 499, 520, 522, 542, 663, 887-89, 902, 910, 913, 1298-1314, 1507, 1528, 1582, 1812, 2453
Galili, Israel, 598, 987-89, 1095-1100, 1218-19, 1418-20, 1511, 1894, 2041-42, 2044-47, 2453
Gamasi, General, 2212, 2377
Gaon of Vilna — see Vilna Gaon
GATT, 1266
Gaza city, 974
Gaza Strip, 273, 290, 292, 294, 296, 308, 320, 497-98, 508, 527, 530, 859, 909, 942, 949, 970, 973, 980, 986-87, 989-92, 999-1000, 1005, 1020, 1022, 1024-28, 1030-34, 1036-41, 1044-49, 1052, 1054-57, 1060-63, 1065-80, 1082-83, 1085-91, 1093-95, 1098, 1100-01, 1104, 1107-12, 1153, 1552, 1557-59, 1563, 1566, 1572-73, 1584-86, 1603, 1606, 1613, 1633, 1682, 1729, 1749, 1863, 1870, 1926, 1933, 1950, 1968, 1980, 2000, 2018, 2023, 2034, 2041-43, 2045, 2047, 2094-95, 2110-11, 2114, 2125, 2127, 2133, 2135, 2140-41, 2156-61, 2188-91, 2193,

2197-98, 2202, 2204-05, 2213, 2219-21, 2225, 2229-31, 2236-38, 2240-41, 2244, 2248, 2250-51, 2260, 2264-65, 2269, 2320-23, 2326-28, 2333-35, 2340-42, 2348, 2352-59, 2361-63, 2367-69, 2371-72, 2374-76, 2381, 2384, 2416-17, 2437, 2452-53, 2476
General Zionists, 86, 343, 374, 385, 439-40, 442, 569, 603, 607-08, 718, 765, 809, 843-44, 864, 870, 878, 880, 912-13, 919, 968, 997, 1014, 1040, 1096, 1103, 1113, 1207, 1216-17, 1224, 2436, 2438-39, 2444-45, 2454-55, 2460, 2463, 2475-80, 2482, 2487
Geneva Conference, 882, 1843-74 1902, 1924, 1938, 1940, 1945, 1947, 1950-51, 1957, 1986-87, 1993, 1995, 1999-2000, 2002, 2005-06, 2008, 2010, 2019-23, 2032, 2034-35, 2088, 2122-24, 2129-30, 2133, 2137, 2139-41, 2149, 2151, 2153-55, 2157-60, 2163, 2166, 2169, 2180, 2197, 2212, 2241, 2246, 2252, 2339, 2354
Geneva Convention, 1012, 1359, 1602, 1608, 1737, 1826, 1831, 1849, 1865, 1959-60, 2127, 2454
Geniowski, Eliahu Moshe, 494, 2454
Gerar, 295, 2454
Germany, 486-88, 494, 516, 631, 776, 795, 803, 806, 811, 937-40, 953, 958, 979, 1125-32, 1143, 1194-95, 1254-55, 1257, 1264, 1284-85, 1359, 1363, 1365-72, 1381, 1385, 1388, 1396, 1400, 1474-75, 1482, 1485, 1489-93, 1536, 1539, 1542, 1544, 1546, 1567, 1597-98, 1660-61, 1665, 1672, 1729, 1748-49, 1770-71, 1781, 1891, 1920, 1970, 1999, 2001, 2017, 2213, 2275-90, 2328, 2404-05, 2433, 2439, 2454-56, 2466, 2471, 2477, 2483, 2488; diplomatic relations with, 937-40, 1427-64; East, 1126-28, 1199, 1372, 1448, 1454, 1490, 1544, 1559, 1771; Jews of, 603, 1199, 1694, 1719, 2476; reparations, 26, 703-44, 937-38, 1107, 1195, 1283-85, 1349, 1453, 1485, 1491-92, 2443, 2455, 2488; scientists in Egypt, 1346-63, 1366-69, 1371, 1373-74, 1376, 1406, 1427, 1438-39, 1446, 1448-50, 1492; statute of limitations for Nazi war crimes, 1194, 1427, 1445, 1450, 2275-90
Geshar, 387, 1730, 2454
Ghali, Butrus, 2433
Ghana, 1478
Ghuez, M., 2050
Gidi pass, 1975, 1979, 1981-82, 2191, 2212
Gil, Yaakov, 617-18, 621, 2454
Gilboa, 499-500, 2454
Gilead, 576, 2454
Givatayim, 1730
Glubb (Pasha), John Bagot, 575, 909, 913, 2128, 2438, 2454
Gluecke, 1198, 1321, 1354
Gluska, Z., 418-21

Goebbels, Josef, 767, 772, 2276, 2454
Goering, Hermann, 758
Golan Heights, 587, 1581-82, 1585-86, 1606, 1682, 1775, 1778, 1857-58, 1862-63, 1870, 1892-93, 1897, 1902, 1940-42, 1944-46, 1948, 1950-51, 1953, 1960, 2020, 2028, 2034-35, 2045, 2065, 2094, 2114, 2137-38, 2140, 2148, 2155, 2168, 2188, 2201, 2209-10, 2221, 2229, 2238, 2240, 2243, 2251, 2254-56, 2258, 2264-65, 2329, 2368, 2370, 2375, 2430, 2450-51
Golan, I., 1665-66
Gold, Marvin, 1321
Gold, Rabbi Wolf, 59, 2455
Goldmann, Nahum, 95, 102, 105, 121, 1285, 1438, 2455
Goldrat, Avraham, 676-78, 2455
Goldschmidt, J., 1766-67
Golomb, D., 2221-23
Gordonia, 829, 2464
Goshen, 295, 2455
Gottwald, Klement, 2455
Govrin, Akiba, 679, 809, 968, 997, 1040, 1064, 1084-85, 1159-62, 1296, 2455
Grabowski, Meir — see also Argov, M., 48, 59, 72, 74, 82-83, 104-05, 125-26, 164, 221, 224, 247-49, 289, 301, 304, 314-15, 318-19, 327-29, 364, 450
Granowsky (Granott), Abraham, 59, 184-86, 2455
Great Britain, 3, 33-36, 93-99, 103-04, 106, 112, 115-21, 127, 130-32, 161-62, 188, 190, 192, 203-06, 209-11, 228, 231-32, 240-42, 244, 252, 256, 259, 267, 270, 273, 277-79, 283, 286, 290, 296, 305-12, 314-17, 319, 324, 335, 354-55, 358, 366, 395, 399, 406, 408, 416, 429-30, 441, 447, 463, 467, 471-72, 486-88, 491, 498-99, 501-02, 504-05, 509-12, 520, 531, 533, 540, 549-51, 554-57, 567-69, 571-85, 590-93, 617, 622-23, 628-29, 635-36, 642-43, 645, 647-48, 653-54, 661-62, 672, 675-76, 680, 684, 691-92, 703, 705-07, 722, 725, 728, 771-72, 780, 782, 800, 804, 807, 823, 828, 835-36, 858, 861-62, 870, 872, 882, 884-86, 890-91, 893-95, 897, 900-01, 907-11, 913, 924, 927, 933-34, 941, 943, 946-47, 949-50, 954-59, 961, 963, 967, 969-70, 974, 978-79, 983, 985-87, 989-91, 993, 996, 999, 1003-04, 1006, 1009, 1011, 1024, 1028, 1031, 1037-38, 1041, 1043, 1047, 1053, 1057, 1068, 1079, 1088, 1090, 1092, 1101, 1103-05, 1112, 1126, 1132, 1142, 1183, 1196, 1198, 1201, 1230-31, 1248-49, 1265, 1267, 1269, 1299, 1301-02, 1309, 1316-17, 1321, 1323, 1333, 1338-39, 1343, 1347, 1360 1384, 1390-92, 1397-99, 1436, 1439-40, 1451, 1455, 1473, 1476, 1485, 1495-96, 1502, 1507-08, 1512, 1538, 1541-42, 1563, 1573, 1587, 1610, 1629, 1663, 1682, 1695, 1700, 1753, 1779, 1782, 1788, 1836, 1880, 1883, 1885-86, 1920,

2017, 2053, 2068, 2086, 2128, 2153, 2192, 2202, 2213, 2217, 2231, 2252, 2272, 2277, 2284, 2355, 2388, 2396-97, 2400, 2404-05, 2435, 2437-40, 2446-48, 2454, 2465, 2471, 2474, 2479, 2486-88; British army, 38-39, 51, 63, 76, 86-88, 95-96, 108, 110, 112, 116, 210, 218, 279, 307-08, 311, 510, 540, 556, 572-73, 579, 592, 642, 682, 921, 933-34, 954, 1043; Jews of, 1329
Greece, 105, 795, 1266-67, 1431, 2069
Greenberg, A.J., 1290-91
Greenberg, Uri Zvi, 425-33, 727, 1184, 1654, 2455
Greenwald, 1329
Gromyko, Andrei Andreyevich, 96, 686, 883-84, 1567, 1849, 1863, 2086, 2153, 2455
Gross, S.J., 1661-63, 1672-73, 2103, 2205, 2252-54
Grossman, H., 1730, 1851, 2248-49, 2410-13
Grotewohl, Otto, 736, 1126, 2455
Gruenbaum, Yitzhak, 59, 86, 204-05, 289, 300, 327-29, 1440, 2455
Guildhall Speech, 2456
Gur, Mordechai, 1941
Gush Emunim, 1995, 2203, 2249, 2253, 2243
Gutwald, Clement, 771

Haaretz, 469, 474, 1254, 1260, 1481, 1618, 2456
Habash, George, 2018
Habib, Philip, 2428
Habibi, Emil, 796, 1032, 1675-76, 2456
Haboker, 1332, 2444
Hacohen, David, 683, 772, 1038, 1211, 1223, 1242, 1257, 1264, 1382, 1430, 1446, 1488-90, 1492, 1541, 1600, 2456
Hacohen, M., 2146
Hadar Hacarmel, 210, 2456
Hadar, A., 2345-46, 2390
Hadassah, 39, 285, 2456
Hadera, 507, 1730, 2456
HaDor, 771, 2456
Haganah, 58, 84, 99, 104, 106, 123, 131, 135, 144, 149-51, 158, 165, 331, 395, 403, 410, 441, 682, 943, 1917, 1967, 2151, 2385, 2436-37, 2441, 2453, 2456, 2458-59, 2465, 2469, 2474, 2479-82, 2489
Hager, Rabbi Menachem Mendel, 128-29, 2456
Hague, 244
Hague Convention, 1359
Haifa, 39, 63, 87, 92, 96-97, 99, 110, 16, 193, 197, 200, 203, 205-06, 209-10, 213, 229, 248, 268, 270-71, 276, 283, 288, 306, 332, 387, 406, 409, 414-15, 500, 516, 577, 588, 646, 793, 855, 875, 934, 974, 1066, 1089, 1093, 1106, 1179, 1190, 1194, 1200, 1206, 1523, 1852, 1925, 2113, 2126, 2440, 2456, 2459-60, 2465

Haig, Alexander, 2427
Haj (Mohamed) Amin el-Husseini, 286, 856, 2435, 2456, 2479
Haj Yahya, W., 2425-26, 2429-30
Hakim, Bishop George, 511, 2457
Halevy, Benjamin, 1198, 1733-35, 1758-62, 2281-82, 2292-93
Halifax, Lord, 891
Halil, Mustafa, 2373, 2382
Hamashbir Hamerkazi, 246, 2457
Hamid, Abdul, 432, 2435
Hamizrachi — see Mizrachi
Hammarskjold, Dag, 927, 947, 1031, 1047, 1088, 1093, 2457
Hammer, Z., 1797-1800, 1873, 1905-06, 2368-71
Hanita, 197
HaOlam Hazeq, 1253
HaOlam Hazeq-Koah Hadash party, 1687
HaOved Hazioni, 2436, 2447, 2457, 2476
Hapoel Hamizrachi, 389, 726, 809, 845, 875, 879, 997, 1040, 2446, 2454, 2457, 2476, 2481, 2487
Hapoel Hatzair, 1271
Harari, Yizhar, 493-94, 504-06, 583-85, 632-33, 657-58, 685-87, 900-02, 1219-20, 1273-74, 1305-06, 1316-20, 1327, 1331, 1337, 1363-65, 1378, 2457
Harel, Isser, 1346, 1359
Harish, M., 2364
Harman, Avraham, 1605
Hartman, M., 86
Harzfeld, Abraham, 684-85, 808, 1183, 2457
Hashemites, 395, 506, 949-50, 963, 1605
Hashomer, 104, 170, 410, 447, 2443, 2473, 2490
Hashomer Hatzair, 403, 641-42, 742, 765-66, 774, 777-78, 782, 879, 931, 1324, 1388, 2443, 2457-58, 2466, 2468, 2477-78
Hasmoneans (Maccabees), 212, 917-18, 2458
Hassan Beck, 427, 2458
Hassan Hanifas, Salah, 995-96, 2458
Hassan, King, 1592
Hassin, A., 1591-92
Hatzofeh, 1363
Hatzohar, 598, 609
Hausner, G., 1647, 1762, 1768-69, 1803-05, 1855-57, 2143-44, 2263-66, 2288-90, 2387, 2391, 2400
Hawatmeh, Naif, 1928, 1935
Hazan, Yaakov, 715-17, 734, 829, 866-70, 896-99, 927-29, 958-60, 1054-56, 1156-58, 1260, 1330, 1365-69, 1377, 1415-18, 1425, 1509-10, 1533-34, 1543-44, 1561-62, 1723, 1767-68, 1800-03, 2458
Hazani, M., 1138-39, 1413-15, 1663-64
Hazor, 1915
Hebron, 432, 500, 515, 576, 586, 681, 923,

