

miss anyone who acts contrary to the basis of the Government's existence....

Everything would be done in an open and official way and be subject to public criticism, so that the Prime Minister would not be able to act in an arbitrary way....Our Ministers appear to be afraid of accepting parliamentary and individual responsibility for their actions and words...hiding behind coalitionary agreements and continuing to snipe at one another....I suggest that the proposal be transferred to the Constitution, Law and Justice Committee.

The Minister of Justice, H. Tzadok: Mr. Speaker, distinguished Knesset, the subject raised by MK Aloni has been discussed by the Knesset on at least two occasions in the past....Both times the Knesset rejected proposals to empower the Prime Minister to dismiss Ministers....It is true that in certain countries with parliamentary regimes the Prime Minister is so empowered, but the Government feels that this would not be appropriate in the political reality of Israel, where all the governments to date have been based on coalitions....The Government consequently suggests that MK Aloni's proposal be removed from the agenda....

S. Aloni (Citizens' Rights Movement): Mr. Speaker, distinguished Knesset, the fact that the subject has been discussed in the past does not preclude the Knesset from debating it today. Many things have changed. We should free ourselves of conservatism....I object to statements on the lines of "the Government thinks." I think that this is a subject for the Knesset. I would like to inform you that we will discuss this issue again...within the framework of another proposal, because anyone who wishes to guarantee democracy in Israel cannot agree to having a group of people rule in the name of coalitionary habits without the Ministers being responsible for their actions, words and blunders. I ask the Knesset for its support once again. The authority is the Knesset's by virtue of its being a constituent assembly. Coalitionary agreements are not binding in this instance....

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

The Allon Plan

Introduction

In September 1976 Foreign Minister Yigal Allon published an article in *Foreign Affairs* detailing the principles underlying Israel's definition of secure and defensible borders. In that article he expressed his private opinion that the town of Gaza should become part of the Palestinian-Jordanian entity. The Knesset was in recess at the time. After thirty Knesset Members had submitted a request to that effect to the Speaker, the Knesset was convened in a special sitting to debate the subject, four days before Rosh Hashana, the Jewish New Year. Mr. Begin, the leader of the Likud, took issue with the opinions expressed by Allon.

Sitting 333 of the Eighth Knesset

21 September 1976 (26 Elul 5736)

M. Begin (Likud): Mr Speaker, my teachers, Knesset Members, irresponsibility and folly, the denial of our people's right to the Land of Israel, derision for the Government's decisions...an irrational, unfortunate conception of supposed security borders which exist only on an imaginary map—all these are to be found in the Foreign Minister's wretched and distressing article in the leading American journal of international diplomacy, *Foreign Affairs*. To the absurd plan to repatriation the western Land of Israel, granting what is known in the confused jargon as "Jordanian-Palestinian" sovereignty over the heads of Israel's soldiers posted along the Jordan River and Valley, the Foreign Minister added: "The town of Gaza and its environs, which is densely populated by Palestinian Arabs, may be part of the Jordanian-Palestinian entity which will arise to the east of Israel." Thus far Israel's Foreign Minister.

On the subject of the Gaza Strip an official Government spokesman, speaking on behalf of the Government, has said: "The members of the Labor Party should know...that all the Government's decisions regarding guidelines for negotiations with others state that the Gaza Strip will be part of the State of Israel." He also said: "In 1956, in opposition to the attitude of the Labor Party, the Knesset decided to withdraw from the Gaza Strip. Many of the inhabitants of the Gaza Strip fear that this may happen again. It must be made clear to them that it is our intention that the Gaza Strip shall not be severed from Israel again."...

That statement and others were made from this podium by Minister without Portfolio, but with understanding, Israel Galili....Have the de-

cisions of the Government, as conveyed on its behalf by Minister Galili, been altered or annulled? When were they annulled? If they were annulled, why did the Knesset not hear about it from you, Minister Galili, as it did about the former decisions? If they were not annulled, by what right, by what authority, did Israel's Foreign Minister present the town of Gaza and its environs to the Jordanian-Palestinian entity? Who empowered him to write those things? Has the Government decided to detach the town of Gaza and its environs from the Gaza Strip...?