953, 980, 1031, 1582, 1602-03, 1606, 1633, 1732, 1808, 1855, 1945, 2126, 2149, 2370, 2458, 2466
Hehalutz, 1842
Heikal, Mohammed, 1736, 1781
Heletz, 1052, 2458
Herald Tribune, 1210
Herut, 21, 331, 343, 349, 391, 436, 443, 467, 503-04, 514, 551, 569, 580, 593-94, 598, 608-09, 637, 674, 691, 720, 745-46, 843, 870, 873, 880, 908, 913, 915, 919, 936-37, 940, 962-66, 968, 993, 997-98, 1000, 1019, 1021-23, 1037-39, 1046, 1062, 1068, 1096, 1102-03, 1105-06, 1112, 1131, 1140, 1151, 1176, 1182, 1194, 1207, 1210, 1216-17, 1224, 1251, 1268, 1272, 1296, 1308, 1313, 1358, 1371, 1377, 1389, 1410, 1467, 1482, 1506, 1641, 1809, 1877, 1995, 2063, 2071, 2075, 2093, 2101, 2196, 2253, 2342, 2366, 2437, 2440-42, 2447-48, 2454-55, 2458-61, 2464, 2468-69, 2473, 2477, 2482, 2490-91
Herut, 444
Herzfeld, A., 995
Herzl, Benjamin Zeev (Theodor), 105, 220-21, 297-99, 347, 392, 431, 544-47, 619, 623, 687, 734, 758, 1241, 1693, 1744, 1768, 1835, 1926, 2426, 2459, 2473, 2475, 2484, 2486, 2489, 2491
Herzliya, 1730
Herzog, Haim, 28, 2021
Hibat Zion (Hovevei Zion), 612, 687, 2459, 2463, 2486, 2489
Hillel, S., 902-04, 1929-32, 2121, 2254-56, 2324
Histadrut, 21, 103, 156, 384-87, 403, 405, 421, 425, 441, 443, 446, 493, 609, 762-63, 778, 865, 907, 1095, 1146, 1177, 1180, 1223, 1621, 1626, 1668, 1674, 1836, 1842, 2072, 2092, 2100-01, 2436, 2438, 2442-43, 2446, 2448, 2454, 2456-57, 2459, 2464, 2468-69, 2472, 2477, 2483, 2485
Hitikva Quarter, 1185
Hitler, Adolf, 510, 538, 572, 637-38, 641-43, 704-05, 711, 713, 723, 734-35, 740-42, 756, 760, 771-72, 777, 799, 805, 855, 858, 869, 942, 971, 985, 1011, 1013-14, 1125, 1127, 1129, 1142, 1152, 1196, 1283, 1321, 1347, 1352, 1355, 1357, 1367-68, 1370, 1431, 1435-37, 1443, 1445, 1450, 1453-57, 1474, 1566-67, 1598, 1611, 1680, 1768, 1770-71, 2004, 2016, 2039, 2275-77, 2282, 2284, 2321, 2368, 2442, 2447, 2465, 2471, 2477
Hod Hasharon, 1730
Holland, 483, 642, 1012, 1063, 1078, 1112, 1251, 1266, 1281, 1451, 2069
Holocaust, 424, 626, 703-04, 709-10, 713-14, 721-22, 738, 740, 810-22, 878, 1027, 1126-27, 1132, 1148, 1283, 1347, 1350, 1353, 1356-58, 1375, 1428-29, 1444-45, 1448, 1450-53, 1456-57, 1459, 1461, 1463, 1469, 1490, 1544, 1566-67, 1569, 1598, 1705,

1729, 1740, 1742, 1746, 1748, 1751, 1769, 1772, 1781, 1784, 1836, 1838, 1856, 1893, 1945, 2013, 2265, 2278-80, 2282, 2284, 2287, 2296, 2311, 2346, 2368-69, 2433, 2444, 2487, 2489
Home, Alec D., 1269, 1802
Horeb, Operation, 305, 2459
Horthy, Nicholas, 2459
Hosni Zaim, 2459
Hoter-Yishai, Aharon, 1016, 2459
Houshi, Abba, 1016, 2459
Hula Region, 663-65, 667, 669-93
Hungary, 483, 654, 994, 1035, 1038, 1104, 1317, 1766, 1768, 2459, 2470; Jews of, 440, 781
Hurwitz, Y., 1805-06, 1808, 1857-59, 1883-85, 2050, 2091
Husan, 953, 1035, 2460
Hussein, Ibn Tallal, 1541, 1565, 1584, 1596, 1606, 1728-30, 1800, 1811, 1852, 1860, 1862, 1992, 2086, 2148, 2178, 2220-01, 2225, 2230, 2251, 2255, 2315, 2319, 2428, 2460
Hyat, Victor, 511, 2460
Hyrcanus, Jochanan, 2460

Ibn-Saud, Abdel-Aziz, 509, 591, 856, 1048, 2435, 2460
Iceland, 699, 1494
Ichilov, Ezra, 1038, 1095-96, 1099, 2460
Idelson, Beba, 99-101, 160, 222, 303-04, 409-11, 719, 806, 994, 1099-1100, 1161, 1165, 2460
Idelson, I., 349-50, 352-53, 355-57, 360-62, 366-67, 421-22, 456, 493
IDF (Israel Defense Forces), 4, 28, 92, 98-99, 101, 104, 106, 113-14, 123-24, 135-37, 141-42, 145, 147, 150, 157, 159, 161-62, 167-68, 232, 239, 244-45, 255, 263-65, 331-32, 335, 387, 410, 415, 420, 422, 425, 436, 441-42, 497, 524, 537, 539, 550, 554, 566, 575, 582-83, 663-64, 666-67, 716, 805, 826, 834, 836, 838, 850, 875, 879, 892, 933-34, 942-44, 946-47, 962-66, 969-71, 973, 975, 980, 982-84, 987, 989-90, 992, 995-99, 1001, 1008, 1016-17, 1019, 1030, 1036-37, 1039-40, 1048, 1061-62, 1067, 1069, 1082, 1091, 1095, 1099, 1101, 1103, 1107, 1109-11, 1119, 1148-49, 1157, 1162, 1164, 1167-70, 1178, 1210-11, 1214, 1218-19, 1223, 1230, 1259, 1298, 1301-02, 1308, 1373, 1408, 1421, 1468, 1471, 1487, 1518-20, 1523, 1529, 1531-32, 1538, 1549, 1555, 1557, 1559-60, 1562, 1565-67, 1572-75, 1577, 1580-86, 1590, 1592, 1595-96, 1598, 1600, 1602-03, 1605, 1608-09, 1611-12, 1615, 1627, 1633, 1636, 1638-42, 1651-53, 1656, 1684, 1687, 1695, 1714, 1776-78, 1780, 1787-88, 1791-98, 1801, 1804-07, 1810-11, 1813-14, 1819, 1827, 1837, 1840-41, 1846, 1854, 1858-59, 1871-72, 1890,