There is something more serious still in this regrettable phenomenon. The statements made by a Minister of the Government of Israel were granted the approval of the Knesset....I would like to know when the Knesset decided to annul those decisions of the Government.... Meanwhile, the Foreign Minister has left for New York...although I learn to my surprise that he is not to participate in the opening session of the U.N. Assembly....Initially he was very apologetic, saying that those were his private views, though how a Foreign Minister can have private views on a matter such as this is beyond me. Last night, however, before leaving for New York, he said that he had published the article in *Foreign Affairs* in the awareness of his responsibility as Foreign Minister. This is something unparalleled in a democracy. He changed his tune because, it seems, at the Cabinet meeting three other foreign ministers supported him. Another argument of his is that four years ago the Minister of Education lectured at the Van Leer Institute and said that we may have to relinquish Gaza....Foreign Minister Allon relies on Minister of Education Allon and thence derives his authority....

I would like to ask the Prime Minister...whether he permits such licentiousness in his Government, which is anyway a laughing stock...with Cabinet meetings constituting a running battle between the Prime Minister and the Minister of Defense....I would also like to know how that information reached the press....I sometimes wonder whether certain members of the Government are not doing what Richard Nixon did....Does the Prime Minister agree that the Foreign Minister, the principal Government spokesman on foreign affairs, should speak contrary to the Government's decisions...and hand parts of the Land of Israel, our homeland, to the enemy...? You are making the Government an object of derision and scorn.

Of course, after what happened, the Foreign Minister should have resigned...but he did not. For the sake of the country, for the sake of its vital interests, for the sake of serious negotiations for the peace treaty which will come one day, I propose that the Government make use of paragraph 17A of the Basic Law: the Government...which entitles it to alter the distribution of portfolios among the Ministers....

Davar, the organ of the Labor party, writes of the Foreign Minister's article: "The article may have done a disservice to Israel's information efforts." The pro-Government *Jerusalem Post* writes: "The fundamen-

tal policy statement made by the Foreign Minister prior to his departure for New York indicates merely the internal disintegration of the Government of Israel."...Quite. *Al Hamishmar*, the paper representing views on the left of the Labor party, lauds the Foreign Minister's opinions while claiming that he "goes too far in his territorial demands." If part of the Alignment says that Mr. Allon has gone too far in his territorial demands after he has already given up Gaza and its environs and more besides, what will the Arabs say? What will the Americans say? Any child can see that if one submits a drawing of that kind...exact almost to the last mile, which Mr. Allon regards as the minimum, it will immediately be made the maximum for *Al Hamishmar* and Mapam, as it will for the former Foreign Minister...not to mention the Arabs and other international bodies....Now Egypt says that that plan is unacceptable and there must be withdrawal to the borders of 4 June 1967 and the establishment of a Palestinian, not a Jordanian-Palestinian, state. The Americans say that the plan will not be acceptable to the Arabs, meaning that it has to be whittled down in negotiations.

Where does this lead if not to an extremely dangerous proximity to the borders of 4 June 1967? Is that the way to conduct negotiations? Only a year ago you asked the U.S. for an explicit undertaking that the next agreement after the interim settlement with Egypt would be a final peace treaty. Is that the way to negotiate for a peace treaty? You are such pragmatists, such lovers of political tactics, what did the Foreign Minister do to you with his wretched and distressing article...? What has happened? I acknowledge that we have different views...but what has happened to the Land of Israel? What have you done to the Land of Israel? Each Minister places the Land of Israel on the operating table. One hands over Judea, the other Samaria, a third Gaza, the town of Gaza and its environs. Did we not write, together with Minister Galili, at the end of the Six Day War, on behalf of the Government and the Zionist Organization: "Our patrimony has been redeemed"? And those words were approved unanimously by the Government. Were we not referring to Judea and Samaria? Did we not include the necessity of establishing settlements throughout the homeland—meaning Judea, Samaria and Gaza—in the Government's guidelines...? You are causing demoralization among the younger generation...!

Permit me to share a personal experience of mine with you. I received a letter from a girl in her last year of high school asking me to explain two concepts: state and homeland. I replied that state is a legal concept and is easily defined as an area of land wherein a nation is sovereign. Homeland is difficult to define. Can one define a mother? A mother is a mother. Of course, one can say that homeland is the land where one was born, where one's parents and ancestors were born, where a nation is formed and maintains its culture. But that is not yet a definition, just as it is not enough to define a mother as the woman who

gave birth to one. Those definitions do not embody love, sanctity, devotion, loyalty. Homeland—the term is self-explanatory.

What are you doing to the homeland of the Jewish people? Who empowered you to relinquish it, partition it, hand it over? When did any Government decide to give up one part or another of Judea and Samaria? When did the Knesset resolve that? When was the subject debated here? When was the vote held? You do not have a majority here for handing Judea and Samaria over....By what right, by what authority does a disintegrating, declining, disputatious, discordant Government play games with the homeland for which our forefathers yearned and our best sons gave their lives and to which all Jews everywhere direct their prayers—the Land of Israel?

Now look at what you are doing to yourselves. What are you gaining from all that wrangling, from the Foreign Minister's article and all your statements? Peace? Not a chance. An agreement with the Arabs? Not a hope. The more you give up, the more the Arabs say: the borders of 4 June 1967, a Palestinian state in Judea and Samaria, with a corridor linking them. What do the Arabs call Yigal Allon after the article? An annexationist. What do they say about his plan? It is an obstacle to peace....Permit me to conclude by extending my best wishes for the coming year to all the members of the House....

Minister I. Galili: Mr. Speaker, distinguished Knesset...MK Begin was kind enough to quote part of a speech I made in the Knesset in May 1972, but refrained from quoting the whole speech...which I think was a good one and whose content is still valid. Naturally a statement of that kind could only be made on the basis of the Government's decision of October 1968, which has not been altered to this day....

As everyone knows, the Opposition, for which MK Begin speaks, disagrees with the Government's policy on various issues. The Opposition carries weight in the Knesset and with the public, but it has not gained the confidence of the nation sufficiently to govern the country....In contrast to the Likud, the policy of the Government of Israel, like its predecessors, aspires to attain peace within defensible borders and is ready to reach a territorial compromise. That policy is conducted with the knowledge and approval of the Knesset at every stage. Our actions in the international, settlement and defense arenas have been in accordance with that policy. We believe in that policy and are convinced that the nation has benefited and will benefit from it....We reject the Likud's policy of "not one inch shall be returned"....and maintain that it could, albeit unintentionally, foil the chances of gaining peace....

M. Drobles (Likud): That is demagoguery.

M. Yedid (Likud): You have brought us wars.

A. Lin (Likud): Has your policy brought us peace?

M. Nissim (Likud): Can someone who is responsible for the Yom Kippur War speak like that...?

G. Cohen (Likud): You are here to speak about the policy of the Government, not of the Likud. If you have nothing to say, leave the podium.

D. Levy (Likud): What do you think of the map that was drawn?

M. Begin (Likud): Aren't you in favor of the territorial integrity of the country, Mr. Galili?

Minister I. Galili: On that issue there has been a public debate, which will doubtless continue during the forthcoming elections. Beyond what is said in one article or interview or another, the main point is that the Government's peace policy has received the approval of the majority of the nation....

G. Cohen (Likud): What is that peace policy?

Minister I. Galili: ...and is prepared to make territorial concessions for peace.

(Shouts.)

Minister I. Galili: And the Knesset has approved that policy, as a result of which steps have been taken towards peace.

B. Keshet (Likud): Minister Galili, for heaven's sake, kindly tell us whether the Government agrees with Minister Allon or not.

Minister I. Galili: I don't have to answer systematic interruptions and obstructions....