- 1892, 1904, 1911, 1913, 1919, 1921, 1933, 1935-36, 1941-42, 1944, 1946, 1949, 1954, 1956, 1960, 1964-44, 1968-71, 1973-74, 1977-79, 1991-92, 1997, 2017, 2048, 2051, 2055-62, 2064, 2067, 2069, 2079, 2090, 2092, 2094, 2096, 2117-21, 2139, 2190-91, 2193, 2201-02, 2231, 2236, 2239-40, 2243-44, 2248, 2251, 2255, 2259, 2261, 2265, 2273, 2276, 2332, 2335, 2339, 2352-53, 2356, 2362, 2368-70, 2372, 2375, 2377, 2379-81, 2414-15, 2435-37, 2451, 2453, 2456, 2458-60, 2465, 2472-73, 2475, 2480, 2489; women in, 727, 875, 2092, 2096, 2117-21
- Ikrit, 2426**
- Imber, Naftali Herz, 2458**
- Independent Liberal party, 1463, 1527, 1650, 1724, 1756, 1773, 1788, 1821, 1857, 1872, 1877, 1884, 1910, 1932, 1958, 1998, 2010, 2386, 2454, 2457, 2478**
- India, 677, 1069, 1248, 1438, 1485, 1536, 1563, 2024-25**
- International Red Cross, 103, 261-62, 1593-94, 1600, 1602, 1737, 1826, 1828, 1831-32, 1846, 1849, 1868, 1940, 1959-60, 2454**
- Iran, 509, 675, 893, 2325, 2353, 2367-68, 2440; Jews of, 450, 720**
- Iraq, 77, 79, 86, 91, 116, 141, 206, 248, 273, 281, 292, 331, 387, 395, 414-15, 499-500, 503, 509, 513, 582, 674, 686, 858, 861, 870-72, 894, 897-98, 941, 943, 949-50, 952, 954-56, 959, 961-63, 967, 972, 983, 988, 1046, 1079, 1088, 1152, 1184, 1507, 1514, 1536, 1578, 1584-85, 1632, 1682, 1742, 1776, 1779, 1791, 2000, 2007, 2018, 2024-26, 2033, 2160, 2218, 2220, 2312, 2328, 2368, 2379, 2429, 2440, 2479, 2487; Jews of, 249, 1591-92, 1594, 2160**
- Iraq el-Manshiya, 293-94, 2460**
- Iraq Suedan, 293-94, 2460**
- Ireland, 1879**
- Isaiah, 110, 118, 126, 334, 726, 815, 831, 891, 973, 1610, 1706, 1835, 1984, 2164, 2296, 2461**
- Ismailiya, 974, 1790, 2188, 2192-93, 2199-2200, 2461**
- Israel, Arabs of, 14, 21, 77, 96, 435, 527, 530, 747, 843, 853-54, 863, 875-77, 992, 1017, 1105, 1522-27, 1545, 1565, 1624, 1648, 1657, 1779, 1809, 1914, 1925, 2205; Constitution, 52-53, 55, 63, 351-52, 439-40, 696-97, 1390, 1494-95, 1500, 1502-03, 1759, 1761-62, 1822, 1965, 2457**
- Italy, 406, 1078, 1514, 2281**
- Iton Rasmi, 2461**
- Ivory Coast, 1276**
- IZL (Irgun Zvai Leumi), 123, 135-37, 141-47, 149-52, 154-72, 177, 180, 263-65, 343, 391, 395, 436, 445, 467, 551, 558, 593, 684, 784, 873, 1917, 1967, 2096, 2117, 2152, 2232, 2253, 2261, 2321, 2385, 2437, 2440-42, 2444, 2448-49, 2452, 2460-61, 2464-65, 2469, 2476**
- Izvestia, 1560**
- Jabotinsky, Vladimir (Ze'ev Yona), 365, 730, 734, 765, 978, 1182, 1654, 1707, 1926, 2085, 2131, 2136, 2208-09, 2228, 2364, 2437, 2441, 2444, 2461**
- Jaffa, 200, 203, 229, 251, 268-69, 276, 279, 284, 395, 429, 534, 588, 622, 889, 934, 1270, 1969, 2126, 2458, 2461, 2484**
- Jaffe, Adi, 1605, 1932**
- Jaljulya, 500, 2461**
- Jamayil, Pierre, 2027**
- Janovici, 1321**
- Japan, 636, 1852, 1920, 2207, 2286**
- Jarjoura, Amin, 433, 2461**
- Jarrah (Sheikh) — see Sheikh Jarrah**
- Jarring, Gunnar, 1652, 1678, 1726-29, 1735, 1818, 1871, 2093**
- JDC (Joint Distribution Committee), 597, 786, 801**
- Jebel Libneh, 974, 2461**
- Jenin, 89, 278, 1602, 1606, 1633, 1860, 2461**
- Jeremiah, 432, 813, 1706, 1897, 2186**
- Jericho, 584, 1633, 1732, 1855, 1945, 1969, 2149, 2435, 2461**
- Jerusalem, 1, 25-27, 35, 38, 42-43, 52, 54-55, 58, 63, 66, 74, 79-80, 86-88, 90, 93, 108-09, 112, 114-19, 123, 125-27, 130, 132-33, 135, 137-39, 141-42, 145, 147, 149-54, 165, 167, 178-97, 200, 202-05, 208-11, 213-18, 226, 231-34, 236-42, 245-46, 248, 250-53, 255-57, 259-65, 268-72, 274-76, 278-89, 291, 295-96, 306, 311, 313-14, 316, 320, 332, 343, 350, 366, 370, 377, 382, 387, 393-96, 402, 406, 412, 424-25, 428-33, 436-37, 440-41, 445, 447, 497, 499-500, 506, 508, 517, 530, 541, 544-45, 548-70, 576-79, 581-82, 586, 590, 596, 598, 627, 629-30, 635, 646, 656, 674, 679, 698, 720, 766, 770, 776, 804, 811, 821, 848-49, 855, 875, 895, 923, 947-48, 953, 980, 1031, 1052, 1059, 1107, 1114, 1118, 1190-91, 1194, 1200, 1270, 1301, 1303, 1383, 1386, 1483, 1494-95, 1560, 1576-77, 1581-82, 1584-85, 1602-03, 1605-06, 1608-14, 1616, 1620-25, 1633, 1635, 1643, 1645-46, 1651, 1653, 1668, 1683, 1694, 1730, 1732, 1794, 1837, 1839-40, 1854-55, 1862-63, 1865, 1870, 1892, 1911, 1918, 1930, 1945, 1954, 1979, 2014, 2045, 2051, 2093, 2125, 2133, 2148, 2163, 2166, 2171, 2177, 2180, 2190, 2192, 2200, 2204, 2213, 2215, 2224, 2226, 2230, 2237-38, 2246-47, 2251, 2266, 2301-02, 2307, 2311, 2325-27, 2335, 2340-41, 2357, 2359, 2367, 2369, 2372, 2374, 2382-83, 2406-13, 2437, 2439, 2449-52, 2461-62, 2467, 2469, 2471-72, 2476-77, 2479-80, 2482, 2484-85, 2489-91; Jewish Quarter (Old City), 63, 80, 87-88, 103, 180, 187, 189, 193-94, 197, 215, 241, 271, 274, 276, 279-81, 284-85, 287, 394, 430, 534, 564-65, 567-69, 578-79, 589, 694, 923, 1153, 1600, 1602-03, 1608, 1612-13, 1615, 1624, 1646, 1849, 1930, 2171, 2215, 2382**
- Jerusalem Chamber of Commerce, 246-47**
- Jerusalem Post, 831, 1153, 1155, 1184, 1277, 2042**
- Jewish Agency, 25, 33-36, 41, 46, 58, 65-66, 71, 74, 80, 102, 122, 130, 147, 151, 154-55, 158, 170, 181, 188, 260, 272, 345, 390, 445, 460, 467, 483, 494, 503, 534, 548, 591, 596-99, 601, 603-07, 707, 759, 804, 927, 1237, 1240, 1467, 1626, 1645, 1650, 1674, 1740, 1746, 1751, 1754, 1756-57, 1836, 1839, 2012, 2406, 2435, 2439, 2442, 2444, 2450, 2453, 2455, 2461-63, 2466, 2469, 2474, 2476, 2481-82**
- Jewish Brigade/Battalion, 301, 447, 704-05, 921, 1753, 1967, 2438, 2454, 2459**
- Jewish Defense League, 1749**
- Jewish Legion, 1835, 2442-43, 2461-62**
- Jewish Observer, 1362**
- The Jewish State, 545-46**
- Jezeel Valley, 296, 500, 507-08, 1106, 1643, 1645, 2075, 2462**
- Jibril, Ahmed, 2018**
- JNF (Jewish National Fund), 58, 184, 446, 467, 596, 602, 2455, 2462**
- Joel, 891**
- Johnson, Lyndon, 1485, 1572-73, 1731**
- Johnston Plan, 898, 905, 2462**
- Jordan, Hashemite Kingdom of, 63, 77, 79, 86-87, 91, 188, 198, 205, 210, 215, 248, 261, 269-70, 273, 286, 288, 290, 305-06, 308-13, 316-18, 323-24, 331, 387, 395, 414, 426-27, 430-32, 497-501, 503-10, 513-19, 523, 527, 532, 536, 541-42, 550, 554-56, 568, 571-94, 680, 843, 889-90, 894, 898-901, 909, 913, 933, 941-43, 947-50, 954, 959, 961, 967, 969, 972, 983, 990-91, 1000, 1005-06, 1016, 1024-27, 1031, 1050, 1052, 1057, 1066, 1069, 1090, 1152, 1277, 1298-99, 1507-08, 1512-15, 1522, 1533, 1537, 1547, 1576-78, 1581, 1585, 1595-96, 1602-03, 1605, 1612, 1621, 1632, 1634-35, 1679, 1682, 1726-27, 1777, 1779, 1786, 1791, 1800, 1814, 1846, 1854-55, 1857, 1860, 1863, 1933, 1953, 1985, 1987-88, 2019, 2021-22, 2028, 2035, 2041-42, 2047, 2094, 2109, 2123, 2128, 2134, 2138, 2140, 2142-43, 2154, 2156-61, 2177, 2180, 2182, 2185-86, 2189-90, 2197-99, 2202, 2207, 2221, 2229-31, 2240-41, 2243-45, 2250, 2252, 2254-55, 2260, 2264, 2269, 2305, 2309, 2314-15, 2319-20, 2322-23, 2329-29, 2333, 2335, 2339, 2341-42, 2348, 2355, 2357, 2361, 2368, 2372, 2379, 2381, 2415-16, 2428, 2435, 2437-38, 2452, 2457, 2460, 2467, 2472, 2490**
- Jordan River, 311, 397, 432, 520-21, 542, 574, 587, 591, 663, 672, 726, 849, 876, 896, 902, 908, 1031, 1152, 1301, 1581-82, 1603, 1634, 1654, 1729-30, 1732, 1803, 1812, 1855, 2041, 2097, 2149, 2159, 2185, 2196, 2201, 2315, 2339, 2370, 2373, 2381, 2384, 2462, 2470**
- Jordan Valley, 63, 79, 88, 196, 500, 579, 1106, 1643, 1945, 2041, 2045, 2097, 2255-56, 2265, 2315, 2335, 2375**
- Joseph, Bernard Dov, 66, 375, 652, 654, 656-57, 1323, 1341-44, 1392-99, 1409, 2102, 2462**
- Josephtal, Giora, 1144**
- Judea, 499, 541, 551, 2440, 2462, 2472**
- Judea and Samaria (West Bank), 1632, 1728-31, 1852, 1856, 1860, 1897, 1926, 1933, 1950-51, 1968, 1980, 1984, 1989, 1996, 2011, 2017-18, 2023, 2034, 2043-45, 2094, 2110-11, 2114, 2125-28, 2133, 2135, 2140-41, 2143-44, 2149, 2155-61, 2168, 2188-91, 2193, 2196-99, 2202, 2204-05, 2213, 2218, 2220-21, 2225, 2229-31, 2236-41, 2243-46, 2248-51, 2254-55, 2258, 2260, 2262-65, 2267, 2269, 2273, 2315, 2320-24, 2326-28, 2332-35, 2337, 2340-43, 2347-48, 2352-55, 2357-59, 2361-63, 2367-69, 2371-72, 2375-76, 2381-82, 2384-85, 2416-17, 2437**
- Kaddafi, M., 2025**
- Kadishai, Yehiel, 2151**
- Kadoumi, Farouk, 2016-18**
- Kaestner, 1191, 1198, 1748**
- Kafir Qasem — see Kfar Kassem**
- Kalkilya, 500, 953, 960, 994, 1035, 1107, 1602, 1812, 2125, 2462, 2485**
- Kantara, 2209**
- Kaplan, Eliezer, 55, 59, 84, 375, 451-56, 477-84, 486-492, 2462**
- Kargman, I., 1420, 1463, 1659-61, 1669-70, 1851, 2075-77**
- Karmonah, Eliahu, 823**
- Kartiya, 291, 2462**
- Kassem, 1148**
- Katanga, 1269**
- Kattowitz Conference, 345, 2463**
- Katz, J., 1293-95**
- Katz, Shmuel, 2151**
- Katz, Z., 2427-28**
- Katzav, M., 2346-49**
- Katzir, Ephraim, 28**
- Katznelson, Abraham, 59, 151-52, 174, 187-88, 196, 216-17, 318, 330, 2463**
- Katznelson, Berl, 2312, 2448**
- Katznelson, Yitzhak, 813, 1430, 1436, 2277**
- Kaukji, Fauzi el, 79, 270, 414-15, 540, 676, 2463**
- Kennedy, John F., 1268, 1271, 1363, 1371,**

1626, 1629
 Kenya, 121-22, 900, 1542
 Keren Hayesod, 58, 602, 2463
 Keshet, B.Z., 2006, 2045
 Kesse, Yona, 684-85, 806-07, 1038, 1093, 2463
 Kfar Kassem, 500, 1016, 2051, 2462
 Kfar Saba, 947, 1730, 2463
 Kfar Szold, 387, 2463
 Kfar Temkin, 467
 Kfar Vitkin, 136-38, 147, 159-60, 169, 264, 858, 2463
 Khan Yunis, 974, 1107
 Khartoum, 1631-32, 1652, 1679, 1681, 1866, 1985
 Khoumeini, 2325, 2368
 Khrushchev, Nikita, 888, 897, 901, 1030, 1038, 1090, 1126, 1371, 1386-87, 1694, 2321, 2430
 Kibbutz Artzi, 641-42, 778
 Kiryat Anavim, 428, 2463
 Kiryat Arba, 2370, 2458
 Kiryat Shmona, 1642, 1730-31, 1891, 1901, 1903, 1905-06, 1908, 1911-12, 1915-17, 1920-22, 1928, 1934-36, 1938, 2027
 Kissinger, Henry, 1790-92, 1815, 1817, 1827, 1844-45, 1847-48, 1854, 1868-69, 1877, 1939-40, 1943, 1946, 1948, 1951, 1953-54, 1961, 1975, 1980-81, 1994, 1996, 2013, 2134, 2153, 2184, 2227, 2268, 2301
 Klausner, Josef, 727, 2463
 Klinghoffer, I., 1390-92, 1399-1401, 1639-40
 Klivanov, Jacob, 604, 620-21, 655-56, 2463
Knesset Record, 698, 944, 1114, 1120, 1167, 1277, 1402, 1693, 1939, 2463
 Knesset, 1st (1949-1951), 29, 331, 341-700
 Knesset, 2nd (1951-1955), 701-840
 Knesset, 3rd (1955-1959), 841-1122
 Knesset, 4th (1959-1961), 1123-1242
 Knesset, 5th (1961-1965), 1243-1464
 Knesset, 6th (1965-1969), 1465-1684
 Knesset, 7th (1969-1973), 1685-1874
 Knesset, 8th (1974-1977), 1875-2080
 Knesset, 9th (1977-1981), 2081-2434
 Kobashi, Saadia, 59, 186-87
 Kohl, Helmuth, 2278, 2280, 2284
 Kol (Kolodny), Moshe, 59, 141-42, 251-53, 274-75, 309, 322-24, 326, 328, 1163-65, 2463
Kol Ha-am, 763, 774-76, 778, 2486
 Kollek, Teddy, 27
 Korean War, 624-44, 674-75, 688, 771, 805
 Koren, D., 2007, 2051
 Kosoi (Kusoy), Y., 142-44, 159, 211-12, 592, 604
 Kosygin, 1540, 1597-98, 1719
 Kreisky, Bruno, 1763-71, 1773, 1893, 2433
 Kuneitra, 1581, 1634, 1941, 1945-46, 1948, 1952, 1956
 Kunteila, 974, 2464
 Kurd, 2000, 2025
 Kuseima (El-Kuseima; Kuzeima), 974, 1019-20, 1046, 1557, 2464
 Kushner, J., 1191, 1194-96
 Kuwait, 1132, 1507, 1635, 2160
 La'am party, 2482
 Labor party (Alignment), 21, 331, 343, 372, 825, 1467, 1517, 1527, 1628, 1639-40, 1650, 1679-80, 1692, 1729, 1731, 1756, 1760-61, 1770, 1773, 1788, 1801, 1806, 1815, 1817, 1821, 1851, 1859-61, 1863-65, 1870-72, 1877, 1881, 1887, 1897, 1900-02, 1905, 1907, 1910, 1925, 1932, 1944-45, 1950-51, 1958, 1989, 1998, 2010, 2036-37, 2041-43, 2055, 2064-66, 2083, 2091, 2093, 2095-96, 2101, 2103-04, 2106, 2110, 2112-13, 2115, 2117, 2133, 2140-41, 2150-51, 2153, 2155, 2158, 2217, 2220, 2223, 2226, 2239, 2241-42, 2249-51, 2262, 2267, 2270, 2273, 2293-94, 2321, 2334-35, 2337, 2339, 2350, 2352, 2355, 2357-58, 2372, 2384, 2387, 2391, 2399, 2401, 2407, 2409, 2414, 2435, 2437, 2439, 2443, 2450, 2453, 2455-59, 2468, 2475, 2477
 Lachish, 1643, 1645, 2262
 Lake Tiberias — see Galilee, Sea of
 Lamdan, H., 1180
Lamerhav, 1363
 Lamm, Josef Michael, 492, 620, 2464
 Landau, Haim, 584, 637, 665-67, 733, 735, 739, 744, 761, 789, 830-32, 1051, 1053-54, 1066-68, 1070-71, 1074, 1076-77, 1079-84, 1096, 1100, 1107-08, 1161, 1179, 1373-77, 1423, 1490-93, 1529-31, 1540-42, 1631-32, 1808-09, 1831, 1851, 1909, 2018, 2058, 2464
 Lankin, Eliahu, 622, 2464
 Latrun, 102, 109, 132, 151, 256, 278, 287, 291, 437, 500, 517, 684, 927, 948, 1600, 1602-03, 2464
 Latvia, 445, 2473
 Lausanne Conference, 525-27, 529, 532, 535, 543, 2464
 Lavon, Pinchas, 731-38, 765, 807, 825-26, 1487, 2464
 Lavon Affair, 825-39, 1125, 1146-85, 1202-24, 1226, 1229, 1359, 1402-26, 1640, 1900, 2438, 2443, 2464
 Lawrence, Thomas Edward (Lawrence of Arabia), 575, 2465
 Laws: Area of Jurisdiction and Authorities Ordinance, 1611; Bader-Ofer Law, 13; Basic Law: The Army, 1518, 1964-74; Basic Law (Proposed): Declaration of Independence, 2418-23; Basic Law: The Government, 1393, 1494-1505, 1727, 1965-66, 2038, 2042, 2396; Basic Law: Human Rights (Proposed), 1390-1401, 1758-62; Basic Law: Jerusalem the Capital of