M. Yedid (Likud): You're avoiding the issue....

Minister I. Galili: That policy has led to the interim agreement with Egypt. The Government is entitled to conduct negotiations with Jordan and reach decisions, but has undertaken to go to the nation and hold elections, provided one of the members of the Coalition requests this, if relinquishing parts of Judea and Samaria is involved. For political reasons, the Government has not yet submitted an official map to anyone. We do not think that the conditions are ripe for doing this yet....But we do not think we should do nothing in political, settlement or security terms, and are doing all we can to increase our strength. The general Arab refusal to make peace with us does not justify leaving a vacuum in Jewish, Zionist and constructive terms in parts of the country which are essential for our security and existence, such as the Golan Heights, the Jordan Valley, the Etzion Bloc, the Jerusalem region, the Gaza Strip, the Rafah area and the Gulf of Eilat. Hence the settlements which the Gov-

ernment decided to establish after the Six Day War. Not only does Yigal Allon agree with this approach, he is one of its principal proponents....

As far as the future is concerned, there are various plans, including the one known as the Allon Plan. My colleague the Foreign Minister put his plan before the Government on 26 July 1967, when the Likud was still in the Government. The Government did not think it appropriate to adopt any detailed plan then, and since then references of various kinds have been made within the Government to the principles and details of the Allon Plan during the course of discussions on general and settlement issues. But neither that nor any other plan has yet been submitted for a decision.

Nonetheless, since a few months after the Six Day War the Government has been aware of the fact that in its contacts with various political factors it is advisable to examine the acceptability of open and secret talks with certain elements, but the Plan has not been submitted as the official plan of the Government of Israel. Similarly, no map has been presented. None of the neighboring countries has agreed to the principles of the Allon Plan or any other plan based on defensible borders and a compromise, but that does not detract from its educational and settlement value, and of course it does not deter the Government from persevering in its efforts to attain peace....

The assumption underlying Minister Allon's approach...is that our right to the Land of Israel is the moral basis for Israel's right to exist within any borders. He maintains that his approach ensures the strategic and national integrity of the country. His version takes the Arab factor which is entitled to an expression of its identity into account as far as possible, and is also a fair basis for a peace settlement with a territorial compromise which will end the protracted conflict.

His article in *Foreign Affairs* puts Israel's case for defensible borders...within the strategic, security, demographic and political reality of the situation....The article makes it clear that the borders of June 4 are not defensible and cannot guarantee Israel's security and existence. Allon also states that we will not agree to an imposed solution, criticizes France for encouraging the most extreme Arab countries, castigates the Rogers Plan and contrasts Israel's basically peaceful policy with the Arab countries' intentions of destroying Israel.

I believe that those arguments will help us whenever we have to explain the security motives for significant border changes. Anyone who has been following our discussions with our friends will know...that the need for strategic depth is an essential element of Israel's argument for defensible borders. I am sure that the Foreign Minister is aware of the fact that the compromise he advocates does not meet with MK Begin's approval, just as the Government's policy does not....I am sure that when we do finally reach peace negotiations and it is necessary to draw

exact maps there may be differences of opinion within the Government and a decision will have to be made.

Allon did not ask the Government to endorse his whole article... even though the principles underlying it are the Government's....The readers of *Foreign Affairs* can distinguish between an official statement of the Government of Israel and an analytical article, even if written by the Foreign Minister....The Foreign Minister has made it clear that the views expressed in the article are his own private ones... and as you know, members of the Government are allowed to hold and express their own views....

It has been suggested that the time is now ripe for preparing a detailed peace map and submitting it to international bodies and the Arab countries. To date the Government has not decided to do this nor have new decisions been made regarding Gaza or El Arish, or the strip of territory connecting Sharm el-Sheikh....We are prepared to make concessions for peace, while maintaining defensible borders, rejecting the establishment of another Palestinian state, expressing our unwillingness to rule another nation, particularly if its numbers threaten the country's Jewish character and democratic regime, continuing to establish settlements which buttress defensible borders, enabling the Palestinian identity to express itself only within a Jordanian-Palestinian state and repudiating an imposed settlement. All those elements will continue to constitute Israeli policy. Anyone who disagrees will be able to speak out at the forthcoming elections...and meanwhile we are authorized to reinforce the period of tranquillity by reaching additional agreements, including one to end the state of war. I see no reason to discuss this subject in the plenum and recommend that it be transferred to committee....

The Vote

Those in favor	53
Those against	13
Abstentions	2

(Minister Galili's proposal, with MK Begin's agreement, to transfer the subject to the Foreign Affairs and Defense Committee is adopted.)