Israel, 2406-13; Basic Law: The Knesset, 3, 10, 1614, 1670, 1672, 1675, 1822-23, 1877-88, 1917, 2048-54, 2069; Basic Law: The President, 1393, 1518-21; Citizenship, 1721, 2205; Coalitionary Discipline Law, 1496-97; Collective Responsibility, 2055; Courts (Offenses Punishable by Death) Law, 1188-1201, 1933-38; Defense Service, 1965-66, 1973, 2118; Elections to the Eighth Knesset and Local Authorities, 1822-25; Emergency Regulations, 1525-27; Entry into Israel, 1316-20, 1327, 1329-33, 1335-37, 1340, 1721; Extradition, 1318, 1320-22, 1331-32, 1334-35, 1337; General Amnesty Order, 1949, 331-39; IDF Ordinance, 1964-66, 1971; Judges Law, 645-62, 1393; Jurisdiction Regulations, 1965; Knesset and Local Authorities Elections, 1659, 1671; Knesset Members' Immunity, 2387; Law and Administration Ordinance, 1948, 66-78, 1608, 1964, 2465; Law of Return, 611-23, 698, 747, 1240-41, 1315, 1318-23, 1328, 1330-32, 1336-37, 1393, 1414, 1498, 1690, 1694, 1696, 1699-1700, 1710, 1712-13, 1720-22, 1725, 2014, 2465; Marriage and Divorce, 1699, 1722; Martyrs' and Heroes' Remembrance Act — Yad Vashem, 810-22; Merchant Marine Flag Ordinance, 221; Military Justice, 1188, 1405, 1964-74; Municipalities Ordinance, 1609; Nationality Law, 611-23; Nazi and Nazi Collaborators (Punishment) Law, 1141, 1143, 1193, 1196-97, 1200, 1936; Population Registration, 1699, 1709, 1713-14, 1721; Protection of Holy Places, 1609, 1612, 1615; Rabbinical Courts Jurisdiction, 1710; State Comptroller Law, 486-96; Transition Act, 349-68, 397, 1225, 1339-45, 1393, 1400, 1495, 1505, 1758, 2485
Le Monde, 909, 1210, 1361, 1487
 Lebanon, 86, 89, 91, 206, 270, 292, 306, 331, 414, 427, 497, 499, 501, 505, 508, 513, 519, 521, 541-42, 564, 582, 584, 641, 898, 943, 949, 972, 1005, 1024, 1069, 1298, 1507-08, 1513, 1533, 1596, 1794, 1846, 1916, 1924, 1929, 1938, 1953, 2000, 2027-31, 2094, 2122-23, 2130, 2159, 2177, 2180, 2186, 2202, 2219, 2230-31, 2305, 2328-29, 2424-27, 2429, 2431; Jews of, 1591-92
 Leberbraun, A., 1769, 1971-72, 2005-08, 2018, 2052, 2064-65
 Lehi (Lohamei Herut Israel), 84, 136, 263, 1917, 1967, 2152, 2385, 2440-41, 2449, 2453, 2465, 2490
 Leipzig, 772
 Leket, Yehiel, 1851
 Lemberger, S., 212-13, 2465
 Leningrad, 187, 1746, 1755
 Levenstein, E., 608-09, 637
 Levin, Isaac Meir, 9, 59, 165-66, 316-17, 375, 873-75, 914, 1133-37, 1220-22, 1291-93, 1654, 2465
 Levy, D., 1620, 2045
 Lewin, N., 1126
 Lezansky, General, 728
l'Humanite, 978
 Liberal party, 21, 1296, 1313, 1320, 1326, 1350-51, 1358, 1463, 1467, 1517, 1709, 1877, 2091, 2097, 2293, 2444, 2447, 2454, 2458, 2463, 2478, 2480
 Libya, 1150, 1507, 1779, 1931, 2025, 2126; Jews of, 1591-94
 Likud party, 21, 1176, 1770, 1861, 1864-65, 1867, 1870, 1872, 1877, 1887, 1901-02, 1904, 1906-07, 1925, 1928-29, 1948, 1950-52, 1955-56, 1989, 1995-96, 2010, 2030, 2036-37, 2041, 2044, 2046, 2059-60, 2062, 2065, 2071, 2083, 2091-93, 2095-97, 2103-06, 2108-17, 2119, 2134, 2140-41, 2146, 2150, 2152, 2154-57, 2224, 2246-47, 2249-51, 2254, 2265, 2273, 2291, 2293-94, 2339, 2348, 2351, 2358, 2372, 2386-87, 2391, 2401, 2407, 2459, 2482
 Lin, A., 1925, 2005-06, 2045, 2052, 2238, 2263
 Litani Operation, 2231, 2347
 Lithuania, 445, 2278, 2487; Jews of, 730, 816
 Litvinov (Wallach), Maxim Maximovich, 641, 2465
 Livneh (Liebenstein), Eliezer, 808, 2465
 Lod (Lud; Lydda), 209-10, 248-44, 278, 283, 406, 429, 500, 534, 889, 1270, 2126, 2465
 Lod Airport, 200, 205-06, 268, 409, 588, 1764, 1850, 1911, 2465
 Lodge, Henry Cabot, 1065, 1088-89, 1091
 London, 95, 98, 102, 105-06, 130, 441, 584, 642, 949, 1088
London Observer, 145, 1254-55, 1257-58, 1260, 2473
London Times, 832, 1269, 1361
 Lorch, Netanel, 2164, 2187, 2295, 2317
 Lorincz, S., 1130, 1247-49, 1297, 1337-38, 1355-57, 1615-16, 1689-90, 1693, 1715, 1744-45, 1761, 2092
 Lowenstein, Meir David, 59, 76, 223, 246-47, 284, 2465
 Lubyanka, 2466
 Luria (Lurie), Zvi, 59, 77-78, 83, 140-41, 172-73, 244-46, 278-79, 289, 2466
 Luz (Luzinsky), Kadish, 9, 26-27, 1126, 1173, 1177, 1179-80, 1327, 1374-77, 1494-95, 1577, 1581-82, 1590, 1648-49, 1683-84, 2466
 Maabarot, 2466

Maaleh Adumim, 2127
Maalot, 1911-32, 1934-36, 1938, 2027
Ma'ariv, 1226, 1480-81, 1699
MacDonald, Malcomb, 2488
Machpela (Cave of), 576, 584, 1582, 1615, 1635, 2466
Magori-Cohen — see Cohen-Maguri
Mahal, 437, 2152
Maidanek (Majdanek), 714, 733, 806, 1247, 2466
Maimonides, 76, 298, 919, 1133, 2466
Majdal, 291, 293-94, 2466
Maki (Israel Communist Party) — see also Communist party, 569, 581, 585, 640, 719, 774, 776-80, 800-01, 809, 897-98, 913, 968, 996, 1023, 1068, 1089, 1106, 1112, 1127-28, 1131, 1223, 1268, 1281, 1296, 1304, 1314, 1421, 1596, 1695, 1773, 2101, 2456, 2467, 2475, 2483
Malaya, 628, 2467
Malaysia, 1536, 2467
Malenkov, 2321
Mali, 1542
Malik, Jacob, 884
Manara, 387, 2467
Mandelbaum House, 429, 2467
Mao Tse Tung, 2467
Maoz Haim, 947, 2467
Mapai (Israel Workers Party), 374-75, 384-88, 403, 407, 411, 421, 425, 440, 443, 445, 447, 474, 526, 599, 601, 636, 688, 691, 693, 771-72, 791, 809, 828-29, 832, 835, 843, 845, 860, 865, 873-74, 879, 923, 931, 993, 997, 1040, 1064, 1066, 1088, 1091, 1096, 1127-28, 1154, 1158, 1166-67, 1172, 1177, 1180, 1182, 1184-85, 1202-06, 1208-10, 1212-18, 1220, 1222-23, 1226, 1229, 1296, 1313, 1358, 1370, 1414-18, 1421, 1426, 1447, 1463, 1478, 1487, 1501, 1542, 1650, 1658, 1841, 1851, 2119, 2266, 2435, 2437-40, 2442-43, 2448, 2450, 2455-60, 2462-69, 2472, 2475, 2477, 2479, 2481-84, 2490-91
Mapam (United Workers Party), 77-78, 314-15, 317, 331, 334, 343, 374, 383-85, 388, 395, 400, 403, 411, 418, 425, 435, 439-44, 446-47, 464, 474, 503-04, 569, 578, 581, 584-85, 592, 607-08, 624, 628, 640, 656, 689-90, 719, 736, 739, 748, 752-54, 760, 763-64, 774-83, 797-802, 809, 843, 845, 861, 864, 866, 871, 873, 876-79, 989, 997, 1031, 1040, 1064, 1068, 1090, 1103-05, 1110, 1125, 1131, 1160, 1217-18, 1222, 1254, 1260-61, 1268, 1270, 1276, 1281, 1296, 1304, 1313, 1331, 1358, 1372, 1385, 1388, 1478, 1517, 1527, 1801, 2043, 2135, 2242, 2293, 2409, 2436, 2440, 2442-43, 2452-53, 2458, 2466, 2468, 2473-75, 2477-78, 2482, 2489, 2491
Mareshah (Tel), 294-95, 2468
Marlin, Shmuel, 2468
Maronite Christian, 2000
Marshall, George C., 36, 119, 190, 241, 276, 278, 675, 686, 2468
Marzouk, Moshe, 823, 825, 1618
Massada, 528, 1368, 1799, 1842, 2100, 2412, 2468
Mauriac, Francois, 1492-93
Mauritania, 1277
Mazevski, Bezalel, 2278
Mazor, Eliahu, 604, 2468
Mea Shearim, 1287
Mecca, 2157
Megiddo, 295, 2468, 2472, 2487
Megillat Hamedina, 2469
Mei Merom Lake, 522
Mein Kampf, 971, 985, 1011-12, 2275
Meir (Meyerson), Golda, 9, 27-28, 56, 59, 375, 575, 739-43, 797-803, 807, 911, 921, 939-40, 965, 969, 1138, 1186-87, 1275-80, 1311-13, 1324, 1346-47, 1357-58, 1385-89, 1512, 1626, 1650-53, 1657-58, 1716-21, 1763, 1776-80, 1790-94, 1818-21, 1838-42, 1844-48, 1867-72, 1877, 1889-91, 1895-96, 1911-15, 1939-43, 2086, 2108, 2113, 2183, 2469
Mekor Haim, 39, 2469
Melamed, A., 1969-70, 2004-05
Mengele, J., 2275
Merhavia, 829, 879
Meridor, Ya'acov, 593, 1039, 1046-48, 1164, 1190-93, 1268-70, 1389, 2469
Meshel, Y., 2120
Metulla, 542, 2469
Mevo Betar, 953
Mexico, 800, 1247, 1390
Micah, 891, 2084
Michoels, S., 800, 2470
Mikoyan, A., 959
Mikunis, Shmuel, 72-74, 76-77, 84, 240-44, 282-84, 302, 334-35, 406-09, 461-65, 495, 531-33, 679-81, 686, 734-35, 738, 794, 834-37, 897, 993-95, 1037-39, 1063, 1070, 1103-06, 1125-27, 1353-55, 1380-82, 1385-86, 1420-21, 1453-56, 1544-46, 1562-65, 1595-97, 1599, 1603-04, 1612-13, 1641, 1668-69, 1681-82, 1762, 1863-65, 2470
Mikveh Israel, 1149
Military Government, 1105, 1522-27, 1623, 1633, 2414-16
Milman, D., 1748
Mindszenty, Cardinal Josef, 2470
Ministry of Absorption, 360
Ministry of Agriculture, 1668, 2098
Ministry of Communications, 83, 2088
Ministry of Cooperation, 392
Ministry of Defense, 110, 113, 137, 140, 336, 360, 420, 441, 493, 920, 930, 1170, 1179, 1228, 1230-31, 1254, 1618, 1642, 1962, 1971, 2057-58, 2136, 2379
Ministry of Economic Affairs, 360, 392, 2098

Ministry of Education, 103, 359-60, 378, 391-92, 821, 880, 1739-41, 1746, 1754, 1756-57, 1914, 1921-22
Ministry of Energy and Infrastructure, 2088
Ministry of Finance, 102, 360, 1265, 1660, 2098
Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 102, 110, 114, 122-24, 196-97, 269, 306, 309, 313-14, 318, 360, 493, 524, 578, 589, 591, 678, 687, 920-22, 930-31, 1265, 1275, 1341, 1479-80, 1482, 1486, 1542, 1548, 1680
Ministry of Health, 2088
Ministry of Housing and Construction, 2088
Ministry of Immigration, 614
Ministry of Information, 98, 101
Ministry of Interior, 101, 140, 360, 392, 407, 1315, 1622, 1687, 1697, 2087
Ministry of Justice, 123-24, 140, 263, 360, 648, 660, 2403
Ministry of Labor, 116, 360, 854-55, 2088, 2098
Ministry of Police, 101, 338, 359, 391-92, 407, 2087
Ministry of Posts, 1622
Ministry of Rationing and Supply, 392
Ministry of Religious Affairs, 252, 392, 407, 1616, 2097
Ministry of Social Welfare, 2088
Ministry of Tourism, 2088
Ministry of Trade and Commerce, 392, 1265, 2088, 2098
Ministry of Transport, 2088
Ministry of Welfare, 604, 2088
Mintz, Benjamin, 113-14, 148, 213, 619, 630-31, 822, 911-17, 1014, 1058-60, 1100, 1108, 2470
Mishmar Haemek, 387, 676, 2248, 2470
Mishmar Hayarden, 137, 151, 467, 497, 519, 521, 523, 528-29, 542-43, 2470
Mitle, 973, 1606, 1975, 1979, 1981-82, 2191, 2212, 2470
Mizrahi party, 52, 140, 142, 144, 148, 151, 155, 158, 165-66, 238, 298, 444, 530, 726, 809, 845, 997, 1040, 1064, 2444, 2446, 2453, 2455-57, 2473, 2475, 2480
Moav, B., 1878-81, 2049, 2051-52, 2063
Modai, Y., 1950, 2007-08
Moked party, 1773, 1788, 1932, 2063, 2467
Molotov, 96, 121, 735, 777
Mondale, Walter, 2109-10, 2192
Monnet, Jean, 2352
Montefiore, Moses, 1149, 2490
Morgenthau, Henry, Jr., 728, 779, 2470
Morocco, 1150, 1186-87, 1319, 1507, 1592, 1778, 2178; Jews of, 720, 924, 1186-87, 1591-93
Morrison-Grady Plan, 120-21, 278, 288, 472, 2471
Mortaga, General, 1578
Moscow, 776, 799-800, 1650, 1718, 1724, 1790, 1813
Mosque of Omar, 2471
Motza, 428, 2471
Mount Hermon, 672, 1791, 1808, 1846, 1940-41, 1960, 2458
Mount Herzl, 544-45
Mount of Olives, 500, 948, 1620, 2471
Mount Scopus, 216, 306, 428, 500, 829, 948, 1610, 1646, 2461, 2471, 2482
Mount Zion, 432
Moyal, E., 1991, 2251
Muadi, Jabbar, 1565-66, 1648
Munich, 580, 591, 900, 1090, 1440, 1566, 1748, 1764, 1767, 1782, 1850, 1911, 2302, 2363, 2447, 2471
Mussolini, Benito, 510, 2039, 2321
Nablus (Shechem) — see also Shechem, 89, 317, 435, 510, 513, 564, 1602, 1633, 1808, 2202, 2205, 2333, 2471, 2485
Nahal, 848, 2472
Nahal Sorek, 2024
Nahariya, 2267
Nameiry, Kamel, 1694
Namid, Mordechai, 761-65, 921, 1084, 2472
Namid, O., 2117-19, 2121
Naphtali, Peretz, 455, 2472
Nasser, Gamal Abdul, 830, 861, 863, 871, 876, 888, 899, 903, 924, 941, 955-56, 958, 967, 971-72, 976, 981, 985, 989-91, 1001, 1003, 1012, 1014, 1019, 1036, 1046-47, 1054-55, 1058, 1098-99, 1128, 1148, 1152, 1210, 1272, 1275, 1349, 1357, 1368, 1387, 1438-40, 1442-43, 1446-48, 1450-53, 1459, 1478-79, 1488-91, 1506-07, 1513-15, 1530, 1532, 1541, 1557-59, 1562-63, 1565-67, 1569, 1572, 1574, 1578, 1584, 1587, 1606, 1611, 1631, 1637, 1680, 1726, 1728, 1730, 1816, 1985, 2338, 2381, 2452
National Committee — see Va'ad Leumi
National Conference of American Zionists, 33
National Insurance Institute, 2088
National Liberation League, 96
National List party, 1761, 1773, 1788, 1872
National Religious Party (NRP; Mafdal), 843, 1125, 1296, 1313, 1358, 1365, 1463, 1517, 1527, 1622, 1650, 1663, 1687, 1693-94, 1699, 1707, 1711-12, 1756, 1773, 1788, 1821, 1873, 1877, 1907, 1910, 1932, 1958-59, 1989, 1998, 2010, 2055, 2062, 2066, 2083, 2092, 2100, 2102, 2116-17, 2152, 2254, 2273, 2291, 2293-94, 2342, 2351, 2353, 2357-58, 2360, 2362, 2386, 2402, 2414, 2436, 2446, 2457, 2476, 2481
NATO, 748, 754, 884, 1125, 1321, 1381-82, 1446, 2243, 2433, 2440

Navon, Yitzhak, 28, 1502, 1834, 2112, 2119
Nazareth, 243, 246, 257, 283, 414-15, 726, 972, 1031, 1633, 1638, 1969, 2126, 2237, 2472
Nazi, 216, 262, 622-23, 634, 642, 704-08, 712, 715-18, 722-25, 735-37, 739, 741, 743-44, 755, 760, 771-73, 788, 803, 811-12, 817-18, 856, 858, 921, 940, 984-85, 987, 1027, 1043, 1045, 1125-29, 1131-32, 1141-43, 1193-95, 1197-99, 1247, 1255, 1283-84, 1321-22, 1347-50, 1352-58, 1360, 1367-69, 1371, 1428, 1431-32, 1434-36, 1441, 1444-45, 1448, 1450-51, 1453-55, 1457, 1462, 1469, 1474, 1492, 1514, 1542, 1544, 1546, 1560, 1591, 1593, 1690, 1701, 1717, 1748, 1753, 1755, 1768-73, 1781, 1784, 1786, 1850, 1891, 1915-17, 1933-34, 1935-36, 1999, 2001, 2004, 2032-33, 2123-24, 2190, 2237, 2263, 2275-90, 2304, 2424, 2439, 2456, 2470, 2483, 2488
Nebi Daniel, 681-82, 2472
Nebo, 2472
Nebuchadnezzar, 2472
Necho (Pharaoh), 2472
Negba, 244, 387, 829, 2248, 2472
Negev, 80, 116, 137, 196, 200, 204, 209-10, 213, 215, 217-18, 241, 245, 256-58, 261, 268, 270-71, 275-76, 278, 281, 283, 286-88, 290-97, 305, 307-09, 312-13, 316, 320, 324, 332, 377, 382, 387, 395-96, 406, 415, 428, 432, 447, 449, 461, 472, 477, 497-99, 506, 508, 541-42, 577, 675, 804, 839, 846, 848, 857, 868, 886, 889-90, 893, 895-96, 933, 947, 950, 966, 1044, 1061, 1080-81, 1084, 1149, 1206, 1470, 1472, 1522-23, 1575, 1578, 1582, 1585, 1643, 1779, 1833, 1839, 1841, 2235, 2248-49, 2252, 2368, 2399, 2443, 2460, 2462, 2472-73, 2477
Neguib, 871
Nehai, 973-74
Nehushtan, J., 1760, 1851, 1870
Neria, M.Z., 1703-05
Nes Ziona, 778, 2472
Netanya, 1066, 1523, 1606, 1730, 2125, 2472
New Statesman, 1361
New York, 272, 306, 707
New York Times, 240-41, 257-59, 999, 1199, 1210, 1360, 1476, 2113
New Zealand, 1078-79, 1508, 1549
Nicaragua, 646
Nir (Rafalkes), Nahum, 9, 55-57, 59, 67-70, 84, 128, 161-62, 327, 334, 363-64, 610, 623, 651-53, 695-97, 1197-98, 2473
Nirim, 387, 2473
Nisanov, Ezekiel, 170, 2473
Nissim, Chief Rabbi, 1620
Nissim, M., 2045, 2135, 2293-94, 2336-40, 2421-22
Nissim, M.B., 1226, 1241, 1716

Nitzana, 863, 869, 872, 876, 895, 934, 972, 974, 2243-44, 2473
Nixon, Richard M., 1731, 1790, 1845, 1854, 1951, 1961-63, 2042, 2108, 2295
NKVD, 2473
Nof, A., 1909, 2005-08, 2024-26, 2029, 2129, 2364, 2401-02
Nordau, Max, 347, 1744, 2473
Norway, 646, 1078, 1687
Nu, U, 1272-73
Nuclear-Free Zone, 1980-89, 2065
Nuclear Proliferation Treaty, 1380
Nukhayb, 1303-05, 1308-10, 1314
Nukrashi (Pasha), 89, 169, 2473
Nurock, Rabbi Mordechai, 492, 530-31, 602, 727, 877-78, 904-05, 1193-94, 2474
Obadiah, 1014, 1767
October, 2211, 2214-15, 2218
Ofar, A., 1730, 1822-24
Official Gazette, 128, 350, 367, 1823
Okomoto, 1934, 1936
Olmert, E., 1985-2006-07, 2009, 2058, 2060, 2262-63
Olmert, Mordechai, 1096, 2473
Oren, Mordechai, 754, 761, 763-67, 769-70, 772-77, 779, 782, 802, 2473
ORT, 597, 2474
Ottoman Empire, 520
Pa'il, M., 1906-07, 1927-29, 1931, 1972-73, 2023, 2036-37, 2054, 2060, 2093, 2102, 2109-10, 2116, 2127-29, 2217, 2315, 2322-23, 2327-28, 2356-58, 2366, 2371, 2374-76, 2381, 2403
Pakistan, 872, 893, 1438, 1536, 2025, 2123, 2440
Palestine Telegraph Agency, 107
Palestinian Arabs, 1, 230, 234, 273, 279, 281, 286, 293, 413-17, 571, 573, 579, 995, 1000, 1023, 1058, 1105, 1268-82, 1501, 1530, 1552, 1564, 1596, 1600-04, 1607, 1613, 1632-33, 1635-36, 1656-57, 1769-70, 1772, 1785-86, 1788, 1814, 1849, 1856, 1859-62, 1864, 1866, 1868-69, 1897, 1901, 1923-24, 1928-29, 1937-38, 1949-50, 1953, 1971, 1993-98, 2000, 2002-03, 2005-09, 2011, 2016-17, 2027, 2031-33, 2035, 2041, 2065, 2104, 2106, 2122, 2125, 2127, 2139-42, 2156, 2159-61, 2163, 2172-73, 2177-78, 2182, 2185-86, 2188, 2193-94, 2198, 2203-11, 2213, 2220, 2225, 2238, 2247, 2250-52, 2259-60, 2266, 2299, 2301, 2305-06, 2309, 2312-14, 2322, 2327, 2332-35, 2342, 2344-45, 2351, 2353-54, 2357-58, 2361, 2367-69, 2372, 2375, 2414-17, 2426, 2468, 2490
Palestinian Covenant, 1866, 2123
Palmach, 145, 150-51, 167, 170, 187, 387, 441, 550, 829, 1324, 1626, 2151, 2437, 2474, 2479
Panama, 1078

Pankratz Prison, 765, 770
Pardes Hannah, 1730
Paris, 144, 280-82, 296, 306, 315, 511, 706, 708, 743, 882, 1493, 1841
Passfield, Lord, 676, 2474
Patish, 858
Peace Now, 2247, 2267
Peel Commission, 33, 278, 575, 2448, 2474
Peled, N., 1478, 1638
People's Council (4-14 May 1948), 2, 25-26, 29, 31-60, 63, 2474
People's Directorate, 2
Peres, Shimon, 28, 969, 1153-54, 1257-62, 1354, 1370, 1418-19, 1423-26, 1478-81, 1498-1500, 1505, 1532-33, 1907-10, 1918, 1939, 1959-60, 2032-36, 2083, 2090-95, 2132-36, 2145, 2153-57, 2181-87, 2195-2200, 2217-21, 2239-42, 2309-16, 2331-36
Peretz, Y., 2070, 2075
Peri, Eliezer, 760-61, 765, 2474-75
Persitz, Shoshana, 733, 1099, 2475
Peru, 646
Petah Tikva, 296, 395, 402, 440, 579, 694-95, 1149, 1606, 1643, 1730, 1835, 1892, 2267, 2438, 2440, 2475-76, 2479, 2483
Petyura, 734, 2475
Phalangists, 2027, 2030
PICA (Palestine Jewish Colonization Association), 1114-17
Pig-Rearing, 916-19
Pinkas, David Zvi, 52, 59, 71-72, 81-83, 85, 103-04, 127-28, 146-48, 177-78, 221-22, 230-31, 302-03, 335, 518, 726, 2475
Pinsk, 728-29
Pisga, 2475
Plehve, Vyacheslav K., 734, 2475
PLO, 1536, 1723, 1730-31, 1850, 1860-61, 1985, 1999-2003, 2005-06, 2010, 2016-23, 2030, 2034, 2065, 2105, 2123-24, 2140, 2149-51, 2156-57, 2159-60, 2162-63, 2190, 2198-99, 2204, 2219, 2225, 2231, 2237, 2252, 2269, 2309, 2313-14, 2320, 2329, 2335, 2343, 2354, 2362, 2438
Poalei Agudat Israel, 604, 968, 1040, 1296, 1313, 1358, 1463, 1650, 1773, 1788, 2446, 2470, 2475
Poalei Zion — see also Achdut
Ha'Avoda, 608-09, 779, 2435, 2445, 2452, 2475, 2477, 2481
Poland, 96, 445, 483, 486-88, 641-42, 728, 1126, 1266, 1317, 1485, 2213, 2277, 2466, 2483; Jews of, 603, 728, 816, 1241, 1694, 2277, 2465, 2468, 2491
Ponary, 726, 1431
Port Said, 969, 1011, 1068, 2475
Portugal, 1078, 1253-62
Porush, M., 1610-11, 1647-48, 1725, 2092, 2354-56
Prague Trial, 754-809, 2483
Pravda, 768, 793, 978, 1560, 2236, 2384
Preminger, E., 586, 649

President's Conference of Major American Jewish Organizations, 2131
Progressive party, 343, 372, 374, 385, 399, 636, 691, 693, 809, 845, 867, 997, 1040, 1064, 1223, 2436, 2447, 2454-55, 2457, 2463, 2476, 2478
Provisional Council of State (14 May 1948-10 February 1949), 2, 25-26, 29, 37, 45, 55-56, 61-339, 616, 2448, 2476
Raab family, 440
Rabin, Yitzhak, 28, 1581, 1939, 1959, 1961-63, 1976-79, 1996-2002, 2014-15, 2055, 2057-60, 2083, 2086, 2108, 2146, 2183, 2371-74
Rachel's Tomb, 576, 583-84, 586, 1582, 1615, 2476
Rafah (Rafiach), 308, 312, 324, 386, 437, 498, 508, 530, 675, 970, 974, 987, 990, 1050, 1053, 1941, 2045, 2094, 2097, 2127, 2209, 2217, 2220, 2229, 2242, 2248, 2253, 2259, 2262, 2266, 2269-70, 2272, 2334, 2340, 2342-43, 2349, 2364, 2371, 2476
Rafi party, 1467, 1487, 1517, 1542, 1576, 1580, 1904, 1907, 2153, 2401, 2435, 2439-40, 2443, 2448, 2468
Rakah party, 1604, 1761, 1887, 2063, 2066, 2105, 2109, 2158, 2456, 2467, 2484, 2488
Ramallah, 90, 256, 534, 1606, 1633, 1638, 1812, 2476
Ramat Gan, 784, 1730, 1892, 2267
Ramat Gan News, 1184
Ramat Rachel, 947, 952-53, 2213, 2476
Ramle, 80, 243-44, 276, 534, 889, 1270, 2126, 2476
Raphael, Yitzhak, 717-22, 926-27, 984-87, 1034, 1524-25, 1558-61, 1655, 1783-84, 1853-55, 1869, 2476
Ras al-Nakab, 970, 974, 2476
Ras Muhammed, 2201, 2272, 2324, 2336, 2433
Ras Natzrani, 974, 1097, 2476
Rathenau, Walter, 164, 2476
Raziel-Na'or, Esther, 582-83, 590, 637, 685, 691, 745-46, 766, 965-67, 1013, 1062-63, 1069, 1072-73, 1077-84, 1108, 1110, 1144, 1185, 1216, 1336, 1741-42, 1809, 1872, 2476
Reagan, Ronald, 2427-28, 2432
Recanati, Abraham, 494-95, 2477
Red Cross — see International Red Cross
Red Sea, 270, 283, 288, 498, 846, 848, 859, 949, 963, 970-71, 974, 1026-27, 1040, 1052-53, 1061-62, 1068, 1084, 1104, 1281, 1470, 1491, 1541-42, 1566, 1570, 1596, 1755, 2438
Redford, Admiral, 908
Reform Judaism, 875, 1705, 1710, 1712, 1725, 1743, 2131
Rehavia, 430, 2477

Rehovot, 1730
Reilly, General, 679, 684, 689-90, 2477
Religious Front, 331, 343, 372, 374-75, 386, 388-89, 440, 443-44, 604, 607, 694, 916, 1133-40, 2455, 2468, 2473, 2480, 2487
Remer, General, 712
Remez, Aharon, 2477
Remez, David, 57, 59, 83-84, 299-300, 375, 699, 815, 2477
Repetor, Berl, 59, 74-75, 84-85, 92-94, 115-17, 148-51, 182, 191-92, 209-11, 457-59, 2477
Reuters, 633
Revisionist party, 2, 37, 49, 105, 131, 145-46, 150, 254, 390, 444-45, 726, 2437, 2444, 2447, 2460-61, 2463, 2468, 2477, 2482-83, 2486-87, 2491
Revivim, 288, 387, 2477
Rhee, Singman, 805, 2477
Rhodes, 111, 113-16, 119-20, 123-24, 126, 164, 198, 201, 205, 213-14, 245, 250, 305, 309, 316, 320, 324, 395, 427, 497, 499, 519, 967, 980, 1020, 1098, 1997, 2124, 2477
Rhodesia, 1539
Ribbentrop, Joachim von, 723, 735, 777, 2477
Riftin, Ya'akov, 310-13, 318-19, 321, 325, 328-29, 336, 502-03, 550-51, 636-39, 743, 1036-37, 1339-41, 1344-45, 1387-88, 2477
Riga, 785
Rimalt, Elimelech, 708-15, 792-97, 1211-15, 1251-52, 1349-51, 1568-69, 1794-97, 1943-46, 2477
Ringelblum, Emanuel, 813, 2477
Rishon Lezion, 1050, 1149, 1730, 1835, 2478
Rochevsky, 170
Rogers, William, 1726, 1729, 1731-32, 1735, 1795-96, 2046, 2113, 2134, 2240, 2338-39
Rokach, Israel, 467-69, 607, 668, 912-13, 1013-14, 1022, 1080, 1096, 2478
Rom, J., 2235, 2366-68
Romania, 1266, 1485, 1536, 1912-13, 1918, 1920, 1924; Jews of, 618-19, 781
Rome, 1764, 1850, 1852, 1860
Romema, 2328
Ron, O., 2337
Roosevelt, Eleanor, 1445
Rosen (Rosenblueth), Pinhas (Felix), 55, 59, 64, 66-70, 81-82, 173, 337, 352, 375, 645-50, 659-62, 1132, 1143-45, 1188-91, 1196, 1199-1201, 1227, 1336, 1394, 1411-13, 2478
Rosenberg, Ethel and Julius, 772, 1315, 2478
Rosh Ha'ayin, 507, 1730, 2478
Rosh Hanikra, 542, 2478
Rosh Pina, 1149
Rosolio, D., 2120
Rothschild, Dorothy, 1114, 1116

Rothschild, Edmond de, 347, 2478
Rothschild, James de, 1114-17, 1120, 1494, 2491
Rubin, Hanan, 592-93, 642, 1023, 1106, 1217-18, 1231-32, 1328, 2478
Rubin, Reuven, 2478
Rubin, Y., 159-60
Rubinstein, A., 2121, 2256, 2294, 2338, 2343, 2387-93, 2395, 2402-05
Rude Pravo, 2478
Runciman, Lord, 216
Rusk, Dean, 1385
Russian Compound, 558, 1918
Rutenberg, Pinchas, 446, 2478

Sadat, Anwar, 13, 15, 28, 1793, 1802-03, 1810-11, 1827, 1845, 1862, 1866, 1945, 1968, 1978-79, 1981-82, 1985, 1988, 1992, 1994, 1996-97, 2002, 2025, 2032-35, 2037, 2086, 2125, 2163-88, 2190-92, 2194, 2196, 2200-01, 2206, 2211-31, 2235, 2239, 2241, 2246-47, 2251, 2254, 2262, 2264, 2269-71, 2296-97, 2299, 2301, 2309, 2318, 2320, 2322, 2324-25, 2329, 2332, 2335, 2344-45, 2353-56, 2359, 2365, 2369, 2373, 2377, 2379, 2381, 2384-85, 2407-09, 2428, 2433
Safed, 182, 285, 375, 428, 934, 1270, 1911, 1913, 1919, 1925, 2479
Sa'id Nuri, 414, 2478-79
Saiqa, 1763
Salame, 229, 426
Salem, Gen. Ahmed, 1005
Salman, Yosef, 414
Samaria, 430, 499, 508, 2339, 2479, 2485
Samuel, Herbert, 441, 575, 2479
Sanhedrai, T., 1690, 1809
Sapir, Josef, 402-06, 492, 506-08, 528-30, 552-53, 561, 565-66, 577-79, 589, 593, 631-32, 1394, 2479
Sapir, Pinchas, 1266-67, 1650, 2479
Sarafand (Zerifin), 80, 2480
Sarid, Yossi, 1851, 2100, 2110-11, 2120, 2256-59, 2390, 2392
Saris (Shoresht), 229, 2480
Saud (Ibn Abdel Aziz), 153, 2480
Saudi Arabia, 91, 95, 288, 293, 318, 498, 513, 856, 880, 894, 950, 983, 988, 1027, 1046, 1052, 1081, 1246, 1250, 1507, 1514, 1984, 2000, 2025, 2059, 2198, 2221, 2326, 2328-29, 2368, 2378, 2431-33, 2452, 2460, 2480
Scandinavia, 951, 1194, 1247, 2404-05
Schmidt, Carlo, 1129
Schmidt, Helmuth, 2290
Schneerson, Rabbi M., 2018
Schoenau, 1763
Schumacher, Yosselo, 1286-97
Schutz, Klaus, 2280
Schwab, Karl, 775
Sde Boker, 826, 828, 964, 972, 1158, 1209, 1833, 1839, 2443

Segal, Zvi, 59, 75-76, 121
Sejera (Ilania), 170, 1835, 2480
Senior Council of State, 1626-30
Sephardic List party, 372, 374, 385, 422, 435, 440, 565, 603, 2437, 2452
Sephardim, 187, 391, 423, 425, 602, 1149, 2437, 2480
Serlin, Joseph, 222, 567, 767, 1013, 1098-99, 1112, 1158-59, 1196-97, 1646, 2480
Seventh Brigade, 109, 2480
Sha'ag (Zwebner), Abraham Chaim, 552, 623, 698-99, 2480
Sha'ar Hagai (Bab el-Wad), 87, 132, 2480
Sha'ar Hagolan, 528, 2481
Sha'ari, Y., 1724-25, 1884-85, 1899-1901, 1933-35, 1947-49, 1984-86, 2019-20, 2063-64
Shahal, M., 1865-67, 2048-50, 2150, 2324, 2396-99
Shahor, B., 1742-44
Shaki, Avner, 1808
Shalit, Benjamin, 1694, 1696, 1698
Shalit, Oren, 1687-88, 1704
Shamir, M., 2235, 2246-48, 2271, 2301-02, 2304-07, 2311-12, 2315-17, 2327, 2370-71, 2382-83, 2427, 2431
Shamir, Yitzhak, 28, 1935-36, 2032-33, 2164, 2175, 2181, 2187-88, 2232-34, 2237, 2295-96, 2300-09, 2312-14, 2320-21, 2323, 2327
Shapira, Israel, 1184
Shapira, J.S., 1416, 1488, 1503-05, 1519-20, 1608-09, 1614, 1640, 1689, 1694-1700, 1713, 1721-24
Shapira, Moshe (Chaim), 27, 59, 162-64, 175-76, 222-23, 375, 613-15, 727, 918, 1324, 1333, 1687, 1693, 1721, 2481
Sharef, Ze'ev, 58, 2481
Sharett (Shertok), Moshe, 28, 36, 50-52, 59, 110-12, 157-58, 163, 174-75, 177, 196-204, 217, 219-20, 226-36, 239, 254-60, 265-74, 286-89, 305-10, 317-21, 324-25, 351, 357-59, 366, 375, 519-26, 573-74, 584, 587-90, 624-27, 637, 642, 663-67, 669-73, 675, 677-78, 688-90, 743-44, 751-57, 767, 779, 799, 823-27, 839, 863, 899, 905-07, 920-23, 1147, 1184, 1416, 2086, 2183, 2481
Sharir, A., 2393-95
Sharm el-Sheikh (Ophira), 970-71, 974, 1038, 1047, 1052, 1056, 1063, 1065, 1082, 1086, 1091, 1097-98, 1100, 1104, 1559, 1566, 1572, 1584, 1605, 1678-82, 1729, 1785, 1863, 1870, 2047, 2205, 2209, 2229, 2240, 2248, 2364, 2380, 2481
Sharon region, 430
Sharon, A., 2374-76
Shattner, Mordechai, 49, 59, 70-71, 99, 175, 182, 299, 2481
Shazar (Robashov), Zalman, 28, 375, 1467-69, 2481

Shechem — see also Nablus, 546, 576, 681, 1732, 1860, 2149, 2267, 2471, 2481
Shechterman, A., 1761
Sheffer, Ze'ev, 744, 2481
Sheikh Jarrah, 38, 80, 90, 180, 428, 829, 2461, 2482
Sheinkin, Menahem, 446, 2482
Sheinman, P., 2279-81, 2403
Sheli party, 2109-10
Shemer, Naomi, 1545
Shemtov, V., 1621-22, 1664-65, 1851, 1853
Shenhavi, Mordechai, 815, 2482
Shepilev, 924, 1056, 1101, 1105
Shilanski, D., 2129, 2256, 2277-78
Shilo, 2126
Shimoni, David, 727, 2482
Shitrit, Bekhor Shalom, 59, 83, 337-38, 375, 1286-87, 1295-96, 2482
Shofman, Josef, 912, 1069-70, 1072, 1075, 1079, 1083, 1085, 1096, 1127-28, 1144-45, 1171-73, 1220, 2482
Shohat, Israel, 1836
Shostak, Eliezer, 734-36, 763, 912, 1068, 1079, 1084, 1102, 1264, 1611-12, 1618, 1623-30, 1692-93, 1870-71, 1885-87, 2136, 2334, 2482
Shukeiry, A., 1272, 1275, 1278, 1507, 1559-60
Shuval, Z., 1851, 1887, 2063-64, 2151
Sidon, 857
Sinai, 305, 315, 969-70, 973-75, 982, 987-88, 991, 999-1001, 1003, 1005, 1007-09, 1019, 1022, 1026, 1028, 1030, 1033-36, 1040-41, 1046, 1048, 1051, 1054, 1067-69, 1082, 1087, 1092, 1101, 1103, 1108, 1551-54, 1556-57, 1559, 1563-64, 1566-67, 1572, 1577-78, 1581-82, 1584-86, 1600, 1602, 1604, 1606, 1614, 1637, 1652, 1678, 1778, 1792, 1800, 1805, 1808, 1854, 1857-60, 1862, 1942, 1944-45, 1950-53, 1967, 1988, 1992, 1995, 1997, 2019, 2032-34, 2094-95, 2137-38, 2155, 2167-68, 2188, 2191-92, 2197-98, 2200-01, 2209, 2212-13, 2218-21, 2225, 2229, 2235-36, 2239-40, 2243-47, 2249-51, 2254-55, 2257, 2259, 2264-66, 2269, 2273-74, 2304, 2313, 2325, 2328, 2331, 2336, 2340, 2349, 2351, 2356-59, 2364-67, 2369, 2371, 2373, 2377, 2379-80, 2382, 2408, 2431, 2435, 2438, 2451-52, 2461, 2470, 2481-82, 2484
Sinai Campaign, 908, 941-97, 1002-03, 1007-08, 1011-12, 1016, 1022, 1029-30, 1032-36, 1044, 1046, 1050-51, 1055, 1063, 1065-67, 1069, 1082-83, 1090-91, 1093-95, 1097-98, 1100-02, 1107-09, 1112, 1138, 1153, 1166, 1301, 1310, 1482, 1512, 1545, 1556, 1558, 1566, 1986, 2093, 2153, 2261, 2379, 2439, 2443, 2449
Six-Day War, 1506, 1549, 1551-90, 1608, 1621, 1631-32, 1635, 1637, 1639, 1641-43, 1651-54, 1674, 1680, 1682-83, 1727, 1755,

1778, 1788, 1807, 1809, 1812, 1814, 1832, 1864, 1908, 1931-33, 1936, 1941, 1945-46, 1948, 1957, 1959, 1967, 1970-71, 1980, 1991, 2033-34, 2043, 2046, 2086, 2093, 2106, 2115, 2129, 2141, 2163, 2207, 2212, 2216, 2249, 2258, 2261-62, 2268, 2334, 2348, 2357, 2372, 2379, 2406, 2410, 2435, 2449, 2465, 2479, 2483
Slansky, Rudolf, 766-67, 771, 773-77, 779, 782, 787, 2482-83
Slavinsky, 734
Smuts, General, 1249
Snapir, 1067
Sneh (Kleinbaum), Moshe, 445, 465, 469-71, 804-07, 809, 870-73, 967-68, 994, 998-1000, 1003, 1014-15, 1032, 1074, 1132, 1141-43, 1198-1200, 1222-24, 1260, 1263-65, 1277, 1280-82, 1314, 1693-95, 1714-16, 1723, 1735-36, 1751-53, 2482-83
Sobibor, 1431, 2483
Soblen Affair, 1315-38
Socialist movement, 272, 740, 1363, 1388, 1770, 1773, 2439
Sodom, 271, 947, 2483
Sokolov, Nahum, 347, 2483
Sokolowski, Marshall, 908
Sole Boneh, 1626
Solomon, Gulf of, 970-71, 1049-50, 1052-53, 1061-62, 1066, 1071-73, 1076, 1081, 1083, 1086, 1093, 1095, 1606, 2431
Somalia, 1277, 1782
South Africa, 782, 1047, 1245-52, 1270, 1542, 2002, 2051, 2209-10; Jews of, 707, 1245, 1256
Spain, 634, 1277, 1319
Spanish Morocco, 1319
Sprinzak, Joseph, 2, 9, 219, 222-23, 236, 265-66, 289, 300, 304, 318-19, 321-23, 325-26, 328-30, 338-39, 349-52, 365-71, 450, 454-57, 484, 544-45, 559-61, 569-70, 624, 668, 684-85, 694-95, 699, 719, 727-28, 789, 803, 834, 839, 843, 881, 965-66, 1018, 1084-85, 1116-17, 1120-21, 1238, 2483
Stalin, J., 243, 777, 1324, 1724, 2468
Stamper, Joshua, 2483
Stamper, Shlomo Yitzhak, 2483
Stamper family, 440
Starkes, Shalom, 1323
State Comptroller, 7, 599, 607, 855, 1178, 1476, 1498, 1520, 1660-61, 1663-66, 1670-72, 1676, 1843, 1889, 1894, 1969, 1973, 2422
State Gazette, 350, 367
State List party, 2443
Stern, Abraham (Yair), 2465
Stern-Kattan, S., 2290
Sternberg, Benzion, 59, 2483
Stevenson, Adlai, 1300
Stockholm, 262
Stop, A., 114-15, 162, 177, 253-54
Strauss, Franz Josef, 2278, 2284

Strauss, Nathan, 2472
Strotsky, V., 220
Sudan, 121, 291, 293, 295, 1184, 1449, 1542, 2000
Sudetenland, 237, 272, 281, 2017, 2471
Suez Canal, 28, 823, 859, 890, 894, 902, 941-42, 949, 955-56, 958-59, 961, 963-64, 968-71, 973, 976, 981-83, 989-91, 993, 1001, 1003, 1005-08, 1020, 1024, 1027, 1034, 1036, 1039-40, 1043-44, 1047, 1049-50, 1052, 1054-55, 1068, 1071-72, 1075-77, 1081, 1087-88, 1093, 1111, 1250, 1281, 1299, 1439, 1542, 1551, 1570, 1581-82, 1584, 1596, 1606, 1631, 1634, 1636, 1678, 1682, 1726, 1731, 1733-38, 1775, 1777, 1781-82, 1790, 1803, 1810, 1843, 1858-59, 1942, 1946, 1948, 1952, 1975, 1988, 1991, 1997, 2034, 2051, 2093, 2105, 2191, 2273, 2336, 2475
Suez city, 927, 1790, 1843
Sukenik, Elazar, 299-300, 2484
Supreme Court, 239, 288, 352, 620, 622, 645-54, 658-62, 917, 1180, 1188, 1194-95, 1197, 1200, 1226, 1328, 1332-34, 1394, 1399, 1401, 1403, 1418, 1670-77, 1687, 1689-90, 1692, 1694-96, 1698, 1704, 1706, 1709-10, 1719, 1721, 1759, 1837, 1843, 1877, 1885, 1889, 1894, 2328, 2399, 2321, 2410-11, 2418-22
Sutzkever, Abraham, 727, 2484
Sweden, 261-63, 1078, 1265, 1660-61, 1671, 2019, 2025, 2074, 2444
Switzerland, 358, 1346, 1352-54, 1357, 2346
Syria, 63, 79, 86, 89, 91, 137, 206, 244, 270, 273, 281, 292, 295, 331, 387, 414, 497, 503, 508-09, 513, 519-43, 582, 663-93, 871-72, 875, 880, 885, 888-89, 894, 935, 943, 948-49, 969, 972, 983, 988, 990, 1005-06, 1024-26, 1050, 1057, 1066, 1069, 1090, 1150, 1152, 1298-1314, 1325, 1422, 1507-17, 1528-33, 1536, 1538-39, 1541-43, 1548-51, 1553-60, 1562-63, 1567, 1569, 1577-78, 1581, 1584-86, 1595-96, 1605, 1612, 1618-19, 1631-32, 1634, 1637, 1679, 1682, 1726, 1742, 1763, 1775-79, 1782, 1786-87, 1791-92, 1796, 1801, 1808, 1812, 1814, 1822, 1826-29, 1831-32, 1843, 1845-48, 1857-58, 1861, 1863, 1865, 1867-68, 1892-93, 1898, 1902, 1913-14, 1924, 1928, 1931, 1939-60, 1962, 1975, 1981-2, 1985, 1987-88, 1996, 2000, 2013, 2020, 2022, 2027-30, 2033, 2035-37, 2094-95, 2109, 2123-24, 2128, 2130, 2139, 2142, 2158-59, 2161, 2177-78, 2180, 2182-83, 2186, 2209, 2218, 2220, 2243, 2245, 2251-52, 2281, 2305, 2309, 2312, 2319, 2328-29, 2341, 2348, 2353, 2368, 2379, 2424-28, 2431, 2459, 2470, 2484; Jews of, 1591-93, 1944, 1952, 1956-57, 1962, 2079, 2089, 2122, 2130, 2429
Szold, Henrietta, 2456

Ta'anak, 2262
Tabenkin, 1926, 2435
Tabib, Abraham, 699, 2484
Tabouk, 2431
Talmi, E., 1131, 1236-38, 1240, 1287-89
Talmi, M., 2341-43
Tamad (Bir), 974, 2484
Tamir, J., 2060-62
Tamir, S., 1605-06, 1632-34, 1673-75, 1680-81, 1715, 1770-71, 1786-87, 1812-13, 1828-29, 1862-63, 1870-71, 1887, 1929, 2027-28, 2065-66, 2111, 2136-38, 2275-77, 2307, 2363-66, 2398-2403, 2405
Tangiers, 1319
Tanzania, 1542
Tarshiha, 1928
Tass, 1925
Tel-al-Muteila, 666, 683, 686, 2484
Tel Aviv, 79-80, 86-87, 89, 104, 132-33, 136-37, 141, 145, 147, 152-53, 158-60, 165, 169-70, 182-84, 187, 189, 191, 193, 196-97, 226, 242, 246, 263-64, 284-85, 308, 310, 315, 372, 387, 426-27, 429-31, 446, 449, 468, 500, 505, 516, 560-61, 582-83, 646, 772-73, 807-09, 828, 855, 875, 942, 1066, 1106, 1114, 1185, 1190, 1200, 1206, 1303, 1315, 1523, 1606, 1635, 1643, 1645, 1650, 1678, 1724, 1730, 2125, 2213, 2383, 2406, 2432, 2438, 2442, 2472, 2475, 2478-79, 2482, 2484, 2490
Tel Hai, 2243, 2248
Templars, 913, 2484
Temple Mount, 428, 431, 551, 576, 589, 981, 1610, 2237, 2409, 2484
Thant, U., 1392, 1531, 1542, 1551-52, 1554, 1558, 1560, 1563, 1565
Tiberias, 39, 285, 375, 428, 934, 1270
Time, 1661
Tiran, 971, 1065, 1086, 1111, 1491, 1559, 1565, 1569-70, 1573, 1578, 1582, 1584, 1587, 1636, 1652, 1678, 1680, 1682, 2105, 2191, 2273, 2433, 2481, 2485
Tirat Zvi, 390, 2485
Tnuva, 246, 2485
Toledano, S., 2388
Toubi, Tewfik, 413-17, 433, 581, 682, 689, 876-77, 1003, 1012-13, 1068, 1076, 1101, 1277, 1386, 1680, 1761, 1887-88, 1925, 1937-38, 1949-51, 1998, 2018, 2050-52, 2114, 2123, 2126-27, 2139-41, 2177, 2190, 2195, 2224-26, 2236, 2301-03, 2306, 2311, 2313-15, 2320, 2383, 2385, 2390, 2424-25, 2430-31, 2484-85
Treblinka, 726, 1353, 1431, 1434, 1438, 2278
Triangle, 89, 193, 281, 313, 499-500, 504-05, 507, 515, 523, 527, 529, 534, 581-82, 1016, 2485
Tripoli, Jews of, 423
Trotsky, Leon, 2485
Truce Supervision Organization

(UNTSO), 2485
Truman, Harry S., 34, 94, 98, 190, 463, 469, 471, 476, 532, 676, 680-81, 736, 748, 752, 764, 776, 2298
Tuchazevsky, Marshall, 768, 2485
Tulkarm, 89, 278, 500, 1602, 1633, 1812, 1860, 2202, 2485-86
Tunisia, 1442, 1452, 1507, 1592; Jews of, 720, 1591-93
Turkey, 501, 674, 681, 782, 805, 835, 872, 893-94, 1610, 1770, 1842, 2440
Tyre, 857
Tzadok, H., 1191, 1760-61, 1891, 1936-37, 1964-67, 1973-74, 2040
Tzemah, 523, 528, 2486
Tzur, Z., 1566-68
Ubeid, Diav, 1657
Uganda, 431-32, 711
UJA (United Jewish Appeal), 599, 603, 2470, 2486
Ukraine, 115, 734, 737, 768, 1643, 1645, 2075, 2475
Ulbricht, Walter, 1446-47
Ullenhauer, 1194
Um el Fahm, 947, 2486
Um Hashiba, 1975
UN Emergency Force, 2486
UNESCO, 2003
United Arab Republic, 1152
United Kibbutz Movement, 778
United Press, 633-34, 772
Unna, M., 1306-07, 1440-44, 1497-98, 1531-32, 1640, 1647
Uruguay, 646, 1247
U.S.A., 77, 80, 90, 93-98, 105, 112, 115, 118-20, 126-27, 131, 156, 189-91, 205-06, 209-11, 235, 240-42, 244, 267, 270-71, 276-78, 305, 307-08, 311-12, 315-16, 319, 324, 355, 358, 376, 386, 406-08, 416, 447, 451-85, 487, 502, 509-12, 529, 531-33, 535-36, 539-40, 554-56, 567, 577, 579-80, 584-85, 623-24, 628, 632-44, 647-48, 661, 675-76, 678-82, 687-92, 703, 705-07, 710, 722, 724-26, 728, 748-52, 763, 769-72, 780, 782, 800, 803-09, 823, 828, 835-36, 858, 861-62, 870-72, 874, 879, 884-85, 888-90, 893-95, 897-98, 901, 903, 905-07, 910-11, 913, 921, 923-24, 931, 933-35, 937, 940, 946, 950, 956, 964, 969-70, 972, 979, 983, 1000-04, 1006-09, 1019-20, 1032-33, 1038, 1041-49, 1051-53, 1055-57, 1059-60, 1062-63, 1065, 1068-69, 1071-76, 1078, 1080, 1083, 1088, 1097, 1101-02, 1104-06, 1112, 1142, 1150, 1152, 1231, 1247, 1268-69, 1271, 1273-74, 1277-78, 1280-81, 1286, 1298-99, 1301-02, 1304, 1306-07, 1309, 1315-18, 1320-25, 1329-30, 1335, 1338, 1340, 1347-48, 1353-54, 1357, 1381, 1384-85, 1395, 1398, 1436, 1455, 1476-79, 1481, 1483, 1486, 1489, 1491, 1496, 1508, 1510, 1515, 1518, 1536,

1538, 1541, 1562-64, 1569, 1572-73, 1576, 1587, 1605, 1611, 1626, 1628-29, 1644, 1646-47, 1655-56, 1661, 1663, 1681-82, 1700, 1726-31, 1733-35, 1737, 1742-43, 1746, 1748-49, 1765, 1770-71, 1779, 1783-84, 1788, 1790-1821, 1826-31, 1839-41, 1844-50, 1852, 1854, 1862, 1867, 1871, 1877, 1880, 1886, 1906, 1939-43, 1947-49, 1951, 1953-56, 1961-63, 1970, 1975-79, 1981, 1983-88, 1990-95, 1997, 2003, 2007-08, 2017-20, 2022, 2025, 2028, 2030, 2032-35, 2041, 2043, 2049, 2053, 2055, 2057-60, 2064-65, 2068-69, 2072, 2074, 2085, 2088, 2093-94, 2104-06, 2108, 2110-11, 2114, 2122-24, 2126-27, 2220-21, 2225, 2227, 2229-31, 2233-34, 2237, 2239, 2241, 2246-47, 2251-56, 2261, 2264, 2271, 2273, 2284, 2286, 2288, 2295-2322, 2324-26, 2330, 2332-33, 2336, 2340, 2342, 2345-46, 2350-55, 2360-61, 2365-68, 2373, 2378, 2380-81, 2384, 2388, 2400, 2408-09, 2412, 2414-17, 2431-33, 2440, 2446, 2452, 2468, 2470, 2477; Export-Import Bank, 451-85; Jews of, 539-40, 603, 677, 689, 725, 730, 785, 899, 901, 906, 1151, 1233-42, 1318-19, 1326, 1328-30, 1337, 1691, 1710, 1717, 1719, 1731-32, 1739-41, 1743, 1746-47, 1779, 1814, 1839-40, 1842, 2131, 2136, 2145, 2271, 2486

Ussishkin, Menahem, 298, 347, 446, 687, 2486

USSR, 77, 90, 93-96, 105-06, 115, 117-21, 124, 126-27, 131-32, 235, 240, 242, 248-49, 258-59, 270, 276, 283-84, 316-17, 319, 365, 376, 383, 386, 394, 406, 413, 434-35, 447, 464, 469, 472, 477, 486-87, 512, 533, 539, 549, 554-56, 564, 567, 572, 581-82, 585, 592, 603, 624-25, 631-34, 636-38, 640-44, 670, 674, 676, 680-81, 686, 691, 703, 705, 716, 721-22, 737, 742, 757, 760, 765-66, 768-71, 776, 779-82, 784-809, 835, 858, 861-62, 864-65, 870-74, 880, 882-84, 888, 890, 893-95, 897, 900-01, 903, 907, 910, 924, 927, 931, 933-35, 942, 946-47, 949, 958-60, 969-70, 973, 982-83, 986-87, 989-90, 995, 998, 1001-02, 1004-05, 1009, 1033-34, 1038-39, 1046, 1051-52, 1056, 1058, 1069, 1073, 1091, 1097, 1101-02, 1105-06, 1110, 1126, 1150, 1152, 1258, 1269, 1277, 1286, 1291, 1294, 1298-99, 1301, 1304, 1307, 1322, 1247-48, 1355, 1380-86, 1388-89, 1436, 1447, 1455-56, 1462, 1483, 1485-86, 1491, 1501, 1509-14, 1516, 1528, 1534, 1536, 1538, 1540-41, 1543-45, 1551, 1554, 1560, 1562, 1565, 1567, 1587-88, 1597-98, 1631-32, 1639, 1644, 1656, 1678-82, 1688, 1690, 1692, 1699-1702, 1708, 1717, 1726-29, 1731, 1733-35, 1737, 1742, 1748, 1755-56, 1766, 1770, 1773, 1778-79, 1781, 1783-85, 1787-88, 1790, 1794-95, 1799, 1801-02, 1804-05,

1807-08, 1813, 1817, 1827-29, 1844-46, 1848-49, 1852, 1856, 1863, 1867, 1887, 1914, 1920, 1925, 1949, 1951, 1953, 1976, 1993-94, 1999, 2004, 2008, 2018, 2020, 2022, 2028, 2030, 2033-34, 2053, 2065, 2086, 2088, 2094, 2105, 2108, 2110, 2122-23, 2125-26, 2133, 2135, 2140-42, 2144, 2147, 2149, 2153-63, 2184, 2199, 2203, 2213, 2246, 2252, 2277, 2309, 2321, 2328, 2354, 2378, 2425, 2431-32, 2445, 2447, 2451, 2455, 2465-66, 2468-70, 2473, 2475, 2478, 2485, 2490; Jews of, 677, 734, 781, 789, 799-800, 802-03, 901, 1110, 1241, 1289, 1328, 1469, 1540, 1543-44, 1644, 1653, 1683, 1688, 1700, 1708, 1710, 1717-22, 1724, 1745-46, 1756, 1763-74, 1962, 2013, 2079, 2086, 2089, 2122, 2130

Va'ad Leumi (National Committee), 1, 36-37, 58, 65-66, 71, 80, 85, 103-05, 125, 151, 155, 170, 177, 179-81, 310, 345, 364, 2486

Vance, Cyrus, 2153, 2192, 2225

Vardi (Rosenblum), Herzl Naftali, 54, 59, 48-49, 2486

Vatican, 2028

Verdiger, A., 1788

Vienna, 544, 1763-64, 1766, 1768

Vietnam, 623, 634, 1484, 1516, 1539, 1543, 1560, 1563, 1827, 1831, 2112

Vilenska, Esther, 736, 752, 754-55, 762, 764, 768, 770, 776, 778, 783, 803, 891, 913-14, 940, 1022-23, 1039-40, 1253-56, 1258, 1277, 1289, 1296-97, 1308-10, 1373, 2486

Vilna (Vilnius), 2484, 2487

Vilna Gaon, 76, 298, 1149, 2453, 2487

Volga Germans, 251

Von Horn, General, 1300, 1305, 1312

Voroshilov, 1291

Wadi Ara, 500, 507-08, 513, 2487

Waldheim, Kurt, 1849, 1868, 2130

War of Attrition, 1631-38, 1678, 1734, 1805, 1867, 1908, 1986

War of Independence, 33-304, 390, 395, 397, 446, 563, 612-13, 664-65, 694, 714, 759, 775, 801, 829-30, 872, 886, 892, 910, 934, 987, 992, 1008, 1060, 1108, 1138, 1268, 1308, 1471, 1506, 1522, 1533, 1560, 1601, 1723, 1755, 1813, 1836, 1838-39, 1952, 2086, 2093, 2196, 2261, 2377, 2383, 2437, 2443, 2453, 2459-60, 2474, 2487, 2489

Warhaftig, Zerach, 1, 9, 59, 153-54, 173-74, 178, 188-90, 208-09, 220-21, 238-39, 301-02, 315-16, 325-27, 334-36, 389-91, 465, 473-75, 503-04, 561, 616-17, 653-55, 1048, 1092-95, 1097, 1289-90, 1609-10, 1616-17, 1920-22, 1946-47, 1982-84, 2138-39, 2202-03, 2245-46, 2487

Warsaw, 785, 2465, 2468

Warsaw Ghetto, 190, 799, 811-12, 1368, 1748, 2277, 2477, 2489

Weinstein, Baruch, 102-03, 123-25, 144-46, 173-74, 213-14, 249-51, 265, 313-14, 326-29, 2487

Weizman, Ezer, 2119-21, 2212, 2377-80

Weizmann, Chaim, 25, 28, 64-65, 95, 97-99, 104-06, 344-48, 369-70, 469, 472, 508, 511, 544, 779-80, 782, 1518, 1836, 2125, 2179, 2487-88

Weizsaecker, Richard von, 723, 2488

Wertheimer, Z., 2247, 2260-61, 2344-46

Wertman, M., 1998-2010

West Bank — see Judea and Samaria

Western Wall, 551, 1582, 1585, 1600,

1608-10, 1612, 1615-16, 1623, 1732, 1747

White Paper, 33, 66, 74, 150, 578, 676, 921, 1043, 1838-39, 2127, 2442, 2447, 2474, 2488

Who is a Jew?, 1125, 1140, 1687-1725

Wiedergutmachung (Reparations), 2488

Wilenska, E. — see Vilenska, E.

Wilkomitz, E., 152-53

Wilner, Meir, 46-48, 53-54, 56, 59, 94-97,

117-21, 155-56, 190-91, 205-07, 475-77,

509-12, 554-56, 566-68, 579-81, 593, 603,

622-23, 633-35, 642, 691-92, 718-19, 737,

752-53, 755, 758-59, 763-67, 769-73, 789-

90, 795-96, 798, 801-03, 808-09, 832, 1051,

1053, 1056-58, 1101, 1109, 1111, 1473-75,

1477-78, 1501-03, 1600-01, 1636, 1648,

1655-56, 1678-79, 1691-92, 1708-09, 1747-

49, 1785-86, 1807-09, 1860-62, 1901-03,

1923-25, 1993-95, 2103-05, 2114, 2123,

2126, 2129, 2131, 2178, 2181, 2184, 2203-

06, 2237, 2242, 2250-52, 2283-84, 2304,

2307, 2309, 2311, 2313, 2321, 2327, 2352-

54, 2362-63, 2384-85, 2426, 2430, 2488

Wilson, Harold, 1572-73, 2101

Wilson, Woodrow, 2017, 2125

Wirshuvsky, M., 2282-83, 2339, 2366,

2375, 2392-94, 2418-23

WIZO, 304, 417, 2447, 2489

Wolfson, David, 297, 2489

Women's Equal Rights Organization,

417

World Court, 1088, 1092, 1098

World Jewish Congress, 238, 511, 601,

707, 2455

World Peace Conference, 511

World Zionist Organization, 1, 58, 64,

82, 126, 160, 345, 384, 441-42, 445, 460,

508, 545, 582, 595-610, 6116, 686, 694,

696, 773, 780, 853, 938, 1075, 1107, 1233-

39, 1241, 1324, 1470, 1740-41, 1743-44,

1746-47, 1750, 1754, 1756-57, 2012-15,

2043, 2084, 2112, 2410, 2426, 2436, 2441,

2445, 2454-55, 2459, 2461, 2463, 2483,

2487, 2489

Ya'acobi, G., 1881-83, 2291-94, 2366

Ya'ad party, 2386

Ya'ari (Wald), Meir, 383-89, 764, 777, 828-29, 989-93, 1100-03, 1500-01, 1654-55, 2489

Yad Mordechai, 387, 2243-44, 2489

Yad Vashem, 810-22, 2179, 2296, 2346, 2449, 2489

Yadin (Sukenik), Yigael, 2083, 2095-99, 2111, 2115-16, 2376-77, 2397-98, 2405, 2484, 2489

Yadlin, A., 2148, 2193, 2201

Yaffe, A., 1958

Yaffe, Bezalel, 446, 2490

Yamani, Sheikh Zaki, 2432

Yamit, 2198, 2240, 2254, 2261, 2370

Yariv, Aharon, 1844

Yariv, S. Sh., 805, 2490

Yarkon River, 849, 1643, 2490

Yarmuk River, 542, 663, 2490

Yasif (Kufri), 415, 2490

Yedid, M., 1808, 1831, 1851, 1909, 1987, 2044-45

Yehuda, Zvi, 466-67, 2490

Yellin-Mor (Friedmann), Nathan, 558, 568-69, 583, 590-92, 635-36, 687-88, 2490

Yemen, 91, 1491, 1506-07, 1513, 1515, 1536, 1561, 1631, 2078

Yemenite party, 385, 418-21, 699, 2484, 2490

Yemin Moshe, 39, 2490

Yeshayahu, Israel, 9, 1177, 1386, 1763, 1775-76, 1831, 1833-38, 1851, 1943, 2078-79

Yevsekzia, 719, 780-81, 2490

Yifrah, J., 1747

Yitzhaki, Y., 2389

Yivo, 814, 820, 2491

Yom Kippur War, 8, 10, 28, 1518, 1576, 1733, 1763, 1775-822, 1826, 1846-47,

1849, 1851, 1861, 1865, 1877, 1887, 1889-1910, 1927, 1935, 1939-41, 1943-44, 1946-

48, 1952-53, 1961, 1964, 1967-68, 1970-71, 1981-83, 1991-92, 1997, 2033-35, 2045,

2076, 2078, 2102, 2106, 2109, 2135, 2137, 2148, 2227, 2243, 2350, 2356, 2381, 2396,

2399, 2449, 2458, 2469

Yotvat — see also Tiran, 971, 974, 997, 1067-69, 1077, 1086, 1088

Yotvata, 2491

Yugoslavia, 674, 770-71, 782, 795, 1266, 1386, 2277, 2485

Yunichman, Shimshon, 1070, 1075-76, 1079, 1084, 1089, 1093, 1096, 1099, 1105, 1191, 1194, 1197, 1217, 2491

Zabari, R., 1527

Zahleh, 2424-25

Zaim, Hosni, 532

Zakai, Y., 2347-49, 2358-59

Zapotocky, Antonin, 762, 775

Zar, M., 1184
Zarnuga, 2213
Ziad, T., 2237, 2305-06, 2308-10, 2313-15,
2344, 2385, 2427
Zichron Ya'akov, 694, 1142, 2491
Zilberberg, A., 1869
Zimmerman, Z., 1283-85, 1326, 1713,
1824
Zion Square, 429, 730, 2491
Zionism is Racism Resolution, 1999-
2010
Zionist Congress, 1, 345, 365, 431, 445-46,
545, 584, 588, 596, 599, 601-09, 694, 697,
1121, 1216, 1438, 1768, 2437, 2440-41,
2486, 2491
Zionist Executive, 1, 65, 84, 102, 107, 125,
136, 142, 147, 149-50, 153-54, 158, 162,
165-66, 189, 204, 362, 364, 390, 444-45, 503,
588, 595-600, 603-09, 734, 853, 1233-34,
1237-38, 1240, 1836, 1841-42, 2014, 2455,
2461, 2491
Zionist Organization — see World
Zionist Organization
Zionist Organization of America, 1235
Zisling, Aharon, 49-50, 59, 81-82, 174-76,
178, 192-93, 221, 223, 325, 642, 739, 2491
Ziv, 229
Zohar, Benjamin, 1016-17
Zorea, M., 2200-01
Zorin, V., 1269
Zuabi, Abdul-Aziz, 1525-26
Zurich, 740
Zwebner, A.H., 370